## ART. V.—THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION AND CHURCH REFORM IN SPANISH LANDS.—I.

THE writers of the "*Tracts for the Times*" who asserted that union with the Papists is impossible evidently believed in the importance of the differences between Canterbury and Rome. They saw Rome as she is in England, but if they had seen her degradation in the Peninsula their conviction would have been strengthened and their standpoint emphasized. In this country the Gospel at Mass is read in the vulgar tongue; in Spain and Portugal in Latin. Practical contempt for the intelligent comprehension of Scripture teaching finds natural expression in the wild extravagances of Mariolatry and the universal sale of Indulgences in chapel porches and pious wareshops. A Roman Catholic lately returned from Andalucia (the holiest land of the Virgin) writes: "The Church is dying of inanition," and states, after a careful study of the religious situation, with the aid of knowledge of the language and access to the best quarters: "It is terrible to think how the Blessed Sacrament itself is made a source of extra profit. Theologians, of course, will excuse and explain, but the man in the street is not a theologian, and the effect on him is bad. He remains in the street, and does not trouble the Church. Is it any wonder that priests are looked down upon, and are not received into ordinary society? What can be their moral influence? Uneducated, and with no aspiration after better things, how can they help on the moral regeneration of their country? They retard it in every way. I must leave aside the darker colours of the picture. They are the natural result of the system" (*Pilot*, May 24, 1902). A very keen observer, after a long journey through Spain, remarks: "Ignorance is everywhere the lash that whips us all; but he who is in search of downright superstition and blind idolatry should go to Spain" (Luffman, "A Vagabond in Spain," p. 261). Again, to quote the late St. George Mivart:

"We were informed in Seville by a well-informed priest that out of a population of 118,000 not more than 500 men and 2,000 women make their Easter Communion, and that not more than 5,000 men go to Mass on Sundays." Since this was written the religious state has become much worse. Testimony to this is confirmed by close observers, and the opinion of the late English chaplain at Seville, the Rev. J. Blackburn Brown, M.A., is a striking pendant from an Anglican standpoint: "I have recently travelled through the whole length of Spain, and after several months spent in the country, during which I made careful and repeated inquiries from residents of different creeds and nationalities, besides

keeping my own eyes open, I can only say that, bad as I expected to find things, the half had not been told me. The moral and religious condition of both priests and people reminded me with terrible force of the sickening and appalling state of things when Hophni and Phinehas were priests in Israel." What has been said of Spain may be considered true of Portugal, and we can only hint at the greater degradation of the Latin lands of the New World.

Amid such surroundings infidelity and indifference are rife; the revolt from superstition has led to blind unbelief, and those who claim to be cultured and progressive ally themselves with those who profess to have no faith in God. For over one-third of a century the Bible Society has been openly working in the Peninsula, and the circulation of its precious merchandise has led to the awakening of the religious sense where it had been dead, and the dropping of the scales from many blind eyes. Men turning at times to their official teachers for guidance as to the import of the Scripture message, are at once told: "You must surrender your Bible or receive the curse of the Church." They prefer the priest's anathema to the outrage of their conscience, and become marked men. In every case in Spain persecution follows—it may be illegal detention by village tyrants, or, if the victim be a conscript, legal incarceration because he cannot worship the Host—always social ostracism must be faced, for by a strange delusion a blatant atheist may remain a true Spaniard, whereas a Bible-reading native is a pariah. Even in Spain more charitable views prevail in time, and obedience to the decalogue—the practical evidence of the acceptance of Scripture teaching—wins its way into the hearts of honest men. In Portugal, in the chief centres of population public persecution is dead, and in Mexico and South America the strident cry of a false patriotism is not invoked to give force to the hatred of a true life lived outside the Roman allegiance. The brave and earnest men who have sacrificed much for the Truth naturally group themselves into little bodies for the purpose of mutual aid and encouragement, and they are of necessity propagandists of their convictions, for they accept the all-sufficiency of Jesus Christ, and long to win others to their side. They have heard of friends and teachers of the faith they love in neighbouring districts; these they seek out, as they long for soul communion and greater knowledge of God. Ministers are sent to instruct them and administer the Sacraments, and schools are opened to instruct the children in the Reformed faith; for parents naturally object to their offspring being trained in what they believe to be a travesty of the teaching of the New Testament and the doctrine of

