

Quizzes of non-Catholic...
ADU 9546

QUIZZES



on
**NON
CATHOLIC**



Denominations

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

1. RADIO REPLIES 60c
 2. RADIO REPLIES 60c
 3. RADIO REPLIES 60c
- LIBRARY EDITION OF RADIO REPLIES \$2.00 EACH
- CHATS WITH PROSPECTIVE CONVERTS AND NON-CATHOLICS BEFORE MARRIAGE \$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
- 40 YEARS AFTER \$2.00, BOUND \$2.75
- JEWISH PANORAMA \$3.00
- 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
- PURGATORY QUIZZES 10c
- INDULGENCE QUIZZES 10c
- CONFESSION QUIZZES 10c
- MARRIAGE QUIZZES 10c
- HELL QUIZZES 10c
- BIRTH PREVENTION QUIZZES 10c
- EUCCHARIST QUIZZES 10c
- TRUE CHURCH QUIZZES 10c
- VIRGIN WORSHIP QUIZZES 10c
- BOUND IN BOOK FORM FOR INSTRUCTOR, QUIZZES \$1.50
-

Copyright 1945
 by the
RADIO REPLIES PRESS
 Printed in U. S. A.

Deacidified

IMPRIMATUR
 Joannes Gregorius Murray
 Archiepiscopus Sancti Pauli

QUIZZES ON NON-CATHOLIC DENOMINATIONS

1. How many were the major forms of defection from the Catholic Church since the time of the Apostle?

As a general estimate, I would say seven, namely, Gnosticism, Manichaeism, Arianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism, Greek Orthodoxy, and Protestantism. I have given them in the order of their appearance on the stage of history.

2. What was the principle cause of desertion in each case?

That is a very comprehensive question, and I can but give here a general answer. In each case the dissident movement began either in a denial of the teachings of the Catholic Church, or in a rebellion against her authority. Both aspects were always, of course, ultimately involved. Those who began by rejecting the teachings of the Church soon found themselves in rebellion against her authority; whilst those who began by rebelling against her authority soon found themselves denying her doctrines. The Gnostics, Manichaeans, Arians, Nestorians, and Eutychians, began with doctrinal error, and ended by defying the authority of Rome.

The Greek Church began by defying the authority of Rome, and has ended in a denial of much Catholic teaching, today becoming more and more infected by rationalism and modernism. Protestantism began in Germany by Luther's rejection of Catholic doctrine and his subsequent rejection of the authority of Rome; whilst in England it began by Henry VIII's rejection of the Pope's authority, followed by Elizabeth's repudiation of Catholic doctrine.

3. What was Gnosticism?

Gnosticism arose in the second century, being a blend of Greek philosophy and pagan mythology with Christian doctrine. It split up into many independent heresies such as Marcionism and Montanism, and lingered on until about the seventh century. The history of most of these heresies is much the same. Protected by civil authority in many cases, each became fairly widespread, or even very widespread; then split up into warring sections, and eventually died out, or lingered on in a state of stagnation.

4. What was Manichaeism?

Manichaeism tried to blend Indian and Persian philosophy and mythology with Christian doctrine. It commenced in the third century, became very widespread, but split up, and lingered on until the thirteenth century in various forms, the chief of its later forms being Albigensianism. It therefore had a long run of nearly ten centuries.

5. What was the heresy of Arius?

Arius was born in Lybia in 256 A.D., and was ordained a Catholic priest in 313 A.D. In the year 318, at the Synod of Alexandria, the Patriarch of that city gave a discourse on the doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity. Arius declared that the Patriarch had fallen into error, and proceeded to set out his own ideas of Christian doctrine. He denied that Christ was really the Eternal Son of God, equally sharing in the Divine Nature with the Father. According to him, the Person of Christ existed before all other created things, and was nobler than them all. But God had created that Person of Christ in eternity, and then through Him created all other things in time. Later that created Personality of Christ became man for the redemption of the human race. In 320 A.D. a second Synod of Alexandria condemned the doctrine of Arius as heretical because it made the Eternal Son of God a mere creature, denying that He was equally the uncreated God with the Father and the Holy Ghost. Arius would not submit, but went on teaching and publicly spreading his errors, securing many followers and causing immense disturbance in the Church, and also in the State. The Emperor Constantine demanded that General Council be held to settle the matter, and in 325 A.D. the Bishops met at Nicea. They condemned the teaching of Arius because he denied the Deity of Christ, and he was excommunicated because he would not submit to the authority of the Church. His heresy led multitudes astray, and for over four centuries Arian heretics were pro-

portionately as numerous as the various forms of Protestantism during the last four centuries. Arius himself died in 335 A.D., and his movement died out also in the seventh century. In modern times Unitarianism is really a revived form of Arianism, at least by its denial of the doctrine of the Trinity and of the Deity of Christ.

6. Will you explain the teachings of Nestorius?

As opposed to the Arians who would not admit that Christ was God, Nestorius insisted that we must adore Christ as God. But in explaining how Christ is God, he fell into error; and as he had become Patriarch of Constantinople in 428 A.D., his very influence demanded immediate decision by the Church. Nestorius said that we must adore Christ as God because God dwelt in Christ. However we could not identify Christ with God, and apart from the indwelling of God within Him, Christ was a merely human Person. There were, therefore, two persons as well as two natures in Christ; not, as the Church held, the One Person of the Eternal Son of God who, possessing the Divine Nature from eternity, had assumed to Himself a human nature in time. Nestorius taught that Mary was the Mother of a merely human child whom God used as an instrument for our redemption. She may be called the Mother of Christ, but she must not be called the Mother of God. In the year 431 A.D., the Council of Ephesus condemned the teaching of Nestorius.

and defined the doctrine that there is only one Personality in Christ, that of the Eternal Son of God who, after the Incarnation, possessed both a Divine and a human nature. Insisting that the Child born of Mary was truly God, the Council defined that Mary was the Mother of God insofar as God deigned to be born of her in human form, when the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us. Nestorius refused to accept the decision of the Council, was excommunicated, and originated the Nestorian Church which lingers on amongst groups of Eastern Christians to this day in a stagnant condition, and hopelessly bound up with national considerations. At no time was the Nestorian sect as numerous as the Arians in their day, but it has lasted much longer.

7. What was the Eutychian heresy?

Eutyches was the Superior of a Monastery in Constantinople who strongly opposed Nestorius. Unhappily his reaction against the errors of Nestorius led him into an opposite error. The Catholic doctrine teaches that in Christ there is one Person only, that of the Eternal Son of God, and two natures, the one Divine and the other human. Nestorius had wanted two persons and two natures. Eutyches, to safeguard the one Person of Christ, taught that the human nature was so absorbed into the Divine Nature as to lose its identity, so that as a result there was but one Person and one Nature in our Lord. The Council of Chalcedon in 451 A.D. condemned this error of Eutyches as heretical, and redefined the Catholic doc-

trine of one Person and two natures in Christ. Eutyches, despite his first good intentions, manifested a great attachment to his own ideas, refused to submit to the decision of the Church, and gave to the world the Monophysite heresy. The Monophysites, or the "upholders of one nature," have persevered through history to the present day, forming various sects such as the Coptic and Ethiopian Churches in Africa, and the Jacobite Churches in Mesopotamia. National reasons account for their survival, but they are without validity.

8. Do not these wrangles seem a mere matter of words?

That is a very superficial estimate. These heresies struck at the essential doctrine concerning the very Person of Christ, and were destructive of the Christian faith in their ultimate consequences. The Church, which St. Paul calls the "pillar and ground of truth," was safeguarding the revelation of God given into her keeping by her Founder, being in turn safeguarded by the Holy Spirit in her work of preserving the faith intact.

9. I have read recently that the Abyssinians belonged to the Coptic faith, the earliest sect of the Christian denominations, to which all the Christian world adhered until the rise of the Church of Rome.

It is true that the Abyssinians belonged to

the Coptic Church. But the rest of the statement is erroneous. Firstly, a sect is a group of dissentient people who abandon a previous position in order to set up a new form of Church. If the Coptic Church were the original Church to which the whole Christian world adhered, then it is not a sect. All the newer and independent Churches which broke away from the original Church would constitute the sects. Secondly, we come to a question of fact. Was the Coptic faith the original faith to which all Christians adhered from the beginning? In other words, did St. Peter and the other Apostles belong to the Coptic Church? That is impossible, for the Coptic sect did not come into existence until the fifth century.

