

Rumble, Leslie
- The Episcopalians
ADV 4099

The *Episcopalians*

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

IMPRIMATUR

✠ **JOANNES GREGORIUS MURRAY**
Archiepiscopus Sancti Pauli
Paulopoli die 9a Octobris 1950

COPYRIGHT 1950
by the
RADIO REPLIES PRESS
Printed in U.S.A.

The **EPISCOPALIANS**

By The Convert From Anglicanism

REV. DR. L. RUMBLE, M.S.C.

The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America was the name chosen for their Church by those American Colonists who, before the Declaration of Independence in 1776, had belonged to the Church of England. An understanding of the Episcopalian Church, therefore, requires a knowledge of Anglicanism—a religion which, of all forms of professing Christianity, is the most difficult and complex to describe. However, it may be defined in general as the religion of the Established Church of England and of those affiliated Churches throughout the world which declare allegiance to Anglican doctrines, organization, and worship.

The importance of the Anglican Communion can be estimated from the fact that at the Lambeth Conference of 1948 there were assembled 326 Bishops of various nationalities, representing between 30 and 40 million adherents belonging to many different countries. Most of these adherents are, of course, Anglo-Saxons; for most of them live in England, or belong to overseas Churches which have been established wherever British influence is to be found. But small communities exist in China and Japan, which sent their own Chinese and Japanese Bishops to represent them at Lambeth.

Yet its expansion is not the most impressive feature of the Anglican Church in the eyes of the English people. In England itself they appreciate its historic grandeur, taking for granted the ancient Cathedrals and Parish Churches which have come down to them from the past, and quoting a venerable list of Archbishops of Canterbury with no advertence to any break in ecclesiastical realities. More-

over they are justly proud of Anglican scholarship in such men as Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, Gore, Kirk, and many others whether living or dead—men whose contented acceptance of Anglicanism not unreasonably confirms them in their own loyalty to the Church of England.

John Henry Newman, even as a Catholic, could write in his "Apologia", "I recognize in the Anglican Church a time-honored institution of noble historical memories, a monument of ancient wisdom, a momentous arm of political strength, a great national organ, a source of vast popular advantage, to a certain point, a witness and teacher of religious truth." But having paid that tribute, he felt compelled to add, "But that it is something sacred; that it is an oracle of revealed doctrine, that it can claim a share in St. Ignatius or St. Cyprian, that it can take the rank, contest the teaching and stop the path of the Church of St. Peter, that it can call itself the "Bride of the Lamb", this is the view of it which simply disappeared from my mind on my conversion."

The grounds for that change of outlook he found in the history of Anglicanism itself, to which we will have to give some attention in this present booklet.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

Before commencing a closer study of the Anglican Communion, it is well to note that in no sense can it be called one united visible Church in the New Testament sense of the word.

In England the Anglican Church is a constitutionally State-Established religious society subject to the Crown which nominates its Bishops, and to a Parliament without whose consent no ecclesiastical measures on the part of the Convocations of Clergy and of the House of Laity have any official authority. How real is the control of Parliament in England was manifested in 1928 by its rejection of the Revised Prayer Book proposed by the Church Assembly.

Outside England however, Anglican missionaries aimed at establishing independent Churches modelled along the lines of the Church of England, but on a self-governing

basis. These Churches, although professing to be within the fellowship of the Anglican Communion, have their own constitutions, are ruled by their own Synods of Clergy and Laity, and are autonomous in matters of belief, organization and worship. This makes the Anglican Communion, not one visible Church, but a voluntary association of constitutionally independent Churches after the fashion of a "League of Nations". The Lambeth Conference of world Bishops, therefore, has no real authority over the whole Anglican Communion. It cannot legislate for that Communion as if it were one Church. At most it is a consultative body, able to make recommendations which each independent self-governing Church may accept or reject at its discretion.

How little this system conforms to New Testament teaching is brought out by one of its own theologians, the Rev. Dr. H. L. Goudge, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. In his book, "The Church of England and Reunion", p. 168, he writes, "In the New Testament believers in Christ not members of the one visible Apostolic Church are nowhere to be found. We hear, indeed, of "the Churches" as well as of the Church, but these Churches are very different from "the Churches" of which we hear today. The Churches of Galatia or of Macedonia are the Christian communities, all alike under St. Paul's authority, in the Galatian and Macedonian cities . . . The relation of the Churches to the Church is like the relation of our local post-offices to the G.P.O. in London. There is only one Post Office, private enterprise not being here permitted. But the G.P.O. has its local representatives in the towns and villages, and in dealing with them we are dealing with the Department itself. Everywhere in the New Testament the Church is one, and only one."

That description fits perfectly the one Catholic Church throughout the world, subject to the authority of the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter; but it cannot be reconciled with an association of independent self-governing Churches such as the "Anglican Communion" represents! But of that we shall see more later.

POST-REFORMATION ORIGIN

It is customary for Anglican writers to commence their history of the Church of England with an account of the earliest preaching of Christianity in that country. They tell us of old traditions about visits of St. Paul or of Joseph of Arimathea to England, or about Pope Eleutherius, in the 2nd century A.D., sending missionaries at the request of King Lucius. They point with certainty to the fact that, by the middle of the 2nd century, the Christian Church had definitely been established in England, and that in 314 A.D. British Bishops were present at the Council of Arles, a city in Gaul. And they go on from there, taking it for granted that they are describing the history of the Church of England.

But whilst we can say that the history of the Christian religion in England begins with the conversion of the early British people, we cannot say that the history of the "Church of England" begins there. For all the early missionaries were in communion with Rome. When St. Augustine was sent by Pope Gregory I, in 596 A.D., to be the first Archbishop of Canterbury, he preached the only religion he knew—papal Catholicism. It was the religion all Christians then in England acknowledged; and, indeed, St. Augustine had come with jurisdiction from the Pope over all the British Bishops in the land.

Anglican writers are also fond of quoting the clause from "Magna Charta", of 1215 A.D., "*Ecclesia Anglicana sit libera*", as though that meant that their Anglican Church was to be free from Papal jurisdiction. But it meant nothing of the kind. The expression "*Ecclesia Anglicana*" meant, not the "Church of England", but the Catholic Church in England, just as the expression "*Ecclesia Gallicana*" meant the Catholic Church in Gaul, or "*Ecclesia Hispanica*" the Catholic Church in Spain. Nor did "Magna Charta" contain the slightest reference to any independence of the Church from the Pope. It was King John who was compelled to sign "Magna Charta". It was he who was making the concessions; and he had to promise

that the Church in England would be free from royal interference. Thirty years later, in 1245, Pope Innocent IV wrote to the English Abbots that the "Ecclesia Anglicana" is "a special member of the Most Holy Church of Rome."