their Saviour. The majority of the Peninsular Reformers desire to follow the historical traditions of the primitive Church in matters of Church order and public worship; in America very large sections of those who have adopted evangelical principles stand in the same old paths, and the question naturally arises: What stand ought the great Anglican communion to take with reference to those foreign Churches which three centuries after the Reformation era preach Gospel truth on Church lines?

A brief review of the position of the Churches of England, Ireland, and the United States will show what may be done and has been done in the past.

1. *The Church of England.*—The constitution of the great mother Church of the Anglican Communion places her in a position of difficulty as far as official interference on her part is concerned. She is at once an integral part of the State as well as the Church of the people. Her Bishops are appointed by the Crown, and have seats in the House of Lords. When a Bishop was sought by Churchmen in the United States the English Bishops could not act, and the wise and great philosopher, Bishop Berkeley of Cloyne, wrote to the Scottish Bishops: "My reading does not enable me to comprehend how, without an Episcopacy, the Gospel, together with all its Divine institutions, can possibly be propagated. In the present state of matters I do not see how an English Primate can, without royal license at least, if not Parliamentary likewise, proceed to consecrate any Bishop for those districts which erst were allowed to give titles to assistant Bishops. In this state of things I think the glory of communicating a Protestant Episcopacy to the United Independent States of America seems reserved for the Scotch Bishops." The difficulty of the transmission of the Episcopacy by the English Bishops to a foreign body of reformers is greatly increased when the official religion in that country is Roman Catholicism. It is at once evident that the home Episcopate cannot transmit its orders to the Peninsular Reformers without very grave difficulty, and it is naturally unwise for it to meditate any such step on the American continent.

2. *The Church of Ireland.*—Until the Disestablishment Act the Church of Ireland was united with the Church of England, and was subject to the above-mentioned limitations. After that great crisis it adopted a constitution of its own, and in the forefront placed a declaration, which, among other clauses, contains the following:

"The Church of Ireland, as a Reformed and Protestant Church, doth hereby reaffirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship whereby the Primi-

tive Faith hath been from time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject.

"The Church of Ireland will maintain Communion with the sister Church of England and with all other Christian Churches agreeing in the principles of this declaration: and will set forward, as far as in it lieth, quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people."

Obviously the Church of Ireland is free to act as it desires in the matter of transmitting the Episcopate. It is free, self-governing, deriving its authority from Christ, who is Head over all things to the Church, and its Bishops have executive freedom, limited only by its Episcopal constitution. Emphasizing its Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, and Protestant principles, living as a minority in the midst of Roman Catholics, it can sympathize with the men who hold its faith and fight for its doctrines.

3. *The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States.*—This Church had its ecclesiastical independence included in the result of the great struggle for national independence. Practically, its ecclesiastical position is identical with that of the Irish Church, but many of its Bishops hold the view that the Roman Bishops so called have no jurisdiction at all, as they are merely deputies or vicars of the Pope. Whatever may be said of this opinion, it is an indication of the sturdy independence always maintained by the American Church.