10. It is said that the Abyssinians were converted to the Christian faith by St. Frumentius, who was consecrated Bishop of Abyssinia by the Patriarch Athanasius of Alexandria.

That is quite correct, but it spells death to the idea that the Abyssinian Coptic Church is the oldest form of Christianity, and to the notion that the Church of Rome was subsequent in origin. For St. Athanasius, who consecrated St. Frumentius, was in complete union with the Pope of Rome! In certain difficulties with his own subjects St. Athanasius appealed to the Pope, and Pope Julius I wrote back to the rebels, "Do you not know that the ordinary practice is first to write to us, and from Rome to receive the decision as to what is right?"

Should any reproach fall upon the Bishop of your city, you must undoubtedly refer the case to this Church of Rome." How could St. Athanasius be subject to the Church of Rome if the Church of Rome had not yet arisen? And what religion would St. Frumentius preach save that professed by the Bishop who consecrated him? St. Frumentius preached the Roman faith, and lived and died without ever hearing of the Coptic Church.

11. How did the Coptic Church come into existence?

Christianity was first preached in Abyssinia by St. Frumentius who had been consecrated Bishop by St. Athanasius in 341 A.D. He preached the faith of the Roman Church to which all the Christian world adhered insofar as it was the faith St. Peter himself had preached at Rome. Over 100 years after the consecration of St. Frumentius, Eutyches, an Archimandrite of Constantinople, was condemned as a heretic at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. Refusing to submit, Eutyches commenced the Monophysite heresy. Now some Bishops from the Abyssinian Church founded by St. Frumentius 110 years earlier were present at the Council of Chalcedon. They then acknowledged the jurisdiction of Pope Leo I. But they became infected by the Monophysite heresy, went back to their own country, broke away from the authority of Rome, and commenced that sect which today is called the Coptic Church of Abyssinia. The word "Coptic"

means "Egyptian," and the "Copts" are simply the descendants of the Monophysite heretics in Egypt. As you will notice, the Coptic sect is very old. It is over a thousand years older than any Protestant sect. But still it did not begin until over 400 years after the foundation of the Catholic Church. And when you realize that it is now just about 400 years since Protestantism began, you will understand that the Catholic Church is a good deal older than the Coptic Church.

12. What is the Greek Orthodox Church?

There are some 16 different Orthodox Churches existing independently of one another. After the first really definite break with Rome when Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, left the Catholic Church in the ninth century, the Eastern Church followed in the path of all schismatical Churches, splitting up into further divisions. Eight of these separate sections of Orthodoxy have their own Patriarchs, namely, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Bulgaria, Rumania, Russia, and Servia. The others lack definite rule. The term "Greek Orthodox Church" is popularly applied to any or all of these Churches; but strictly speaking it should be reserved for that section of Orthodoxy which acknowledges the Patriarch of Constantinople. This is really one of the smaller sections, for the Bulgarians, Rumanians, Russians and others of Slav nationality, are Greeks in no sense of the word. But it

is clear that there is no one united Orthodox Church at all, any more than there is one united form of Protestantism. However, since the schismatic Orthodox Churches began with the rebellion of the Patriarchate of Constantinople against Rome in the ninth century, we can allude to all the Orthodox Churches as belonging to the Greek Schism.

13. Was the Christian Church governed from the beginning with the Bishop of Rome as supreme and infallible head, or by a Council of Bishops?

The Church from the very beginning was governed by the Bishops, including the Bishop of Rome, all the other Bishops being in union with and subject to the universal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. At times the Bishops met together in Councils for more important deliberations, and the decisions of these Councils were acknowledged as binding provided they were approved and sanctioned by the Bishop of Rome as supreme head of the Church.

14. Did the Patriarchs of the Greek Orthodox Church at any stage after the death of Christ recognize the Pope as supreme and infallible head of the Church?

We cannot speak of the "Patriarchs of the Greek Orthodox Church" prior to the Greek Schism commenced by Photius in 867 A.D.

Until then there were simply Patriarchs of Constantinople, presiding there and subject to the Pope. Dr. Orchard, when a Congregationalist, wrote, "An examination of the circumstances of the Great Schism shows that the Eastern Church did then repudiate a supremacy which it had previously been in the habit of conceding to the Roman Patriarchate." The First Council of Constantinople in 381, which only Eastern Bishops attended, demanded that the Bishop of Constantinople should rank next after the Bishop of Rome, and before the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch. The Council of Chalcedon in 451, attended by the Eastern Bishops, ended its discussion with the unanimous cry, "Peter has spoken by Leo," when the Pope's decision was given. A century and a half later Pope Gregory I could still write, "Who doubts that the Church of Constantinople is subject to the Apostolic See?" No one then doubted it; and no one disputed it until Photius came along in 867 to plunge the East into schism. The Patriarch of Constantinople, and all the Eastern Bishops signed the formula of Hormisdas, who was Pope from 514 to 523. That formula contained these words, "We follow the Apostolic See in everything and teach all its laws. I hope to be in that one Communion taught by the Apostolic See in which is the whole, real, and perfect solidity of the Christian religion." Dean Milman writes, "Before the end of the third century the lineal descent of Rome's Bishops from St. Peter was unhesitatingly claimed and obsequiously admitted by the Christian world."

15. What reasons led to the break-away of the Greeks?

The reasons were chiefly political. According to the most recent research work of Jugie, Grumel, Amann, and Dvornik, the schism commenced by Photius in 867 would never have happened had it not been for political rivalry concerning jurisdiction over Bulgaria. In 861 the Bulgarians were converted by missionaries from Constantinople. In 866 Pope Nicholas I appointed Bishops for the Bulgarians in order to bring them under the jurisdiction of the Latin Patriarchate of the West rather than have them under the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The motive to maintain Rome's political authority over Constantinople was not absent, and from this point of view the move was a grave political mistake. The Greeks resented it, and Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, wrote a reprehensible letter to the Pope in 867 in which he condemned the Catholic Church and made various charges against her even from the doctrinal point of view. The undeniable provocation did not justify his doing this. The Pope excommunicated Photius, who retaliated by excommunicating the Pope, and the schism commenced. Photius made peace with Pope John VIII, and was duly recognized as Patriarch of Constantinople; and the reconciliation endured so long as Photius lived. But trouble had been set on foot; and intermittent difficulties with Rome continued until 1054 when Michael Cerularius, the then Patriarch of Constantinople, renewed the break with Rome, moved by sheer

ambition to be universal Patriarch over the whole Church. He won the Emperor to his side by appealing to national pride in the political importance of Constantinople. From that time on, no Patriarch of Constantinople has sought confirmation of his appointment from Rome, nor submitted to the jurisdiction of the Pope. Greek Delegates to the Second Council of Lyons in 1274, and again at the Council of Florence in 1439, admitted that they should do so, and return to unity with Rome. But on each occasion on their return to the East their admissions were repudiated through national interests. So the Greek Churches continue in their schismatical state. Political quarrels and personal antagonisms, with faults on both sides, were the original cause of the schism, not dogmatic differences. But from a doctrinal point of view, the Eastern Churches are gradually drifting from orthodoxy, and yielding to the inroads of modernist influences.

16. I have been told that Greek priests have power to consecrate the Eucharist.

Priests of the Greek Orthodox Churches have valid Orders, and when they offer the Sacrifice of the Mass, they consecrate validly.

17. As the Greeks are schismatics and heretics also, how can you admit their Orders whilst denying Anglican Orders?

The Greek Orthodox Churches are separated from the Catholic Church by schism, or division from its authority; and also by heresy, insofar as they refuse to admit certain Catholic dogmatic teachings. But these things do not necessarily affect the question of Orders. If, after leaving the Catholic Church, such ecclesiastical bodies retain the correct form of ordination, and administer the Sacrament of Holy Orders with the right intention, then the priests will be truly ordained, even though in a schismatical and heretical Church. This is the case with the Orthodox Greeks. And since Greek priests are truly ordained, they cannot be re-ordained should they seek admission to the Catholic Church. Even in the Anglican Church, after its separation from Rome by Henry VIII, in 1534, the ordinations continued to be correct for the first sixteen years, until 1550. But in 1550, during the reign of Edward VI, the form for ordination was altered, and the intention of ordaining priests in the Catholic sense of the word was repudiated. From then on, Anglican Orders have been simply invalid, and converted clergymen from the Anglican Church must remain either as Catholic laymen, or be ordained as Catholic priests without any allowance being made for their previous ordination as ministers in the Church of England.