The truth is that, before the advent of Henry VIII, there was no difference between the religion of Englishmen and that of the rest of Catholic Christendom. The first point of severance from the Catholic Church of the centuries came with Henry's "Act of the Royal Supremacy" in 1534 A.D.—a flagrant violation of "Magna Charta"! It is true that, from time to time, disputes had arisen between Popes and Kings of England, and that there were outbreaks of anti-Papal feeling against what was felt to be undue claims of the Papacy in temporal affairs. But the Anglican Archbishop Garbett, of York, writes in his recent book (1950) "Church and State in England", p. 40, "The true nature of these controversies is often misunderstood . . . as the attempt of an indignant Church and patriotic nation to escape from thralldom to Rome. However much we might wish this had been so, the actual facts give no support to a theory so congenial to later-day Protestantism. Both Church and State accepted the spiritual supremacy of the Pope . . . Only those who were in faithful communion with him could hope for salvation. To die excommunicate meant the loss of eternal life. Papal authority and jurisdiction were accepted in England as in the rest of Western Christendom; the controversies arose only over the extent and limits of their exercise."

WORK OF HENRY VIII

In 1534 A.D. Henry VIII, despairing of persuading Pope Clement VII to grant him a divorce from Catherine of Aragon so that he might marry Anne Boleyn, repudiated the authority of Rome altogether and proclaimed himself head of the Church in England by the "Act of Royal Supremacy".

This rejection of the jurisdiction of the hitherto acknowledged Holy See resulted in the creation of a new and in-

dependent Church, separated from the Papacy and from the Catholic Church on the Continent, every bit as much as the rejection of the jurisdiction of the British Throne by the American Colonies with the "Declaration of Independence" in 1776 A.D. resulted in the new and independent nation in the civil order known as the United States of America.

Anglican writers deny that Henry's break with Rome and rejection of the Pope's authority resulted in a new Church, and declare that the "Church of England" remained the same institution as the Church in England before that event. But such a contention will not bear historical scrutiny.

As a prelude to the "Act of Royal Supremacy" Henry had enacted a "Statute of Appeals", in the preamble to which he sought to justify his actions. Commenting on this subject, in his "History of English Law" (1931), Sir W. S. Holdsworth, Professor of English Law at Oxford University, says, "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 his century, was both a consummate lawyer and a dissenter from the Anglican as well as from 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."

TRIUMPH OF PROTESTANTISM

Henry VIII, having rejected the supremacy of the Pope over the Church in England in order to substitute his own, had no wish to make any changes in other Catholic beliefs and practices.

As soon, however, as Edward VI had ascended the Throne in 1547, the boy-king's Council set to work to Protestantize the Church of England. The Mass and the obligation of celibacy for the clergy were abolished. Services were to be said in English instead of in Latin. In 1549 Cranmer produced a first "Book of Common Prayer"; but it followed the Latin Missal too closely to satisfy those bent on a truly Protestant reformation; in 1552, therefore, Cranmer issued a second "Prayer Book" which reflected in a far more pronounced way both Lutheran and Calvinist influences, sweeping away all references to a sacrificial priesthood and any traces of belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. And at the instigation of John Knox, the Calvinist, what is known as the "Black Rubric" was inserted, declaring it idolatry to offer adoration of any kind to any imagined Sacramental Presence of Christ in the consecrated elements of bread and wine.

Cranmer thus made sure that the Church of England as by law established would rank as one of the Protestant Reformed Churches.

On Edward's death in 1553 A.D., however, Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII and his true wife Catherine of Aragon, succeeded to the Throne. A practicing Catholic like her mother, she at once proceeded to undo the work set on foot by Henry and Edward, repealing the ecclesiastical laws they had made, restoring the Latin Mass, and arranging for the reconciliation of England with Rome. But her short reign of only five years was not long enough to ensure her lasting success, and Elizabeth's accession in 1558, to reign for forty-five years, meant the revival of an independent "Church of England" according to the Protestant form it had taken in the time of Edward VI.

ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT

In 1559 A.D. Elizabeth renewed the "Act of Royal Supremacy", taking the title "Supreme Governor" instead of "Supreme Head of the Church"; and by the "Act of Uniformity in Religion" she restored the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. The change of title from "Supreme Head" to "Supreme Governor" was of nominal significance only. Bishops had to be appointed by the Crown, and the Crown was to be the source of all their jurisdiction.

When the Catholic Bishops refused to take the Oath of Elizabeth's supremacy all were deposed and imprisoned except Bishop Kitchin of Llandaff who conformed to the new law. Elizabeth thereupon appointed a new hierarchy, beginning with Matthew Parker who was consecrated to be Archbishop of Canterbury according to the Rites of the 1552 Prayer Book; and, therefore, according to Catholic requirements, quite invalidly.

But the main thing was to have an episcopate subject to the Crown. Bishop Cooper wrote, in his answer to the Marprelate Tracts, that no form of Church government was divinely ordained, but that episcopacy was suitable to England's monarchical constitution! To this day Anglican Bishops in England have to do homage to the King, saying on their knees before him, "I do hereby declare that Your Majesty is the only supreme Governor of this Your realm in spiritual and ecclesiastical things, as well as in temporal . . . and I acknowledge that I hold the said bishopric, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of Your Majesty."

When therefore the Bishops sanctioned the use of the Revised Prayer Book of 1928, after its rejection by Parliament, Sir Lewis Dibdin, Secretary of the Church Assembly, declared it shocking that they should disregard the decision of the House of Commons. He pointed out that, when the Enabling Act of 1919 was brought in, the Bishops emphatically declared "that the power of Parliament was intended to remain unaltered and absolute."

But besides asserting her supremacy, in 1563 Elizabeth

sanctioned the "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion", Articles which reflected very greatly both Lutheran and Calvinistic teachings, as a doctrinal standard for the Church of England.