Unity of action among all the branches of the Anglican Communion on vital matters is a most desirable end. A comprehensible policy of agreement on fundamental principles, with liberty of action in details, is necessary if internecine strife is to be avoided. Accordingly, the idea of a great pan-Anglican Conference arose, and every ten years in Lambeth all Bishops of the Communion are summoned—or, rather, are invited, for the organization is voluntary—to meet in London for the discussion of pressing problems of major importance. This body has no legislative authority; its influence is entirely moral; but all Churches place great weight upon its utterances. In 1878, at its second meeting, the Peninsular Reform Movement came under its notice for the first time in the form of a memorial from the Reformers requesting the consecration of a Bishop to superintend their work. The committee to which the memorial was referred resolved: "That your committee, having carefully considered a memorial addressed to the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England by four priests and certain other members of the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Episcopal Church praying for the consecra-

tion of a Bishop, cannot but express their hearty sympathy with the memorialists in the difficulties of their position, and, having heard a statement on the proposed extension of the Episcopate to Mexico by the American Church, they venture to suggest that when a Bishop shall have been consecrated by the American Church for Mexico he might be induced to visit Spain and Portugal, and render such assistance at this stage of the movement as may seem to him practicable and desirable."

Bishop Riley—consecrated by the American Church for Mexico—visited the Peninsula, having first obtained a commendatory letter from Archbishop Tait, and by his advice synods were held in Madrid and Lisbon, and a memorial from each synod was presented to the Irish House of Bishops praying for the transmission of the Episcopate. While in the country Bishop Riley ordained and confirmed. At this time both bodies of the Reformers used in public worship the S.P.C.K. translations of the Book of Common Prayer. This was provisional, as no Prayer-Book had been compiled. A few years later service books were approved by the synods containing large portions derived from the ancient Mozarabic and Braga uses.

In 1888 the position of the Reformers was again considered by the assembled Bishops. Based on the report of a committee presided over by Bishop Harold Browne, the following resolutions were passed *nemine contradicente:*

"That with regard to the Reformers in Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal struggling to free themselves from unlawful terms of Communion, we trust that they may be enabled to adopt such sound forms of doctrine and discipline, and to secure such Catholic organization, as will permit us to give them fuller recognition.

"That, without desiring to interfere with the rights of Bishops of the Catholic Church to interfere in cases of extreme necessity, we deprecate any action that does not regard primitive and established principles of jurisdiction and the interests of the whole Anglican communion."

No mention was made of the Mexican movement, for, unfortunately, Bishop Riley had justly incurred the censure of the American Episcopate. He proved himself intractable to brotherly counsel, and wished to have his own way. In consequence chaos followed his footsteps. The melancholy issue of the bold step of the American Church made the 1888 Conference very cautious.

At the 1897 (the Jubilee) Conference, many new facts came before the Bishops: the revival of the Mexican movement, the work among the Portuguese in South Brazil, and the

consecration of Bishop Cabrera, were all passed in review. The resolutions passed read:

"That we recognise thankfully the movement for the formation of an autonomous Church in Mexico, organized upon the primitive lines of administration, and having a Liturgy and Book of Offices approved by the presiding Bishop of the Church of the United States and his advisory Committee, as being framed after the primitive form of worship.

"That we express our sympathy with the Reformation movement in Brazil, and trust that it may develop in accordance with sound principles.

"That we repeat the expressions of sympathy (contained in the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1888) with the brave and earnest men of France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal who have been driven to free themselves from the burden of unlawful terms of Communion imposed by the Church of Rome, and continue to watch these movements with deep and anxious interest, praying that they may be blessed and guided by Almighty God."

This brief narrative plainly shows that the Bishops, realizing a solemn duty, are extremely slow and cautious in practical fulfilment. No stone had been left unturned to commit the Conference to a condemnation of the Irish Bishops who had dared, in the teeth of the wish of an advanced section of English Churchmen, headed by Lord Halifax, to consecrate a Bishop in Spain. The Conference disappointed the agitators, and their discomfiture was shown by the tone of the comments of their journals.

The action of the Conference will be better understood by a brief résumé of what had been done by the American and Irish Churches for their protégés.