18. If a married Greek priest became a Roman Catholic, would he be allowed to officiate as a priest and still live with his wife?

He could not do so if he adopted the Latin rite. But he could do so if, as would probably happen, he joined one of the Uniate Greek Churches which retain their Greek customs and Liturgy even whilst subject to the Pope.

19. Do the Greek Churches believe that Christ is really present in the Eucharist? If so, do they celebrate a valid Mass?

The Greek Churches believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; and since their priests have valid Orders, they possess the power of consecrating the Blessed Eucharist in the true sense of the word. The Sacrifice of the Mass in Greek Churches is, therefore, every bit as valid as the Mass in the Catholic Church, even though it is not celebrated in Latin.

20. May a Catholic hear Mass, then, in a Greek Church?

He may do so in a Uniate Greek Church, but not in any of the schismatical Orthodox Churches. Those Churches are not part of the Catholic Church, but are in a state of schism and of protest against the authority of Christ in His true Church. Churches separated from the unity of the Catholic Church are not according to the will of Christ, who demands that His followers should form one flock under one shepherd. No Catholic therefore may take part

in, or sanction in any way, the services of the Greek Orthodox Churches.

21. I have heard that, when a Catholic priest is not available, Catholics may receive the Sacraments from Greek Orthodox priests. Is that consistent?

When no Catholic priest is available, the Catholic Church permits a dying Catholic to receive one Sacrament only from a Greek priest, and that is the Sacrament of Confession. The very law of the Catholic Church forbidding participation in Greek rites during life is to preserve a Catholic from danger of schism, and within the true Church, for the sake of his very salvation. And if, at the hour of death, that salvation can be the better secured by the reception of absolution from a Greek priest rather than go without such absolution, the Church wisely and mercifully permits it. But, as is clear, this exception avails only in the case of extreme necessity, when no Catholic priest is available, and on condition that the Catholic merely accepts absolution from the Greek priest as a priest, and in no way approving his position as schismatic.

22. In what doctrines do the Greek Orthodox Churches differ from the Roman Catholic Church?

They differ on many essential points, al-

though they are much nearer to Catholicism than they are to Protestantism, insofar as they retain the bulk of original Christian doctrine, and a valid priesthood. They acknowledge the doctrine of the Trinity, but deny that the Holy Ghost proceeds from both Father and Son. They deny the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope; the right of the Church to baptize by pouring the water instead of by completely immersing the subject; the right to give Communion under one kind only; the Catholic doctrine of the particular and general judgments; also the Catholic doctrine on the nature of purgatory, although they admit the existence of purgatory. Whilst believing that Mary was quite sinless, and maintaining a great devotion to her as the Mother of God, they deny the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. This, however, is a more recent denial. The Greek Churches believed in the Immaculate Conception until the advent of Protestantism. Under pressure of Protestant opinion they wavered without denying it. The denial came when the Pope defined the doctrine in 1854, but merely because they were opposed to the Pope and wished to manifest their opposition. They have nothing against the doctrine in itself. The Greeks also differ from Rome concerning the nature of original sin, and of justification. These are the chief differences, some of them rendering the Greek Churches heretical as well as schismatical.

23. I belong to the Greek Orthodox Church, and regard my religion as

identical with the Roman Catholic except for the fact that you acknowledge the Pope as head, whilst we acknowledge the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

Even were that true, you are confronted with a great 'problem. Christ declared definitely that His Church would be one fold under one shepherd. And your duty would be to inquire as to the relative merits of the Pope and of the Patriarch of Jerusalem in their claims to be head of the Church. Both cannot be. But, as a matter of fact, you cannot speak of one Greek Orthodox Church with the Patriarch of Jerusalem as its head. The Rev. C. J. MacGillivray, in his book, "Through the East to Rome," 1931, says that, as an Anglican clergyman, he spent some years in the East amongst the Greeks and Syrians, working for the reunion of Greeks and Anglicans. He found it impossible, and in the end became a Catholic. On page 91 of his book he writes: "To begin with, there is no such thing as the 'Orthodox Church'. There is a group of some 15 or 16 independent Churches, recognizing no common authority, but loosely connected as being all 'Orthodox'. And again, if you leave out Russia, the whole number of the Orthodox is exceedingly small; and the Russian Church was only held together by the power of the State. Compared to the Roman Catholic Church the so-called Orthodox Church is just a collection of fossilized and moribund fragments of what was once a great and living Church. Indeed it seems to me to be a great object lesson in the disastrous con-

sequences of abandoning the rock on which the Church of Christ was built. The Orthodox Church has ceased to be a living teacher. It is incapable of any sort of development, or of that constant advance in thought and undying vitality which are characteristic of the Roman Catholic Church. It is not, indeed, carried about with every wind of doctrine like the Protestant Churches. It has, in the main, kept the old Faith, but only at the cost of ceasing to think. On all the vital questions which have been discussed, and in many cases settled in the West, it neither has, nor can have anything to say." Such is the impression formed from first-hand knowledge by the Rev. C. J. Mac-Gillivray during his sojourn amongst Eastern Christians as an Anglican clergyman. You cannot, therefore, speak of the Greek Church as one Church; and not all the groups comprising it acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem by any means.

24. Even though in schism, the Greek Orthodox Church is at least an Apostolic Church.

That cannot be admitted. The word "Apostolic" in general signifies the identity of a present Church with the Church of the Apostles. This identity can be either adequate or inadequate. Adequate apostolicity is present when a Church of today has not only the same doctrine and worship, and the same episcopal constitution, but also the same uninterrupted and lawfully transmitted jurisdiction or authority.

Without this latter requirement, any vestiges of apostolicity are inadequate, and useless as a mark of identification. The chief thing, therefore, is the continued juridical succession of apostolic authority. Now this element precisely is missing from the Greek Orthodox Church. By the mere fact of being in schism, apostolic authority is forfeited. In addition, the Greek Church has not preserved the Faith intact in many points. The Greek Church cannot therefore be called apostolic in the technical sense of that word.

25. Do you deny the Greek Church to be truly Catholic?

Yes. By Catholic we mean a given Church, i.e., one united Church, which remains everywhere essentially the same, and inherits the commission of Christ to teach all nations as a right, exercising that right by constantly propagating itself in continual expansion. Now, in the first place, there is no one Greek Orthodox Church. For example, there is no authoritative bond of union between the Greek Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Russia, Servia, Rumania, Bulgaria, Ukraine, and Estonia, etc. Moreover, these Greek Churches are not even conscious of a Divine commission to teach all nations. They consent to be national in their outlook, and show no sign of the expansive power which seeks to propagate itself amongst all peoples. The Greeks declare the Latins to have fallen into schism, yet make no effort to convert them back to "Orthodoxy."

Is it not significant that, whilst no Latins ever followed the Patriarch of Constantinople, many in the East, including many Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria, remained in Communion with Rome after the schisms of Photius and Cerularius? It is impossible to regard the Greek Orthodox Churches as Catholic in the true sense of the word.

26. Since Greek Orthodoxy is so near to Roman Catholicism, why change from one to the other?

The mere fact that they are not identical is sufficient reason for a change from Greek Orthodoxy to Catholicism. It is necessary to be subject to the right authority. Obedience is the very heart of religion. We went from God by disobedience; the road back is by obedience. And the authority of the Pope is that of Christ. Of him Christ said, "He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me." Lk. X, 16. Again, Christ said, "If a man will not hear the Church, let him be as the heathen." Matt. XVIII, 17. Our Lord could never have commanded men to obey two conflicting authorities. That would spell chaos. The very reasons the Greeks urge for not becoming Catholics show that they do not really believe their Churches to be as near to Catholicism as they pretend. Moreover, Greek priests are getting more and more into the habit of fraternizing with Protestants in common services. But no Greek Orthodox priest would be allowed to participate in any Cath-

olic rites. The Greeks acknowledge a bond with definitely heretical Churches; but they have no real bond with the Catholic Church. They are outside Catholic unity.

27. I was taught by my parents that the Church of England has always been a distinct Church on its own right from the second century.

Your parents apparently belonged to that school of Anglicans which refuses to admit that the Church of England originated only at the time of the Protestant Reformation. Those who belong to that school of thought persuade themselves that the present Anglican Church is one and the same as the Church which was established in England by the first Christian missionaries to that country. But this theory cannot stand the test of history.