From all this it is evident that the Elizabethan Settlement gave England a religion which could not be mistaken for the "old religion". On her accession England was a Catholic country, in full communion with the See of Peter. At the end of her reign Catholicism was a forbidden religion in England, to say Mass was a capital offense, and to profess belief in the supremacy of the Pope was a crime. Was it any wonder that, in 1570, the Pope excommunicated Elizabeth and forbade Catholics any longer to worship in the Parish Churches!

But besides dealing with Catholic recusants, Elizabeth found that she had to contend with Protestant exiles who returned from the Continent after the death of Mary, and who thought that the reformation in England had not gone nearly far enough. These began to exert all possible influence to "purify" the Anglican Church in a Protestant direction, protesting even against the retention of an episcopal form of ecclesiastical organization. These "Puritans", as they were called, wanted a Presbyterian or Congregational type of Church, and many of them ended by leaving the Church of England to become members of Non-conformist sects. Those who remained in the State Church gained recognition as a legitimate Low Church Party within it at the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, a year after the accession of James I. The struggle at once commenced between Low Church and High Church factions within Anglicanism for the control of the Church of England.

INTERNAL CONFLICT

During the reign of Charles I (1625-1649) High Church Anglican theologians began to work out a theory of their Church as an ancient Catholic Church true to Scripture and the primitive traditions of Christianity, cleansed only from mediaeval "Romish accretions and superstitions".

But the powerful Puritan forces had no sympathy with pretensions to an ancient Catholic inheritance, and Archbishop Laud of Canterbury was put to death in 1645, King Charles I himself sharing the same fate in 1649.

The Puritan Commonwealth under the Cromwells followed, and lasted for eleven years, Presbyterianism being substituted for Anglicanism as the official religion of England, and the use of the Book of Common Prayer forbidden.

However, on the Restoration in 1660, when Charles II returned to the Throne, the Church of England was given the place of honor once more. A revised Prayer Book was imposed by an "Act of Uniformity" in 1662, based on the Second Prayer Book of 1552 but with some changes in the direction of the First Prayer Book of 1548 to satisfy the High Church Party, the "Black Rubric" (which had been omitted in Elizabeth's 1559 Book) being restored to placate the Puritans.

The advent of William of Orange in 1688 brought with it a further swing to Protestantism which degenerated into a lethargy and indifference which seemed to threaten the very existence of religion in England. The "Evangelical Revival" set on foot by John Wesley, strongly Lutheran and Calvinist in outlook, awakened a temporary enthusiasm for religion, but ended in the creation of a new and independent Methodist denomination, and the Church of England lapsed back into its contented laxity once more.

Then, in 1833, came John Keble's famous sermon on "National Apostasy", and Newman commenced publication of his "Tracts for the Times" in which he tried to uphold the Catholic and Apostolic character of the Anglican Church. Thus commenced the "Oxford Movement" which at least definitely awakened the Church of England from its lethargy both by enkindling enthusiasm for High Church principles and by stirring adherents of the Low Church Party to violent hostility.

In 1845 Newman and many of his followers left the Church of England to enter the Catholic Church. But Keble, Pusey and others remained to foster a "Catholic

Revival" amongst Anglicans, creating a ritualistic "Anglo-Catholic Party" which is the most progressive aspect of Anglicanism today.

In the same 19th century however there arose another Party, the members of which were infected with Modernism and who advocated lax doctrinal standards and a compromise with rationalism. So we have "High", "Low", and "Broad" Church Anglicanism leading to almost endless internal disputes.

So much, then, for our brief survey of Anglican history. Our attention must now be given to the teachings of the Church of England.

NO DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY

Writing in the "Sunday Express", of September 14th, 1947, Archbishop Fisher of Canterbury complained, "It is sometimes said that nobody can tell what the Church of England believes. I hope I have shown that the accusation is untrue." But his hope was not realized. For although his article was entitled "The Beliefs of the Church of England", at most he can be said to have set forth his own beliefs, beliefs which others who equally claim to be Anglicans reject to a very great extent. One can state the beliefs of this or that Anglican, not the definite doctrines of the Church of England as such. That Church has no teaching authority to which members feel obliged to submit.

At the time of the Reformation the idea of Cranmer and his assistants was to substitute Convocation of the Clergy with the King at its head for the hitherto acknowledged Papal authority. The King was to give the Royal Assent to the spiritual decisions of Convocation for the Church as to the political decisions of Parliament for the State. But, since Stuart times, Parliament and the Privy Council have usurped the place of Royal authority; and, as we have seen, Parliament in 1928 rejected the Revised Prayer Book presented by the National Assembly, thus showing its power to decide even matters of doctrine and worship for Anglicans in England.

Anglican writers say that such may unfortunately seem

true in practice, but that on principle the Church alone has authority to decide for itself in doctrinal matters. But if there is one thing on which all Anglicans are agreed it is in the rejection of any idea of an infallible Church. Denying Roman claims to infallibility, they can hardly claim the same prerogative for their own Church. At the same time difficulties arise from the admission that the Bible only, as privately interpreted, is an infallible source of doctrine—for the Nonconformists fell back on that principle to justify their rejection of Anglicanism.

High Church Anglicans thought to solve the problem by saying that the only reliable source of teaching consists of the Bible as interpreted by the Fathers of the primitive Church and as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. Yet the weakness of that appeal is evident. Were the Bishops of the primitive Church infallible? If so, why not the Bishops of today? Yet Anglican Bishops are notorious for their conflict on vital doctrines. Again, were the compilers of the Prayer Book infallible?

To escape these difficulties, Archbishop Fisher, in the article already mentioned, says, "Of course every Church must ask itself this question—Where is the final authority to which we look for the faith we hold? The Church of England believes that the Holy Spirit of God, the only final authority, speaks to us in Holy Scripture, in the tradition of the Church, and in the living thought and experience of today. Thus there is a three-fold cord, each single strand of which unrelated to the others leads astray."

The idea apparently is that the Holy Ghost speaks through the Bible, the tradition of the Church, and the collective consciousness of Christians; and that the testimony of each of these three must be checked by the other two. But this reduces the Anglican position to one of private judgment only. Each individual still has to decide for himself what the Bible means, the sense of traditional doctrines, and on what the collective consciousness of Christians agrees. No living voice speaks to him. And it is surely demanding too much of anyone to ask him to believe the Holy Ghost to be responsible for the bewildering confusion

of beliefs prevalent in the Anglican Communion!