1. *The American Church and Bishop Riley.*—In 1879 Bishop Riley was consecrated Bishop of the Valley of New Mexico. D. Manuel Aguas was destined for this high privilege, but he received his home call some years before the consecration took place. Dr. Riley is a Spanish-speaking native of Valparaiso, a man of great eloquence and apparently strong force of character. His striking personality seemed to mark him out as a natural leader of men. He was set apart as Bishop on the distinct understanding that until the Church had three Bishops of its own he should be associated in its government with seven Bishops (American). His clergy refused to acknowledge his authority, and he in turn refused to work with his Episcopal colleagues. No effort was spared to bring about a truce to his rebellion, and finally, after protracted negotiations, he was formally deposed from his high office, and is not acknowledged by the Mexican Church. The sad

history of this failure has never been written, but its occurrence has had a very deep effect in prejudicing the minds of the Anglican Episcopate against the transmission of the Episcopate to Latin races. Bishop Riley, in his early life, did a good work, and it is a source of great sorrow to find a life so well begun passing under a thick cloud.

2. In November, 1879, Bishop Riley in person presented to the Irish House of Bishops a memorial asking for Episcopal Orders to be given to the Peninsular Reformers. The Bishops then passed a resolution: "In the absence of any authoritative communication to us from the Spanish and Portuguese Reformed Episcopal Church in its corporate and national capacity, it would not be conducive to the best interests of that Church or consistent with the spirit of the Lambeth resolution were the Irish Bishops to enter prematurely on the consideration of the important and difficult question to which the memorial refers." Bishop Riley, immediately after the meeting of the Bishops, visited the Peninsula, superintended the formation of synods, and in the following spring (1880) presented to the Irish Bishops duly authorized memorials praying for the consecration of Bishops for Spain and Portugal. The House of Bishops unanimously resolved that, "In the event of sufficient guarantees as to doctrine and discipline being provided by the Reformed Spanish and Lusitanian Churches, we are prepared to comply with their request as to the consecration of Bishops, all necessary canonical conditions having been complied with." It was then mentioned that Prayer-Books were in process of preparation, and the Bishops in December authorized Lord Plunket—then Bishop of Meath—to visit Spain as their representative to convey to the Reformers a message of sympathy, and to arrange for the printing of the translation of the Prayer-Books to be laid before the House of Bishops.

Archbishop Trench of Dublin strongly advocated the compilation of national service-books with roots in the early Peninsular uses, and declared he could not sympathize with any movement to transplant in the Peninsula branches of the Anglican Communion. From long and intimate knowledge of the spirit of the people, he felt that any such effort was doomed to failure. Lord Plunket made his report to the Bishops, who in December, 1881, determined, before taking further action, to submit the translated Prayer-Books to the Lambeth Committee appointed to consider such matters. Queries were asked as to (1) the probable breach of ecclesiastical order, (2) the sufficiency of the guarantees as to doctrine and discipline, (3) the expediency of the proposed consecration, and (4) the advisability of entering into a covenant with

the Reformers. Of the nine members of the committee, Archbishop Tait was ill, the Archbishop of York remained silent, the Irish Archbishops deferred their statement until they met their colleagues, and the five remaining members wrote letters which may be summarized as follows:

1. All replied that no breach of ecclesiastical order would be committed.

2. The presiding American Bishop and the Bishop in charge of the American Churches in Europe held that the formularies supplied the necessary guarantees, but the Continental Bishop regretted their vagueness on the new birth in the Baptismal Office and the omission of the oblation and invocation of the Holy Spirit after the words of Institution in the Liturgy, "an omission which deprives them of the strongest protest against the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation." The Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson) considered that the adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles—with the necessary local changes—supplied the necessary guarantee in the Lusitanian Church, but thought the general basis of discipline vague. The Scotch Primus considered the Lusitanian Church supplied the necessary guarantee, but the Spanish Church did not, and the Bishop of Gibraltar thought, after a cursory examination, "the formularies very good."

3. Four of the five Bishops (the Bishop of Gibraltar being the exception) saw no reason why the Irish Bishops, if satisfied with the guarantees of doctrine and discipline, should refuse to grant the prayer of the synods, and the Bishop of Gibraltar believed the Churches had not yet attained sufficient importance to justify the compliance asked. Should the Irish Bishops comply, he suggested that the title of the Spanish Bishop should not be territorial.