28. You insist that it originated at the time of the Protestant Reformation?

Yes, until the Reformation, England was a Catholic country. The first missionaries preached the Catholic religion, and were as subject to the Pope as I am. Henry VIII was a Catholic, and subject to the Pope until 1534, when he rebelled against the Catholic Church, left it, and made himself head of his own new Church within his own kingdom.

29. Is your verdict historical?

It is the normal and correct verdict of the ordinary historian who judges simply in accordance with the facts, and who has no particular ecclesiastical theory to maintain. Thus Lecky, an agnostic, in his "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," says that the Church of England was founded at the Reformation as an institution most intensely and distinctively English.

30. The Church of England, then, is not one with the pre-Reformation Church in England?

No. If it were, it would still be subject to the Pope, one with the Catholic Church throughout the world, observing the same Canon Law, offering the same Sacrifice of the Mass, and teaching the same doctrines as those held by all Catholics today, whether in Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Austria, America, Australia, India, Africa, and elsewhere throughout the world. But on all points, doctrinal, devotional, and disciplinary, the Church of England is out of harmony with the Catholic Church. Any one who believes that the religion of England for over a thousand years prior to the Reformation was correct, has no option but to leave Anglicanism and return to the Catholic Church—as I myself did.

31. Will you briefly explain how the Anglican Church came about?

Until the year 1534, Henry VIII was in full

communion with and subject to the Pope, and England was a Catholic country. In fact, after Luther in Germany had rebelled against the Pope in 1517, Henry wrote a book to refute him, and received in return for this from the Pope the title, "Defender of the Faith." Unfortunately Henry grew tired of his lawful wife, Catherine of Aragon, and wished to put her away and marry Anne Boleyn. He asked the Pope to annul his marriage with Catherine; but, as his marriage to Catherine was quite valid, he failed to secure the favor he sought. He therefore broke with Rome, and had himself created head of the Church of England by the Act of Royal Supremacy in 1534. He thus set up the Church of England as a Church independent of the Catholic Church, and took the divorce he wanted. Whilst repudiating the authority of the Pope, however, Henry also repudiated the new Protestant doctrines apart from the denial of Papal authority. He insisted on all other Catholic teachings and practices, persecuting Catholics who denied the royal supremacy, and Protestants who denied transubstantiation and the Mass. After Henry's death, however, his new Church could not remain as it was, neither Catholic nor Protestant. Under Edward VI, who was but a boy, Cranmer protestantized both the doctrines and worship of the Church of England. Edward died before the work was consolidated, and was succeeded by Mary, who was an ardent Catholic. She determined to undo the work of both Henry and Cranmer, banishing the former's royal supremacy, and the latter's Protest-

antism. She restored the Catholic religion, and the deposed Catholic Bishops, and brought the Church once more into unity with Rome under the jurisdiction of the Pope. That ended the first phase of the Church of England as a separated Anglican Church. This was in 1554, twenty years after Henry's first break with Rome in 1534. Mary died, however, in 1558. And in the first year of her reign, 1559, Elizabeth renewed the Act of Royal Supremacy, and set up the independent Church of England again, this time on a definitely Protestant basis. The Protestant Church of England has continued unbrokenly since then, though it has exhibited an interior spirit of dissension and turmoil such as few other Protestant sects can boast.

32. Anglicans deny absolutely that Henry VIII. was the founder of the Church of England.

That denial will not stand the test of history. It is certain that prior to 1534 the Church in England was subject to the authority of the Pope. After 1534, when Henry repudiated the authority of the Pope and set himself up as supreme head on earth of the Church in his realm, a new Church was the result—just as America became a new and separate nation when, in 1776, it repudiated the authority of the King of England, despite its retaining the same customs, traditions, language, and possessions as before.

33. Henry insisted that the Church should remain just as it was.

You forget that the Church is essentially a unified society, and that it is utterly dependent upon the bond of authority binding it together. The authority and jurisdiction of the Pope is the very heart of the constitution of the Church. When Henry rejected the authority and jurisdiction of Rome, and declared these things to be centered in him as far as the Church in his realm was concerned, he dragged that Church into schism and altered its essential character, by the radical constitutional change he had imposed upon it. The Henrician schismatical Church was by the very fact cut off from, and outside the true Catholic Church.

34. There was a true continuity with the previously existing Church in England.

The new Church continued to retain the Church property and buildings that belonged to the old Church, but did not retain identity with that Church. It could not break away from that Church and still belong to it. The Anglican Dr. Goudge rightly says, "The English Church has in England supplanted the Roman, and we hold the Cathedrals, the parish Churches, and the little that the State has left of the ancient endowments. . . . If English Roman Catholics were not hostile to the Anglican Church, it would be a miracle of grace."

35. The continuity of the Church of England with the pre-Reformation Church is recognized by the law of England.

To that I will let Sir W. S. Holdsworth, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D., professor of English Law in the University of Oxford, reply. In his "History of English Law," published 1931, he writes that, because the Pope would not grant Henry VIII a divorce, "a break with Rome became necessary. Although the break was accomplished with as little external change as possible, it necessarily involved an altogether new view as to the relations between Church and State. In the preamble to Henry's Statutes we can see the gradual elaboration of the main characteristics of these changed relations . . . the theory of the Royal Supremacy. The dual control over things temporal and things spiritual is to end. The Crown is to be supreme over all persons and causes. The Canon Law of the Western Church is to give place to the 'King's Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England' . . . In the preamble to the Statute of Appeals in 1533 the relations between the new Anglican Church and the State were sketched by the king himself with his own hand . . . Henry VIII often inserted in the preambles to his Statutes reasoned arguments designed to prove the wisdom of the particular Statute. And . . . he never hesitated to color facts and events to suit his purpose. But the preamble to this Statute of Appeals is remarkable, partly because it manufactures history on an unprecedented scale, but

chiefly because it has operated from that day to this as a powerful incentive to its manufacture by others on similar lines. Nor is the reason for this phenomenon difficult to discover. The Tudor Settlement was a characteristically skillful instance of the Tudor genius for creating a modern institution with a mediaeval form. But, in order to create the illusion that the new Anglican Church was indeed the same institution as the mediaeval Church, it was necessary to prove the historical continuity of these two very different institutions. . . . It was not till an historian arose who, besides being the greatest historian of this century, was both a consummate lawyer, and a dissenter from the Anglican as well as the other Churches (i.e., F. W. Maitland, LL.D., D.C.L., late Downing Professor of Law at Cambridge) that the historical worthlessness of Henry's theory was finally demonstrated." Such are the words of Sir W. S. Holdsworth on the recognition of Anglican continuity by English Law. They will be found in his "History of English Law," 5th Edit., 1931.

36. The Church of England is Catholic, because it holds to the old truths which are patently cardinal.

It permits the denial of those truths even by its own Bishops. In his book, "The Necessity for Catholic Reunion," published in 1933, the Rev. T. Whitton, M.A., an Anglican clergyman, writes, "The Anglican Communion is very unlike the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox

Communion. Each of the latter are at least one in faith. In the Anglican Communion, on the contrary, there is no such unity. Not only are there at least three different and contradictory religions calling themselves 'Catholic', 'Evangelical', and 'Modernist', but also these three religions are divergent."

38. To these the Church of England is as a whole unalterably faithful.

The unalterable fidelity of the Church of England as a whole to the basic truths of Christianity is a mere dream. It is necessary to face realities. The Protestant Bishop Weston, of Zanzibar, published a book in 1914 entitled, "Ecclesia Anglicana." In it he wrote that the Church of England, of which he himself was a Bishop, is "puffed up with a sense of what she calls her broadmindedness," but that she "stands today at the judgment bar, innocent alike of narrowmindedness and broadmindedness, but proven guilty of double-mindedness. And until she recovers a single mind, and knows it, and learns to express it, she will be of use neither in the sphere of reunion nor in the mission field." He added that ministers of the Church of England treat "the fundamental articles of the Christian Faith as open questions."

39. Neither by addition as some, nor by subtraction as others, do we allow the Apostolic deposit of Faith to be impaired.