The truth is that Anglicanism acknowledges no divinely guaranteed authority in this world to define anything, not Parliament, nor the Privy Council, nor Bishops, nor Convocations of Clergy, nor Synods of Clergy and Laity. The most loyal attitude for an Anglican seems to be, "Think what you like, but refrain from positive assertions or denials."

As a result, multitudes remain traditionally Anglican without any very definite convictions, and acknowledge no doctrinal authority in the Church of England which can bind them in conscience.

TYPICAL BELIEFS

Despite this lack of certainty as to what they mean, however, the average instructed Anglican, if asked to state the beliefs of Anglicans, would unhesitatingly subscribe to the following propositions:

- (1) The Bible contains all things necessary for salvation, so that nothing can be required of anyone that cannot be proved from Scripture.
- (2) There is a visible Church recognizable as a congregation of faithful people in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance.
- (3) In this Church there is a hierarchical ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.
- (4) The Anglican Communion claims to be a reformed part of the Catholic Church of Christ, and it retains a valid three-fold ministry as above, derived by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles.
- (5) Whilst the Bible is the remote source of doctrine, the Book of Common Prayer together with the three Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, contained therein, is to be accepted as the practical rule of belief and worship.
- (6) There are two Sacraments to be regarded as generally necessary for salvation, Baptism and the Eucharist.

It is to be noted that the "Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion" contained in the Book of Common Prayer are not today regarded as binding in conscience. An Anglican writer, the Rev. C. B. Moss, in his book "The Divisions of Christendom", p. 46, says, that Elizabeth had no intention of imposing a scheme of doctrine resembling the Tridentine Decrees or the Protestant Confessions. He declares the Articles to have been "Articles of Peace"—"an ambiguous statement designed to prevent clergy from being too definite on doubtful points." In 1865 a legal decision was given that the clergy were not obliged to literal subscription to the Articles, but only to a "general assent". The laity are not bound to accept them at all.

ANGLICAN ORDERS

Protestant Churches dispute amongst themselves about the nature of the Christian ministry described in the New Testament. But there were no disputes about the matter in the primitive Church. There was an ordination to the priesthood by the laying on of hands, those thus consecrated having as their main duties the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice to God, the administering of the Sacraments, and the preaching of the Word of God. And their authority or commission was derived, not from the members of the Church to whom they ministered, but by transmission from the Apostles who had themselves received it from Christ, the Divine Founder of the Church.

The form of government prevailing in the Church is not so clearly described in the New Testament and in the earliest Christian documents; but certainly only one form was known by the second century, each Church having its own Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, all the Bishops linked as a united body and able to meet at times to define doctrines and legislate for the whole Church.

When, therefore, Cranmer published his new Ordinal in 1550, during the reign of Edward VI, he introduced it with the prefatory statement, "It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders

of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." And he added that his new Ordinal was "to the intent these Orders should be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church of England."

Yet despite this declaration of his intentions, although he preserved episcopacy as an external form, he did not succeed in preserving a valid Christian priesthood for the new Church of England. The Anglican Bishop of Derby, Dr. Rawlinson, says in his book, "The Genius of the Church of England" (1949) p. 11, "Continuity of Bishops was retained, not for any reasons connected with the idea of Apostolic Succession, but for reasons of statecraft. The Crown held that the clergy needed control, and that to that end Bishops were requisite; and, accordingly, Bishops there were."

In fact, many Anglican writers today deny the necessity of the three-fold ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. They declare that it is a good and useful system, beneficial but not essential. The Church of England has never given any official judgment insisting on the doctrine of "Apostolic Succession", nor has it ever officially condemned the non-episcopal ministries of Nonconformist Churches.

The truth is that Cranmer, having adopted many of the teachings of the Reformers on the Continent, had lost all belief in the Mass and in a sacrificial priesthood. He had no intention of continuing those. Moreover, in the forms for his new Ordinal of 1550 he deliberately omitted to specify to what priestly or episcopal power the candidate was being ordained. Not until 112 years later, in 1662, were the words added, in the one case "for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God"; in the other "for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God." It follows that even if the forms were put right then, a century's use of the old forms had left no one validly consecrated to transmit priestly powers to others.

When, therefore, in 1896, Pope Leo XIII gave a judgment requested of him concerning the validity of Anglican Orders, he declared them null and void from the viewpoint of Catholic requirements through defect of intention and

defect of form, adding later that his verdict was permanently binding and irrevocable.

The Archbishops of Canterbury and York at that time promptly voiced their protests and published their official Reply, trying to maintain the validity of their Orders, yet showing in that very Reply that they had not a right idea of the Christian priesthood at all.

Writing on this subject in the "National Review", of September 1925, p. 73, the Anglican Bishop Knox, of Manchester, said, "The Pope refused absolutely to recognize our Anglican Orders on the ground that our Church does not ordain priests to offer the Sacrifice of the Mass. In spite of the attempts made by our Archbishops to conceal this defect, the Pope from his point of view was unquestionably right. It is true that certain priests of the Church of England offer so-called Masses, but as they were not ordained by the Church with the intention that they should offer the Body and Blood of Christ to the Father, the Sacrament of their Ordination is for this purpose a failure. The Prayer Book and the Ordinal are simply uncatholic, since they show no sign of fulfilling the most important of all Catholic functions."

The son of Bishop Knox, Monsignor Ronald Knox, said in his Essay, "Why I am a Catholic", written after he had abandoned the Church of England, that even were Anglican Orders valid in themselves (which he had ceased to believe) there was still a complete lack of commission for their exercise derived from the Apostles. And he said that he was not content "to exercise a jurisdiction which proceeded, in the last resort, from no more respectable a source than a Tudor queen."

LOW CHURCH PARTY

It is necessary now to turn to the consideration of the very different and conflicting Parties within the Anglican Communion, if we are to get a right idea of it. And we begin with the Low Church Party which, historically at least, is the most authentic exponent of the Anglican religion as it was originally intended to be by the compilers

of the Book of Common Prayer.

Henry VIII, of course, had wanted a Catholic Church in England, independent of the Pope and subject to himself. But his death in 1547, and the accession of Edward VI, made the way clear for Cranmer to introduce Protestantism. Cranmer, therefore, at once set to work to abolish the Mass, the doctrines of Transubstantiation and of Purgatory, together with many Catholic practices such as the celibacy of the clergy, the observances of Candlemas, Ash Wednesday, and Palm Sunday, Holy Water, Prayers to the Virgin Mary and to the Saints, as well as Prayers for the Dead.