Ideals, and not a vision of the real, dictate such statements. Deploring the different and contending parties in the Church of England, the Rev. T. Whitton, in the book above quoted, says, "In this confusion and contradiction what can be expected of the people? Seeing these differences, and the teachings of the Modernists, and that the Bishops do not repress these contradictions, they naturally conclude that the parsons themselves do not believe that Jesus Christ is God. They think that the Bishops would never allow these important doctrines to be denied if they believed them themselves. . . . The Church of England is simply unable to cope with a situation which is rapidly changing from bad to worse on account of these divisions. . . . There are Bishops and others who boast of their divergence from the Catholic Church even in the fundamental doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation . . . and there is no court in the Church of England competent to declare the truth or condemn error." How can it be said the Church of England does not allow the Apostolic deposit of the Faith to be impaired? The safest position for an Anglican to adopt is to say that it does not matter whether his Church holds to the old truths or not; that those truths cannot be cardinal; and that it is the genius of Anglicanism to allow any kind of teaching at all.

40. At the Reformation we brought back the doctrine of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture.

Anglicanism adopted that principle from the Continental reformers. But it no longer believes in that doctrine. The Rev. Mr. Whitton writes, "The real Evangelicals are in a difficult position, for the Church of England no longer believes in the Inspiration of the Bible, as she allows it to be denied by those who teach in her name." As for the Reformation, he says that the Anglo-Catholic or High Church clergyman "regards the Reformation as thoroughly bad. He yearns for the time when it shall be undone, and the Church of England be one in faith under the Pope as she was until the catastrophe of the sixteenth century, since when she has lost the mass of the people. He gradually learns to repudiate the whole of the present regime. He sees that the so-called Ecclesiastical Courts derive their authority from the State, and that there are no Spiritual Courts whatever left. He sees that the Book of Common Prayer is a schedule to an Act of Parliament, and that spiritual authority it has none except the promise made to use the form contained in it; also that this promise is made by order of, and to the State, and therefore is to be interpreted in a sense as strictly minimized as possible."

41. Together with Scripture, of course, we accept the authority of the Church.

Mr. Whitton writes, "Membership in the Church of England determines nothing; in that comprehensive body all beliefs are called in

question except perhaps the existence of God. No one can say that a man, just because he is a member of the Church of England, must hold any one doctrine. Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals will probably dispute this." But the Rev. Mr. Whitton adds that each of these groups follows its own theory, and it is not in obedience to any authority of the Church. In fact, "they know that the Church of England does not demand it; that others in the same Communion believe and act quite contrarily, and are allowed to do so quite freely by their Church." How then can it be said that Anglicans believe in the authority of their Church?

42. Anglicanism insists on belief in the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the uniqueness of the Incarnation, and the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father and the Son.

I would that the Church of England did maintain such Catholic teaching. But it does not. The Report of the Girton Conference of Modern Churchmen, 1921, records the words of the head of an Anglican Theological College as follows: "Christ did not claim Divinity for Himself. . . . I do not suppose for a moment that Jesus ever thought of Himself as God. . . . We must absolutely jettison the traditional notion that His person was not human but Divine." How can it be said that the Church of England insists on belief in the Trinity and the Divinity of Christ? In their book, "Is Christianity True," Cyril Joad, the rationalist, chal-

lenges Arnold Lunn, an Anglican at the time of their controversy, in these words, "The only branch of Christianity which has not declined is Roman Catholicism. Logical, coherent, definite, and above all, dogmatic, it offers a sure foundation to those whose feet are beset by the quicksands of modern doubt. I find it in the highest degree significant that, although you have so recently controverted against Father Knox and taken up the cudgels against Catholicism, when you come to a rough-and-tumble with me over the whole field of Christian controversy, you have over and over again adopted the Catholic point of view, and . . . retreated in safety behind the ramparts of the citadel of Rome." So speaks the rationalist. And, as a matter of fact, shortly after this controversy with Joad, Arnold Lunn found no alternative save to be received into the Catholic Church.

43. The Church of England retains the seven Sacraments.

Some Anglicans or Episcopalians venerate seven Sacraments; some venerate two; some have no faith in any. The 39 Articles declare that there are two Sacraments properly so-called, Baptism and Eucharist. The other five are not to be regarded strictly as Sacraments. And, of course, even though the Holy Eucharist is declared to be a Sacrament, it is not accepted in the orthodox sense, and that it contains the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is denied. Both the Catholic

Church and the Greek Orthodox Church have retained seven Sacraments as coming down from the very beginning, and as instituted by Christ Himself.

44. The Church of England believes in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

At the Reformation the Church of England abolished that doctrine. Thomas Cranmer, who had gone to the Continent and absorbed the spirit of Protestantism in Germany, decided after the death of Henry VIII to protestantize the Church of England. And one of the foremost planks in the new Protestant platform was the rejection of the Catholic doctrine of the Mass, and of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. As Archbishop of Canterbury under the boy king Edward VI, Cranmer had practically a free hand to do as he pleased. And having lost the Catholic Faith himself, he made the fullest use of his position to rob the English people of that same faith. Rejecting any idea that the bread can actually become the Body of Christ, the Anglican Articles have to find some other explanation for the Eucharist. They say that the Body of Christ is received by faith. The bread still remains bread after the consecration. There is no trace of Christ's Body in the bread, or under its appearances. At most the bread is but a symbol of Christ's Body. If the one receiving the bread has faith, it will be as if it were Christ's Body for him, though it isn't in itself. That is the authentic Anglican

doctrine, invented as a substitute for the Catholic and Greek Orthodox doctrine of the real objective Presence of Christ's Body. John Jewel (1571), Bishop of Salisbury, wrote: "The bread we receive with our earthly mouths is an earthly thing, and therefore a figure, as the water in Baptism is also a figure . . . the Sacramental Bread is bread; it is not the Body of Christ." In 1898, April 4th, the then Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, wrote to a lady who asked him whether the doctrine of the Real Presence was according to Anglican teaching: "Dear Madam, The bread used in Holy Communion is certainly not God, either before consecration or after; and you must not worship it." Bishop Barnes, of Birmingham, repeats the same doctrine today: "There is no real objective Presence of Christ attached to the bread and wine used in Holy Communion."

45. I have attended Anglican Churches in which Mass is celebrated and the blessed Sacrament reserved for the adoration of the people.

Both practices are quite out of harmony with Anglicanism or Episcopalianism. The 31st Article of Religion, setting forth Church of England doctrine, says, "The sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the living and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." In his book, "What We Owe to the Reformation," p. 19, Dr. Ryle, Anglican Bishop of Liverpool, says,

"The Reformers found the Sacrifice of the Mass in our Churches. They cast it out as a blasphemous fable and a dangerous deceit. . . . The Reformers found our clergy sacrificing priests, and made them prayer-reading, preaching ministers—ministers of God's Word and Sacraments. The Reformers found in our Church the doctrine of a real corporal presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper under the forms of bread and wine, and laid down their lives to oppose it. They would not even allow the expression 'real presence' a place in our Prayer Book."

46. Is there much difference between the High Church section of the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church?

There is a profound and radical difference. For High Church Anglicans equally belong to the Church of England with Low Churchmen who hold the Protestant teaching and outlook; and equally with them repudiate the divinely-given authority of the Catholic Church. No introduction of similar forms of worship could make the High Church section of the Church of England identical with the Catholic Church. For the essential thing in religion is obedience. We went from God by disobedience. Our way back is to retrace our steps by obedience. And if religion is to get us back, it must essentially demand obedience. So Christ said, "If you love Me, keep My commandments." Jn. XIV, 15. And again, "If a man will not hear the

Church, let him be as the heathen." Matt. XVIII, 17. Similar rites and ceremonies can no more make an Anglo-Catholic a member of the Catholic Church than the similar language makes an American a member of the British Empire. For the United States repudiates the unifying bond of authority proper to the British Empire. The profound and radical difference between High Church Anglicans and the Catholic Church will cease to exist only when these High Churchmen sever their connection with the Anglican Church and submit to Rome.

47. Whatever her doctrinal differences, the Church of England has never failed in her moral witness.

Writing in the "Hibbert Journal" for July, 1930, apropos of the Lambeth Conference of that year, the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, a Protestant minister of Birmingham, said, "We can be magnanimous enough to recognize that Rome in a uniquely tenacious temper, is a steward of the mysteries and of the moral witness of the Christian Church. The supreme attraction of Rome is to be found in its ethical rigorism. Rome is the one uncompromising corporate witness to that moral code of Christendom which preserves Western Civilization from final collapse. It represents the last loyalty of the human race to its own highest moral standards. It is the iron bulwark of Christianity against the overwhelming invasion of the corrupting neo-paganism of our times. There is no authoritative moral theology which can

tell us what is the final judgment of Anglicans and Free Churchmen on questions such as marriage, divorce, birth control, companionate experiments, abortion, euthanasia, suicide. Only Rome speaks with one voice on such themes, and these are the issues of life and death, of the survival or decline of the West." After the Lambeth Conference of that year, the London "Daily Express," Aug. 15th, 1930, said that the Anglican Church "could not hope to control the conduct of men by debated measures conceived in fear and born in compromise." And the Anglican Rev. T. H. Whitton wrote in 1933, "So the defense of Christian morals is left to Rome, and the Anglican Communion, and all of us within it, stand disgraced before the world . . . the only remedy, and the only safeguard against other breaches in the Christian moral code, is Catholic reunion." *The Necessity for Catholic Reunion.*" pp. 116-117.

48. I have heard it said that the Free Churches could not have withstood the onslaughts of Rome had it not been for the Anglican Church.

Never was a statement farther from the truth. The very term "Free Churches" arose from a refusal to submit to Elizabeth's "Act of Uniformity in Religion" by which she tried to make all Englishmen submit to the Anglican Church. Protestants who refused to submit were called "Nonconformists." They would not conform to the Established Church any

more than Catholics. They wanted Churches free from Rome, but also free from domination by the Crown. They suffered persecution together with Catholics and, as the "Pilgrim Fathers" fled from England to America to escape the State-established Church of England. The truth, therefore, is not that the "Free Churches" withstood the onslaughts of Rome with the help of the Anglican Church, but that both Catholics and Nonconformists have survived the onslaughts of the Anglican Church in England. All that, of course, is past history; but it is past history which should not be forgotten whilst such things as you have heard are being said.

49. How did the Free Churches originate in England?

Their origin can be traced back as far as 1567, when there were small independent congregations of religious people, strongly Protestant, who rejected not only Catholicism, but also the very idea of an established and national Church. In 1593 Henry Barrowe and John Greenwood were put to death for denying that the national Church of England was the true Church of Christ, that the Queen could make laws for the Church, and for insisting that each particular Church should govern itself. The idea of independent Churches gave rise to the Congregational Churches of today.

50. Whence came Presbyterianism?

Presbyterianism was founded by John Knox

in Scotland. John Knox was a Catholic priest who had thrown in his lot with John Calvin at Geneva. He began to preach Calvinistic Protestantism in Scotland about the year 1555. He was expelled from the country, but returned in 1559. By Acts of the Scottish Parliament Protestantism under the form preached by John Knox was made the established religion of Scotland in 1560. Presbyterianism, therefore, was founded by John Knox, and dates from 1560 as an organized Church.

51. Are not Methodists very sincere people?

Many of them are. There are sincere people in every Church. But the Methodist Church cannot be the true Church of Christ. Traced back historically, it merges into Anglicanism. In 1728 John Wesley was ordained as an Anglican clergyman. He gathered together a group of earnest Anglicans who met for study and prayer, and who lived according to such strict rules that they were called "Methodists." They had no intention of leaving the Church of England. In 1738 John Wesley began his campaign as a revivalist preacher, and the hostility of Anglican authorities who resented his unorthodox ways led to the establishment of the separate "Wesleyan" or "Methodist" Church. Methodists teach salvation by faith in Christ and an experienced interior conversion. Apart from that they do not stand for any distinctive point of teaching or Church discipline. Formal Creeds and set forms of worship have little appeal for them.

52. Is not the "Church of Christ" the only true name for a Church mentioned in the Bible?

No. Christ described His Church in very many significant ways—all of which apply to the Catholic Church, and the Catholic Church only.

53. The "Church of Christ" was established on the Day of Pentecost.

The true Church of Christ commenced then, but not what are called the Protestant "Churches of Christ." These can be traced back to a Rev. Alexander Campbell, who was born in 1788, and who was originally a Presbyterian. As Mr. Campbell grew up, he pressed the Protestant principle of "The Bible Only" to its extreme limits, and repudiated all creeds or statements of doctrine. He therefore felt compelled to leave the Presbyterians who clung to the Westminster Confession, based on Calvinism, and became a wandering preacher affiliated with the Baptists. However he was never strictly a Baptist, and soon began writing and lecturing as a free lance religious teacher. He soon gathered some devoted followers, and in 1827 these followers formed themselves into a sect called the "Disciples of Christ." The Rev. Mr. Campbell died in 1866, and his followers fell into disputes concerning methods of organization. As a result two sections arose, calling themselves respectively the "Progressives," and the "Conservatives." The "Progressives" re-

tained the title "Disciples of Christ," whilst the "Conservatives" took the new title "Churches of Christ." As the division took place about the year 1900, the "Church of Christ" as an independent body dates from the beginning of this century.

54. What are the doctrines of the Church of Christ?

Since those who form what are called the "Churches of Christ" repudiate creeds, it is not possible to state their doctrines very clearly. They say at least that people must be Christians, but they will not state what Christians must believe. They demand, of course, that the Bible be accepted as God's Word, but no exact statement of what the Bible means can be imposed on anybody by those who maintain the right of private interpretation. Probably the members of the "Churches of Christ" would like to be described simply as "Bible Christians," and nothing more.

55. On what grounds do you reject the claim of the "Churches of Christ" to be the true form of Christianity?

On the score that they ignore or reject the faith, worship, and discipline Christ intended to prevail in His Church. Also their basic principle, held together with other Protestants, that the Bible only is the one rule of faith is false. Moreover, a Church which cannot trace back its history beyond 1827 is 1827 years too late

to be the Church founded by Christ Himself. We have seen the force of that reason when dealing with the truth of the Catholic Church.

56. I am a Baptist, and I believe that St. John the Baptist himself was the founder of our Church.

You are mistaken in that; and in any case such an origin would be of no real value for one who professes to be a Christian. The New Testament insists that we must follow Christ, not St. John the Baptist. For the preaching of John the Baptist was essentially a preparation for Christ. He himself told his followers not to remain his disciples, but to become disciples of Christ. "He must increase," he said, "and I must decrease." To inquirers he said clearly, "I am not the Christ." In Acts XIX, 3-5, we find the Apostles baptizing again in the name of Christ those who had received only John's baptism. However, as a matter of fact, the Baptist Church cannot trace itself back to St. John the Baptist.

57. How and when did it begin?

The first traces of the Baptists appeared in 1521. Martin Luther began the Protestant revolt against the Catholic Church in Germany in 1517. In 1521 a certain Thomas Munzer set up as a prophet on his own account, claiming that Luther did not go far enough in abolishing former ideas. He taught that no one who had been baptized as an infant was really baptized

at all. His adherents, therefore, had to be baptized again. From this his followers got the name of "Anabaptists," or the "Rebaptizers." It was almost 100 years before this movement spread from the Continent to England, although the English Baptists disclaim any connection with the Anabaptists. The first English Baptists were John Smyth and Thomas Helwys; and the first Baptist Chapel was commenced in London in 1611. John Smyth had been an Anglican minister prior to his becoming a Baptist, which he did in Germany through his association with the Anabaptists there. The Baptist Church, therefore, traces itself back to 1611 in England, and indirectly to 1521 on the Continent. Prior to that it was non-existent.

58. How many Baptists are there in the world today?

The Baptists have gone off into many independent subdivisions, but all told they would number about 12 millions.

59. What are their doctrines?

They are much like the Congregationalists or the Methodists, save in their main point of adult baptism only, and by immersion. For the rest, Baptists are required to accept the Bible as the Word of God and as the only and sufficient rule of faith; and, of course, they must believe in the Divinity of Christ and the atonement for sin wrought by His death on the Cross.

60. Does the Catholic Church recognize the Salvation Army as in any way representative of genuine Christianity?

No. As a religious body the Salvation Army is a form of Protestantism which the Catholic Church cannot but reject. It was founded by William Booth, an ex-Wesleyan minister. Disagreeing with Methodist ways, he left the Wesleyans in 1861 to become an independent evangelist. In 1865 he and his wife began to devote themselves to street preaching and rescue work in the slums of London. In 1877 he organized his converts into the Salvation Army, with himself as General, with the avowed purpose of working for the conversion of the poor and the alleviation of their temporal needs. But the whole movement is characterized by an un-Catholic, and even an anti-Catholic outlook.