Let us recall once more the historical sequence of events:

In 1549 Cranmer produced his First Book of Common Prayer in the vernacular.

In 1550 he provided a new Ordinal which excluded all mention of the sacrificial office of the priesthood.

In 1551 an Order in Council required altars to be destroyed and movable tables to be substituted for them, in order to impress on the people the change from "the old superstition of the Mass to the right use of the Lord's Supper." The latter was to be regarded as a sacramental meal, not as a sacrifice; and to stress this, Communion was to be given under both kinds, as food and drink.

In 1552, since the 1549 Book was declared not sufficiently Protestant, a Second Prayer Book was published, altering the order of the Eucharistic Rite, and abolishing or changing all expressions which could even remotely suggest a sacrificial action.

In 1553 Bishops and Priests were required to subscribe to "Forty-Two Articles", markedly Lutheran in character.

In that same year of 1553, however, Edward VI died; and with the accession of the Catholic Mary and England's reconciliation with Rome, it looked as if the whole of Cranmer's work would be undone. But Mary herself died within a brief five years, and in 1558 Elizabeth became

Queen, to reign for forty-five years. Elizabeth at once proceeded to restore the National Protestant Church as it had been under Edward VI. In 1559 she issued a new Book of Common Prayer based on the Book of 1552, but modified in a Calvinistic direction. Royal injunctions were issued once more that altars were to be removed and tables substituted; and an "Act of Uniformity" demanded acceptance of the renewed change of religion. Archbishop Parker, an avowed Protestant, was (invalidly) consecrated for Canterbury, and men of Calvinist sympathies appointed to other bishoprics to replace the deposed Catholic Bishops who had refused the Oath of Supremacy.

There can be no doubt whatever that the Church of England under Elizabeth, with its doctrines and worship derived to a great extent from Luther and Calvin, became part of the Protestant Reformation Movement. Even Dr. W. H. Frere, one of the modern exponents of Anglo-Catholicism and one-time Bishop of Truro, admitted that "the service books at this epoch, as at the Edwardian, symbolized a real doctrinal change." "English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I", p. 26. He admits that the people themselves in Elizabeth's days thought of it as a "change of religion", and that they spoke of the Catholic Faith as the "old religion". Hence, whilst the word "Protestant" is not found in the Prayer Book, it is in the Coronation Oath in which the King has to profess himself to be a "faithful Protestant" and promise to maintain the Protestant religion in his realm. Nor is it without significance that, after the Declaration of Independence in 1776, Anglicans in America chose as the title for their Church "The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America".

The members of the Low Church Party, then, or Evangelicals as they are sometimes called, are truer to Anglicanism as Elizabeth intended it to be than are the High Churchmen. For Low Churchmen, the Church of England is simply "Established Protestantism". For them, Rome is not one of the "branches of the true Church", or an "erring sister", but an apostate Church and an abomination. They

believe in salvation by faith alone, hating ritualism and sacramentalism. They acknowledge no sacrifice except that of the Cross on Calvary. They deny any priesthood in the Church beyond a ministry of preaching. If they accept episcopacy, it is not because they think it necessary, but only because it is useful for law and order. Intercommunion with Nonconformists, whose ministers are just as much ministers of the Gospel as are the Anglican clergy, is quite permissible. Above all, Anglicans should ever be ready to join forces with Nonconformists in resisting the influence and growth of the Roman Church.

Such is one form of religion which has as much right to call itself Anglican as any other form.

HIGH CHURCH PARTY

The Protestant Reformers, preaching that religion is a personal and individual matter between the soul and Christ, left no room for any doctrine of a visible Church. For them the Church was necessarily invisible, consisting of those only who, by interior faith and repentance, had accepted Christ as their Saviour. It did not matter to what Church such people belonged, provided they did not adhere to the "apostate" Roman Church. Naturally, they saw no sense in asking "Which is the True Church?" They took very low views of the Church as an integral part of the Christian religion, and had little regard for external sacramental practices.

As contrasted with these, there have always been in the Anglican Church others holding much higher views of the position of the Church as a divinely-instituted organization necessary for the sacramental dispensation of grace and for the mediation of salvation to men. For them, to be a member of Christ supposes membership of the Church of Christ; and it is essential that one must be a member of the True Church of Christ, not merely of any man-made substitute for it.

With these convictions, High Church Anglicans feel compelled to justify their Church as still a part of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and to work for the restoration of Catholic teachings and practices within the

Anglican Communion. Low Churchmen have always denounced these High Churchmen as "Romanizers", not allowing for the basis in Anglican history to which High Churchmen appeal.

It must be remembered that Elizabeth wanted a comprehensive Church and that, in order to compromise between warring factions, Anglican formularies were made as ambiguous as possible, retaining Catholic elements to placate Catholic-minded Englishmen, and incorporating Protestant elements to appease supporters of Lutheran and Calvinist doctrines.

In Stuart times, therefore, High Churchmen such as Laud and his followers tried to ignore the Protestant elements, and stressed the Catholic elements, though with the reservations necessary to remain in the Church of England. They insisted on the continuity of their Church with the pre-reformation Church, and declared that it was a "reformed part" of the Catholic Church. At the Reformation, according to them, the Church of England had merely "washed its face", making no essential changes even though it had gravely compromised itself by making distressing concessions to Protestantism. They claimed, therefore, that they repudiated both Roman accretions and Protestant innovations. They allowed the Pope a primacy of honor, but not of jurisdiction. They taught the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but not by transubstantiation. They believed in auricular confession, but not that it was of obligation.

After the death of William Laud in 1645, and during the Commonwealth Period, these views of the Caroline High Churchmen were thrust out of sight, and the Protestant Party secured the dominant position. But the Laudian school was revived by the Oxford Movement of 1833, when the Tractarians tried once more to maintain the "Catholic" position of the Church of England. In obviously forced and unhistorical ways they endeavored to read a Catholic interpretation into the Prayer Book and into the "Articles of Religion." And they began a campaign for the restoration of Catholic Ritual.

"ANGLO-CATHOLICS"

Twelve years after he had published the first of his "Tracts" intended to make the Church of England conscious of its Catholic heritage, John Henry Newman realized the impossibility of such claims, saw the need of a living voice in a teaching Church which was not to be found in Anglicanism, and in 1845 submitted to Rome. Many followed him, but those who remained formed the nucleus of an "Anglo-Catholic Party" which grew steadily in influence and numbers until today it includes, in varying degrees, at least a third of practicing Anglicans throughout the world.

Anglo-Catholics speak contemptuously of the Church of England as it exists at present, with its toleration of Protestantism; but they insist that she has preserved from the Reformation disaster at least the bare essentials of a true branch of the Catholic Church. And they conceive it to be their duty to remain in the Anglican Church, appropriating and propagating Catholic practices until it has been purged of all vestiges of Protestant heresy. Their progress has been in defiance of their Bishops, but they hold that no authority in the Church of England can override things authorized by "Catholic consent" of the three great branches of the Church Catholic, "Rome, Constantinople, and Canterbury"! Pope Leo XIII's condemnation of Anglican Orders was a great disappointment to them, but they continue on their way, gaining popular support by the zeal and self-sacrifice of their clergy, and hoping against hope for the ultimate reunion of the Church of England with Rome under modified Papal claims.

The difficulties of the Anglo-Catholic position are enormous, and efforts to evade them prove futile.

If asked, "Why did you Anglicans secede from Rome in the first place by a guilty act of schism?", they reply, "We never did anything of the kind. The Pope went into schism from us by unjustly excommunicating Elizabeth in 1570 A.D." Reference to Elizabeth's repudiation of the Pope by the Acts of 1559 seems to make no impression on

them at all!

When challenged with the Protestant character of the Book of Common Prayer they reply that the 1552 corruption of the 1549 Book was unlawfully imposed on the Church of England by Parliament, but was never authorized by Convocation. But they overlook the fact that the 1662 Book, in use for nearly three hundred years, was based on the 1552 Book and not on the 1549 Book.

They are committed to a claim to "continuity" refuted by history in thousands of documents, and to a "branch-theory" rejected by the other supposed "branches", both Roman and Orthodox.

Their principles give rise to the absurdity that a Continental Catholic who acknowledges Papal supremacy becomes a schismatic, with no change whatever in his views or allegiance, by crossing the channel and setting foot in England, yet is free from schism the moment he leaves England's shores!

They have no solution of the problem of an infallible revelation with no infallible living voice to interpret that revelation.

Despite these difficulties, they see in the revival of sacramental life and of the Religious Orders in the Church of England evidences of God's presence and power; and they feel that they cannot give the lie to their Orders. But they will not admit the force of these arguments when Non-conformists point to examples of holiness in their own ranks, and speak of their non-episcopal ministries as blessed by God.

If Catholics find the position of Anglo-Catholics bewildering, they can at least be grateful to them for honoring Catholic ideals, and for acting as a leaven in the Church of England to preserve it from drifting to complete unbelief on the one hand, or to a violent anti-Catholicism on the other. Meantime, Anglo-Catholicism is a fruitful source of many individual conversions to Rome and to genuine Catholicism.

BROAD CHURCH PARTY

It is not surprising that, in a Church tolerating both advocates of Protestantism and advocates of Catholicism, there should arise amongst some members an impatience with both extremes and a consequent driftage to religious indifferentism.

As far back in Anglican history as the Commonwealth Period, therefore, we meet the "Latitudinarians" who would espouse neither the cause of extreme Protestantism nor that of Catholicism, but who wanted a comprehensive Church indifferent to the beliefs and practices of its members. Refusing to throw in their lot with either Low Church or High Church Parties, and denouncing all enthusiasm, they took refuge in indifferentism and scepticism. And their school of thought has persisted in the Church of England.

About 1850 their successors became known as "Broad Churchmen", and still later as "Modernists". For them, theology is merely the philosophy of any particular age. No dogmas can be perpetually binding. As religious experience varies, so Christianity must be continually re-stated. The appeal to the supernatural is indistinguishable from an appeal to superstition. The Church of England is simply the nation on its religious side, and in matters of belief and worship and discipline it is for the law of the land to decide what good order requires.

In 1918, when the Modernist Dr. Hensley Henson was appointed by the Crown as Bishop of Hereford, Bishop Kinsman, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, wrote, "Henson has denied the authority of episcopate and priesthood, the sacramental principle generally; and he defends, if he does not make, denials of certain Articles in the Creeds . . . But the Archbishop, as conscientious administrator of the system of the Establishment, has to consecrate him, since that system comprises all "schools of thought", is especially tender toward all sceptics, and only severe toward those who take its profession of loyalty to the ancient Church seriously . . . There is no getting away

from Henry VIII and Cranmer, lay-domination and cringing concession to disbelief in the supernatural. It is all nonsense to set up King Charles and Laud as typical Anglicans." "Salve Mater", pp. 89-90.

Two years later Bishop Henson himself wrote, when he was promoted to Durham, "It is difficult to imagine a more complete demonstration of Anglican confusion than the fact that an Anglican clergyman inhibited in 1909 and disregarding the inhibition, is himself raised to the episcopate in spite of a mighty clamour of protest in 1918, and is preferred to one of the greatest positions in the hierarchy in 1920! There is no doubt that the Church of England is so incoherent and divided as really neither to think nor to act as one body." "Retrospect of an Unimportant Life", Vol. I, p. 326.

But even in 1949 utterances by the Modernist Bishop Barnes of Birmingham made the Archbishop of Canterbury declare publicly that if he himself held such views he would not be able in conscience to remain a Bishop of the Church of England, though he did not contemplate any practical measures to discipline Bishop Barnes.

A comprehensive Church must ever be prepared to compromise, and allow whatever latitude the Broad Churchman sees fit to demand.

ENDLESS CONTRADICTIONS

"It is to the Elizabethan Settlement", wrote Bishop Kinsman, whilst still an Episcopalian Bishop, "that the Anglican Communion owes a characteristic quality, sometimes regarded as an excellence, but more justly as a weakness. This is its habitual ambiguity. It aimed at comprehension; and it ended in compromise." "Salve Mater", p. 116. For the truth is that Anglican theologians borrowed ideas wholesale from other and conflicting sources, Lutheran, Calvinist, Catholic, and even from unbelieving rationalists. And these troublesome people were subject to no authority.