61. Does not the Army agree with the Catholic Church that men owe their redemption to the Precious Blood of Christ?

Yes. But the Salvation Army has an extremely Protestant view of the nature of the Christian religion in other vital points—a view radically opposed to the Catholic concept. Where the Army preaches, "Believe on Christ and be saved," the Catholic Church insists that no one, whilst still in this life, can actually be termed "saved"; and that it is the will of Christ

that all should believe in the Catholic Church, accepting all that she teaches and commands in the name of Christ. This involves acceptance of the Catholic Faith, the worship of God by assistance at the Sacrifice of the Mass, the reception of the Sacraments instituted by Christ, and the fulfillment of those good works for the love of God which are demanded by Christian virtue.

62. Through the Salvation Army God provides for a certain class of people not reached by the Catholic Church.

God does not need the Salvation Army for that. He can provide by divine grace for men outside the fold of the Catholic Church in a thousand and one ways. He does so for infidels, Mahometans, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Adventists, and a host of others. If the apparent good done by the Salvation Army is proof that God Himself inspired its creation, then the apparent good done by all other Protestant organizations is proof that He inspired them also. And we cannot admit that God inspired all these conflicting religious bodies—bodies, also, which unite in denying the claims of that Catholic Church which Christ did undoubtedly establish.

63. Are not Salvation Army methods preferable for simple people incapable of intellectual study to the Catholic Sacramental system?

Under no circumstances could we say that. For, firstly, we can never admit that any means devised by men could be preferable to those instituted by Christ Himself. Secondly, we cannot say that the Catholic Sacramental system is in any way unsuitable for simple people; for Catholic children are well able to appreciate the significance of the Sacraments and to benefit by them. The value of the Sacraments does not depend upon the intellectual capabilities of the recipients. Thirdly, you seem to argue on merely natural grounds, not making sufficient allowance for the fact that Catholic Faith is a gift of divine grace, which is as difficult for intellectual people to attain as for simple people, and as easy for simple people as for intellectuals.

64. The Catholic way may be better for some types of people, but the Salvation Army way is superior for others.

Our Lord gave His religion for all mankind, and that religion is the Catholic religion. Had He thought variations necessary for different types, He would have incorporated them in the religion He established. He did not do so. Nor can a way which involves the preaching of heresy be better for anybody in reality and absolutely speaking, whatever good it may accidentally accomplish or occasion. I am discussing the matter from the viewpoint of principle, of course. Though I do not think the Salvation Army justified as a substitute for the true Catholic Church, I have an immense ad-

miration of the zeal and sincerity of its members; their demonstration of the courage of their convictions, and the sacrifices they make; the indifference to the world on the part of women members exhibited by their modest dress and behavior. But, with all their good will, they support and continue a movement which ignores and is independent of the true Church established by Christ.

65. The conclusion would be that the Salvation Army has a God-appointed, and not merely a man-designed place in this world.

Though the Salvation Army has the best of intentions, there is no doubt that it is a man-designed enterprise for religious purposes. General Booth was a good man who wanted to do something for God and the salvation of souls. Being a stranger to the Catholic religion, and not satisfied with any other Church, he had to fall back on his own ideas. But they were very much his own ideas. However, though not God-appointed, the Salvation Army has resulted in much good, and in many genuine conversions from evil ways of living. And the explanation of that is simply this: Many a good man mistakenly does what is wrong with the best of intentions. In such cases, God overlooks the mistake, and even in spite of it blesses that man, and makes his work an occasion of blessing to others. But it always remains true that the work itself was really in opposition to God's will. Such is the position

of General Booth and the Salvation Army. We Catholics rejoice at the sight of any good the Salvation Army may accomplish. But we are compelled to regret that it should be regarded by its members as a sufficient form of the Christian religion, and be allowed to occupy that place in the lives of its adherents which should really be held by Catholicism only. Many are thus contented to remain outside the Catholic Church, and to have so much less than our Lord really intended them to possess.

66. How does the Roman Catholic Church view Spiritualism?

On April 24th, 1917, the Holy See issued the following decree: "It is not lawful to assist at any spiritualistic meetings, conversations with spirits, or manifestations of spirits. It matters not whether a medium be present or not, nor whether the meeting seems to be above board and apparently conducted from motives of piety. A Catholic may not be present at such meetings even as an onlooker, let alone asking questions of departed spirits and listening to their supposed replies."

67. How do you account for the supernatural powers of some spiritualistic mediums?

Some of the phenomena produced by spiritualistic mediums are due to dexterity and fraud; some to natural clairvoyant and telepathic powers; some to the influence of evil

spirits. None can be ascribed to good spirits. God does not work that way, nor do His good ministering angels.

68. Do departed souls return to speak at spiritualistic meetings?

No. With God's special permission, and by His power, it would be possible for a departed soul to communicate with those still in this world. But I deny that this occurs at spiritualistic seances. Supposed communications from deceased people at such weird gatherings are due to fraud on the part of the mediums; or are only imaginary and due to mental suggestion imposed by a medium; or are created by some dupe's own excited and expectant psychological state; or due to impersonation, some evil spirit exerting its influence and pretending to be this or that departed personality. Not only the Catholic Church condemns spiritualism. No professing Christian should have anything to do with it and its occult practices.

69. Catholics believe in the communications of the Saints.

We do not believe in any communication with the souls of departed human beings in any spiritualistic way. Those souls are not in a condition of life adapted to such communication with us in this world. If God wishes, He can by a miracle permit such communications, but that very rarely happens and is quite abnormal. The Communion of Saints means

simply that we who belong to the same Christ as fellow members of Him can benefit by the merits of the Saints and by their intercession. Communication with them is by prayer on our part. We are certain that they enjoy the very Vision of God, in which Vision they are aware of our prayers to them. But souls which have not attained to the Vision of God have no normal medium by which they can be aware of our doings in this world.

70. By not believing in spiritualism the Church discourages inquiries which could lead to the discovery of knowledge not possessed by herself.

The Church does not believe in spiritualism as a semi-religious cult. She does believe in the existence of a spirit-world. God Himself is a pure spirit. Angels are spirits. So, too, are departed souls, and likewise devils. But the Church does not rely on spiritualism to provide her with the truth she must teach to mankind. She has received that truth from Jesus Christ who commanded her to teach mankind all that He had taught her. In the natural order the Church encourages men to discover all that science can teach them. In the supernatural order, she remains strictly faithful to the teachings of Jesus Christ. And she condemns spiritualism as a movement with all its works. If men want supernatural progress, let them seek to unite themselves with God by prayer and by the Sacraments of Christ, not with spirits by superstitious incantations in dark corners.

moved rather by a morbid curiosity than by any desire to serve God and sanctify their souls. Baron Von Hugel rightly said, "One never gets any spiritual ideas out of spiritualism."

71. The Bible speaks of visions received by men, and of voices heard prompting to a certain course of action.

The Bible records that such things happened at times to certain people. But it does not say that they will happen to all. If you came to me to say that you had received a vision of some departed person, you would not convince me by producing documentary proof that St. Paul had a vision whilst on the way to Damascus. His vision would not prove yours; and I would certainly not take your mere word for it.

72. Why do you doubt visions today, or treat them as being of the devil, or as due to insanity, or a temporary delusion?

The presumption is against God's departure from His ordinary ways. And the giving of visions is not God's ordinary way of acting. Therefore I would take it for granted that a supposed vision would be due, not to God, but to some physiological or psychological cause, or to the influence of some evil spirit. Certainly all such causes would have to be positively disproved before I would go on to consider the

vision in a supernatural light. That is ordinary prudence, from which the Christian religion dispenses no one. If a case were submitted to me, I would first weigh very carefully all the natural qualities of the person concerned. Is he neurotic, nervous, hysterical? Or is he of a calm, well-balanced temperament, and in good bodily health? Is he normal mentally, or endowed with an extravagant imagination? I would weigh well his virtue. Is he utterly sincere and humble, or eaten up with pride, and given to vanity, boasting, and untruthfulness? Then I would examine the nature of his vision, and ask myself whether it in any way conflicted with the doctrines of Christian Faith already revealed by God; or whether it was in strict accordance with Christian holiness and moral decency. I would note also its effects upon himself—good, or bad. The Catholic Church has laid down many such tests. She does not deny the possibility of such things; but she does deny the right of any man to accept them as from God with blind credulity.