The Anglican Bishop of Derby, Dr. Rawlinson, admits quite candidly, "The Act of Uniformity is still on the

Statute Book; but it is, in effect, a dead letter." He declares that a candidate for ordination has to promise with all solemnity that he will use the Prayer Book of 1662 "and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." His own practice is to ask each ordinand what meaning he attaches to the promises, but "I have almost universally found that, when this question is put to them, men have no answer to give. They have not clearly thought out or considered the matter . . . There is clearly a question of conscience involved, and men ought not to be put in the position of having to make solemn promises of which they have not considered the meaning." And he adds, "There is, I suppose, little or no doubt that originally 'lawful authority' meant either the King in Parliament or the King in Council." "The Genius of the Church of England", pp. 19-20.

Earlier in the same book Dr. Rawlinson had written, "Italianizing Anglo-Catholics, self-styled "Modernists", and Kensitite Protestants are all (with varying degrees of discomfort) tolerated in the Church of England, but no one of these various extremist groups has the least chance of ever capturing the Church as a whole . . . Those Christians who can never be happy without unanimity on all points of doctrine or of practice, or who demand clear-cut definitions, will never find the Church of England a comfortable Church to inhabit." p. 17.

With so much tolerated and so little authorized, one can only conclude that the Church of England has no fixed teachings on most points. In a word, you do not tell any man's religious beliefs by saying that he is an Anglican. Different schools of thought have predominated at different times. Theological Colleges range in their teaching from non-Papal Catholicism to anti-Papal Calvinism, Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals vying with one another in subscriptions to ordination funds to make sure of their proportionate quota in the ranks of the clergy.

The High Church "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" sends out missionaries to foreign countries teaching Anglo-Catholicism, whilst the Low Church "Church

Missionary Society" co-operates with the "British and Foreign Bible Society" to send advocates of Protestantism—to the bewilderment of natives who do not know what to make of diametrically opposed religions taught in the name of one and the same Church of England!

The Anglo-Catholic, the Rev. Vernon Staley, published a book entitled "The Catholic Religion". In reply, the Evangelical Rev. W. H. Griffith Thomas, published a book similar in size and style, entitled "The Catholic Faith", setting forth the Protestant interpretation of Anglicanism. In opposition to both we have "My Faith" by the Broad Churchman the Rev. Vernon Storr; and the prediction of a new religion for future Anglicans by the Modernist Dr. J. W. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro, in a Penguin Special entitled "The Gospel for Tomorrow".

Is it any wonder that "The Commission on Christian Doctrine", appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, entitled their Report, "Doctrine in the Church of England" and not "Doctrine of the Church of England", to the delight of Modernists and the despair of Anglo-Catholics?

ANGLICAN UNITY

It has been said that, despite all these different and competing religions, the Anglican Communion nevertheless retains its unity. But what is it that holds all Anglicans together? It must be something deeper than "Establishment", for that exists in England only, and the Bishops assembled at Lambeth came not only from independent Anglican Churches of the British Dominions, but also from the United States and even from China and Japan.

The American Episcopalian, Dr. Leicester C. Lewis, writing in the "Holy Cross Magazine", tried to answer the question. According to him, the bond uniting Anglicans is certainly not the "Prayer Book", since there is no unified fidelity to it; nor the Creeds, which many professing Anglicans do not believe and which may be denied with impunity; nor "liturgical worship", since there is the utmost diversity of practice.

What, then, can it be? Dr. Lewis replies that it lies in the fact that the formularies of Anglicanism are Catholic, but that they are not enforced in practice. Catholic-minded members of the Anglican Communion have the formularies on their side, and are quite free to live up to them. Protestants and others take refuge in the fact that these formularies are widely disregarded, and as the denial of them in practice is tolerated they also may feel quite at home in the Anglican Communion. "Anglican unity", he writes, "has persisted and is real today because of the firm adherence to Catholic order on the one hand, together with a refusal to enforce this order on the other."

Dr. Lewis writes as a "Catholic-minded" Episcopalian. The "Protestant-minded" Episcopalian would declare Anglican formularies Protestant, and say that Dr. Lewis and those who think with him may feel at home in the Anglican Communion only because their denial of the formularies is tolerated by Protestants! Meantime, a unity which is based on the toleration of a lack of unity is a paradox which will prove too much for most people, as will the concept of a "firm adherence" to Catholic order simultaneously with a complete indifference to a very uncatholic disorder!

In reality, the supposed unity amongst Anglicans is no more than nominal, bearing no resemblance to that oneness in belief, worship, and discipline essential to a divinely-instituted Church.

AMERICAN EPISCOPALIANS

A survey of the Anglican Communion would not be complete without a brief glance at its position in the United States of America.

Almost twenty years before the "Mayflower" pilgrims landed at Plymouth, U.S.A., on December 20th, 1620, the Church of England was already existing in Virginia, its clergy subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London.

In 1630, however, many Puritan Anglicans, dissatisfied with the High Church policy of Charles I and of Archbishop Laud of Canterbury, emigrated to the American

Colonies and settled in Massachusetts. These Anglican settlers, however, together with the clergy who came with them, practically abandoned Anglicanism in favor of Congregationalism, shipping back to England those who protested. The Virginian Anglicans, fearful of similar Puritan corruption in their own Colony, made a law in 1643 requiring conformity to the Church of England, fining, imprisoning and expelling Nonconformists from that Colony.

After the American Revolution and the Declaration of Independence in 1776, the "Church of England" in America had to find a new name, and chose that of "The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America".

The first problem of this new Protestant Episcopal Church was to secure Bishops. Anglicans in the Colonies had never wanted Bishops whom the British Government might use as a means of an ecclesiastical control from which so many of them had fled. They had been content to acknowledge the far-distant Bishop of London as their nominal diocesan authority, sending candidates for the Ministry home to England to be ordained there. The Declaration of Independence, therefore, found them without a Bishop.

William White, Rector of Philadelphia, a man of extremely Low Church views, suggested the appointment of a "Moderator" without consecration, along Presbyterian lines. But in 1784 the Rev. Samuel Seabury, a moderately High Churchman of Connecticut, was consecrated an Anglican Bishop in Scotland, English Bishops having refused to consecrate him because of his refusal to take the Oath of Allegiance to the Crown. William White, therefore, with Samuel Provoost, of New York, went to England and, having overcome the difficulties about the Oath, were consecrated at Lambeth in 1787.

Naturally, these Protestant Episcopal ordinations, from the Catholic point of view, were as defective as the Anglican Orders from which they were derived, and could not provide the new Church with a valid Catholic priesthood. But that would not have worried William White at least,

for he had no belief in any Catholic priesthood. At a Convention in 1789, when a Constitution for the new Church was agreed upon, he fought against opposition by Bishop Seabury for doctrinal and liturgical changes in a Protestant direction, as a result of which elements were introduced into the American Prayer Book from the Scottish Rite, the word "minister" being substituted in many places for the word "priest", and the form of absolution of sins being left out of the prescriptions for the Visitation of the Sick.

It was Bishop Hobart of New York, however, (1811-1830) who did more than any other to build up the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. He was strictly "Episcopalian", refusing to acknowledge the validity of any but episcopal Orders.

After his death, the Oxford Movement in England, and the subsequent rise of Anglo-Catholicism, gave rise to High Church tendencies in the American Church which led to strenuous opposition from Low Churchmen and charges of "Romanizing" there as in England. And, as in England also, the conflict between the two Parties resulted in a Liberal or Broad Church Party which pressed for more and more doctrinal and liturgical freedom.

In 1873, a "Reformed Episcopal Church" broke away from the "Protestant Episcopal Church" on the grounds that the latter was not Protestant enough in its outlook; though the latter was, and is, a definitely Protestant Church, despite the claims of the High Church Party belonging to it.

The American High Churchmen have never, of course, described themselves as "Anglo-Catholics". The word "Anglo" would be meaningless in America, and no equivalent term such as "Americo-Catholic" has ever suggested itself. In America "Catholic" means "Papal", and Americans know nothing of a Catholicism without the Pope. So they call themselves simply "Episcopalians", regretting the addition of "Protestant" to "Episcopal" in the title originally chosen for their Church.

The Protestant Episcopal Churches have an influence in

America far greater than their numerical strength would suggest; for they are well down on the statistical list. Compared with some 30 million Catholics, 13 million Baptists, and 10 million Methodists, the Protestant Episcopal Church has but 2,155,514 members, and the Reformed Episcopal Church only 8,000.

But the progress of Episcopalianism in America was greatly handicapped firstly by the fact that most of the original emigrants from England were people seeking to escape the necessity of conforming to the Anglican Church—which scarcely disposed them favorably towards Anglicanism in the land of their adoption; and secondly by the “Declaration of Independence”, with the almost inevitable reaction of the American people against not only England, but also against England’s national Church.

REUNION MOVEMENT

The Anglo-Catholic Revival amongst Anglicans has been one of the chief causes of the Reunion Movement of which we hear so much today. For, as opposed to a low doctrine denying any real necessity of the Church as a visible institution, Anglo-Catholics have brought into prominence amongst Protestants the New Testament teaching that Christ does indeed will one visible and undivided Church such as He Himself established in the first place. More and more books, therefore, are coming from Protestant pens, and not only from those of Anglicans, deploring the scandal of the multitudinous divisions amongst Christians.

But Anglo-Catholics are foremost in their constant insistence on the necessity of Reunion. Regarding themselves as Catholics, they speak of three living branches of the Catholic Church, Roman, Orthodox, and Anglican, which are unfortunately, they say, in a state of schism in relation to one another. Until these three living branches are united once more, there cannot be that single Holy Catholic Apostolic Church for the unity of which Christ prayed. That will come, they hope, in God’s good time.

As one of them has said, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and regret that it does not exist!"

Rome, of course, rejects that explanation absolutely. She declares that, in essential matters affecting its very constitution, there can be no divisions "in" the Church of Christ, but only divisions "from" that Church; and that she is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Undivided Church. And she declares it to be the duty of all not in communion with her to return to the Church their forefathers should never have left.

Anglo-Catholics, however, refuse to see this. They insist that the Anglican Communion is still a living branch together with the Roman and Orthodox Churches, even though wrongly, through human malice or frailty, all three are at variance. They hold that Anglicanism, despite the diversity in its own ranks, at least retains sufficient of the means of grace to sanctify its members. Its state of separation from Rome and from the Eastern Orthodox Churches has been permitted by God; but this is only a temporary makeshift until the schism is healed. And in the healing of that schism, they say, it is God's plan that the "Anglican Communion" should be the "Bridge-Church" between Rome on the one hand, and the Orthodox and Protestant Churches on the other. They do all they can, therefore, to discourage individual conversions of Anglicans to Rome as being a hindrance to ultimate corporate Reunion.

Whilst they recognize the sincerity and zeal of Anglo-Catholics in their efforts towards corporate Reunion, Catholics have to declare the hopelessness and impossibility of such a dream. For its realization would require that all non-Catholics would first become religiously one amongst themselves as are the members of the Catholic Church with which they would unite; and only a principle of divine authority, which all non-Catholic Churches reject, could bring that about.

Each individual has the responsibility of following his own conscience as it is at any given time; and if God, in His goodness, gives any man the light to see the truth of

the claims of the Catholic Church, no considerations of expediency can justify his remaining in some other Church whose separate existence is based on opposition to those claims.

But granted the gift of Faith in the Catholic Church as the one true Church of Christ, no one would fail to perceive this duty. Those who sincerely think of other alternatives have not yet attained to that degree of knowledge or of faith which every convert to the Catholic Church has discovered to be one of the most precious gifts of God. Surely every non-Catholic reader of this booklet should pray that, if such indeed be the case, he might be granted a similar grace.

PAMPHLETS ON THE MAJOR PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS

- THE BAPTISTS 15c
THE METHODISTS 15c
THE EPISCOPALIANS 15c
THE PRESBYTERIANS 15c
THE MORMONS 15c
THE ADVENTISTS 15c
THE ROSICRUCIANS 15c
THE CONGREGATIONALISTS 15c
THE LUTHERANS 15c
THE UNITARIANS 10c
THE CHRISTIAN SCIENTISTS 15c
THE JEHOVAH WITNESSES 15c
WHY ANGLICAN ORDERS ARE INVALID 15c
CATHOLICS AND FREEMASONRY 15c
QUIZZES ON SECRET SOCIETIES 15c

For Copies Address

FATHERS RUMBLE AND CARTY

Radio Replies Press

ST. PAUL I, MINN., U. S. A.