73. The Bible prophesies that such things will be.

The Bible does not say that such things will occur always to everybody. Nor are they at all necessary. Visions do not make the recipient of them any better or holier. God may grant visions at times to the Saints because they are Saints. But they are not Saints because they have visions. They are Saints because they avoid sin as a very plague, and

courageously practise Christian virtue. It is virtue and goodness that matter, not visions.

74. The Bible should at least dispose you to accept spirit manifestations claimed by spiritualism.

That is not so. The evidence produced by spiritualists has nothing like the value of the evidence of Sacred Scripture. I do not deny that, at times, spirit-beings may be responsible for some of the manifestations at spiritualistic seances. But, if they are, they are not good, but evil spirits. God has given His complete revelation through Christ. Also, since good spirits are in perfect accord with the will of God, they could not be sent by Him to reveal the contradictory and often blasphemous doctrines claimed by spiritualists to come from the spirit-world. Moreover, if Scripture has any authority, we must obey its precepts. What are they? "Let there not be found among you anyone that seeketh the truth from the dead." Deut. XVIII, 10. In Lev. XX, God absolutely condemns the man or woman who claims to have a "divining spirit"—not a very comforting reflection for the modern medium. The Prophet Isaiah (VIII, 19) says, "When they shall say to you: Seek of people with a prophesying spirit and of diviners who mutter in their enchantments, should not the people seek of their God instead of seeking comfort for the living from the dead?"

75. I John, IV., 1, tells us to "try the

spirits, if they be of God."

St. John is not referring to spiritual beings of another world than this. He is speaking of impulses and inclinations which come into our minds, and which can lead to disaster if people insist on following private judgment. He also refers to the spirit of other people's teachings. Immediately he makes this clear. "Believe not every spirit," he says, "for many prophets have gone out into the world." I Jn. IV, 1. We must try the spirit of these teachings to see if they be in conformity with the true doctrine revealed by Christ. How are we to know that true doctrine? If every man is to decide for himself what that true doctrine is, we are back in chaos again. Christ knew this, and took the precaution of establishing the Catholic Church, promising to preserve it from error till the end of time. If any doctrine contradicts the authentic teaching of the Catholic Church, it is false.

76. What is your judgment of Christian Science?

I regard it as a violation of Christian teaching as well as of science and reason. Those good people who take it up so enthusiastically have not lost their attachment to a vague Christian sentiment, but they have lost their grip on the fundamental truths of Christianity, and have no real idea of science and the demands of logic. Mrs. Eddy, the accepted prophetess who gave this new religion to the world in 1875, denied that Jesus is the Eternal Son of

God made man. Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, Warden of New College, Oxford, is right when he says that "for the Christian Scientist, a brilliant pioneer in drugless healing has taken the place of the suffering Figure on the Cross." The whole religion depends on faith in Mrs. Eddy as a substitute for faith in Christ. As for science, when a woman rules out anatomy and physiology on the score that they suppose matter, and that matter is unreal and non-existent, she stands condemned as the very embodiment of the unscientific. And the system is absurd, because the absurd violates reason and logic. Mrs. Eddy tells us that "matter is an erroneous belief of mortal mind." Then she declares that "mortal mind is nothing." How nothing can begin thinking, and produce a real thought, even though it be an erroneous thought, is beyond all comprehension. Page after page of her book "Science and Health" is filled with similar nonsense. It simply doesn't make sense. And it is an insult to the God of Truth to assert that such a religion is His responsibility. The only excuse for good and sincere people who take up Christian Science is that they are incapable of logical thought, and do not understand Sacred Scripture.

77. Christian Science is based absolutely on the teachings of the Holy Bible.

It is based on the un-Christian and unscientific nonsense written by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, and falsely ascribed by her to the Bible.

78. Jesus meant all generations of His followers to have the power to heal the sick.

Had He intended that, you can be quite sure that all His followers would have possessed the power. For Christ, being God, could undoubtedly accomplish His designs. The fact, therefore, that not all His followers have possessed the power is indication enough that such was not His intention. Any explanation which does not fit in with the known facts must be rejected. But, in reality, there is not a text in the New Testament which implies such a continued power to be manifest in all followers of Christ. He came to save men from sin, and to induce them to live holy lives. He did not come to bestow upon all men the powers of miracles. Holiness does not consist in doing startling things, or in seeking an escape from the cross of suffering.

79. Jesus said, "He that believeth on Me, the works that I do shall he do also." Jn. XIV., 12.

Jesus had just told the Apostles that He would soon leave them, but He consoled them by saying that He was going to the Father whose work He had come to accomplish, and who would continue to work through them in their task of establishing the Church He had inaugurated. And He promises that the power of God will not be less evident in their work than in His. But there is no suggestion what-

ever that the special providence watching over the initial stages of the Church would continue to operate always and in the same way through all generations. And, as I have said, the facts themselves exclude the possibility of such having been the intention of Christ.

80. He mentioned the signs that would follow those who believe.

The signs He mentioned did follow the first believers in Jesus, being verified now in this individual, now in that. And they contributed greatly to the solid establishing and rapid expansion of the infant Christian Church. But it is going far beyond anything contained in the text to suggest that such signs were meant always to follow all believers in all ages, so that they should be a permanent feature in the lives of all who profess the Christian religion. Moreover, once more, the facts of history exclude such an interpretation.

81. St. James says, "The prayer of faith will heal the sick man." Jas. V., 15.

Those words occur in the midst of a passage describing the Sacrament of Extreme Unction. Immediately prior to them, St. James declares that the priests of the Church should anoint the sick with oil in the name of the Lord. And he adds that, if the sick man be in sin, his sins will be forgiven him. There is no reference to an infallible and ever-ready panacea for all tem-

poral ills. The idea of holding out the recovery of bodily health as a bribe to attract recruits is utterly foreign to the religion of Christ Who said, "If anyone will come after Me, let him deny himself, take up his cross, and follow Me." Matt. XVI, 24. Christian Science, with its impression that Christ came to the world primarily to heal the sick, labors under a complete misconception of the nature of His life-work on behalf of humanity. Jesus came to teach us to avoid sin and all moral evil, and to practice virtue in the midst of the trials of this life. And He died on the Cross to expiate our sins, and to make a heavenly and eternal destiny possible to us as the result of our efforts to serve Him.

82. Catholics say that sufferings can't be helped, and that it should be our joy to suffer; but Christian Science says it is one's own fault if one suffers.

Suffering has ever been a problem to man. Deeply sensitive to this problem, some people have cried out that there is no God. But that does not better things. They have their sufferings just the same, and merely forfeit the one source of consolation. As G. K. Chesterton remarks, "These people say: Grin and bear it like a Stoic. But the trouble is that if you bear it like a Stoic, you don't grin." Other people, religiously-minded, insist that there is a God, but deny that there is any real suffering. Thus the Christian Scientist will tell you that suffering is unreal, a mental mistake. You wrongly

think you are suffering, and if only you decide to think that you are not suffering, you won't suffer. But this fantastic solution does not solve the problem. It merely violates common sense, leaves people suffering just the same, and dries up the wellsprings of human sympathy. Compassion is necessarily lessened by a mental contempt for those we do not believe to be really suffering at all, but who have merely given way to a weakness of mind. It is hard to respect one whom we think to be a sham. On the other hand, Catholics deny neither God nor suffering. They say that a genuine love of God will give peace in the midst of suffering, and that this alone can do so. Genuine love of God always means happiness. It does not always mean pleasure. It is as much at home with pain as it is with pleasure, for it proves itself by self-sacrifice. Catholics see the love of Christ choosing such intense suffering for them on the Cross, and their love of Him makes them glad to share in suffering, blending their pain with His. And that gives the peace of Christ in their souls, a peace the world can neither give nor take away from them. And it is this attitude which gives the power to communicate peace to others.

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, 25c FOR 10 OR MORE

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, TWO NOVENAS TO THE HOLY GHOST 15c
CONFESSION AND COMMUNION CARDS 1c
CONFIRMATION CARDS 1c
FIRST CONFESSION PRAYER CARD ½c
CONFESSION CARD NO. 2 ½c
COMMUNION CARDS, NOS. 1 AND 2 ½c 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 2½c
ACTS OF LOVE OF GOD, LEAFLET 1c
LOW OR HIGH MASS CARDS 1c EACH
NURSES UNIFORM POCKET NOTEBOOK 15c
NURSES CLINICAL EXPERIENCES 80c EACH

For copies address

FATHERS RUMBLE & CARTY

Radio Replies Press

Saint Paul 1, Minn., U. S. A.