4. On the question of a covenant, the Bishop of London thought this rested with the Irish Bishops, the American Bishops thought it desirable, the Scotch Primus believed it a precarious step, and the Bishop of Gibraltar said nothing.

In the meanwhile the ecclesiastical press raised a keen controversy on the subject; the Nonconformist Englishmen engaged in Spanish reform evoked sectarian strife, and in April, 1883, the entire matter was postponed until after the Lambeth Conference of 1888. The Portuguese Prayer-Book was now published, the translation having been made from a manuscript not finally approved by the synod; changes were made in the Spanish Book, and the Thirty-Nine Articles were adopted by the Church; the title of the Bishop-elect was changed to Bishop of the Spanish Reformed Church, and the work went slowly forward in the Peninsula. Bishop Cabrera explains the adoption of the Articles as the outcome of a wish

to have a definite statement of doctrine, and, as they realized the great difficulty in preparing a new one, they selected the Thirty-Nine Articles as that in accord with their opinions and the articles of religion of the Churches with which they wished to be allied. Many have criticised this step, but the development of other Episcopal Continental movements has vindicated the wisdom of the action of the synods. In the year following the Lambeth Conference (1889) the House of Bishops, while expressing its unabated interest in the movement, felt that in view of the conflict of opinion and the doubts of the competence of the Irish Bishops to consecrate a Bishop for a foreign Church with a foreign ordinal, it would be unwise for them to consecrate a Bishop. They hoped the Reformers would receive the Episcopate from a source free from the difficulties that barred their action.

An appeal was then made to the Swiss Old Catholic Bishops, who had followed the movement with sympathy. Their hands were tied by a compact with the Archbishop of Utrecht, which forbade them to take part in the consecration of a Bishop for a Church that held the Thirty-Nine Articles or similar doctrines, and although it was made plain that the formal rejection of the Thirty-Nine Articles would probably bring with it a native Episcopacy, the Reformers stood firm in their maintenance of the Scriptural truths expressed in this document.

In 1894 certain changes had taken place in the Irish House of Bishops, and the then Primate—the far-seeing Dr. R. S. Gregg—was a tried friend of the Reformers. Accordingly, at a meeting held on February 24, 1894, the historic resolution was adopted, two Bishops—Cork and Derry (Dr. Alexander)—not voting:

"That, considering the length of time during which the applications of the Spanish and Portuguese Reformers for the consecration of Bishops have been before us, the difficulties under which they have laboured, and the progress made during that time in numbers, in the adoption of liturgical services, in the building of churches, and in the formation of congregations, we would not consider it as an indefensible exercise of the Episcopate if, at the request of such congregations, the Archbishop of Dublin, who is intimately acquainted with the history of the movement and with the character of those who are carrying it on, acting in concert with two other Bishops who may be willing to act with him, either of the Church of Ireland or of a Church in communion with the Church of Ireland, should, if he shall so deem fit, proceed to Spain and Portugal, and there confer Episcopal Orders upon the two clergymen chosen in those two countries respectively

by the representatives of the said congregations, and of whose personal fitness the consecrating Bishops shall be fully satisfied."

In April, 1894, the question was discussed by the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, who decided that, as such action belonged solely to the House of Bishops, the matter should be left entirely in their hands. Accordingly, in September the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishops of Clogher and Down, set out for Spain in the company of the Rev. H. E. Noyes, to whom the Reformers are much indebted for ceaseless service in their behalf, and, before taking further steps, met the synod of the Reformed Spanish Church. A concordat was entered into between the synod and the consecrating Bishops to the following effect:

1. That until the Reformers have three Bishops of their own there shall be associated with their Bishop or Bishops a Provisional Council, consisting of two or three Bishops of the Church of Ireland or of some Church in communion therewith.

2. That during the same interval the synod of the Church shall be pledged: (*a*) Not to permit the election or consecration of any Bishop for the said Church without the written consent of the Provisional Council of Bishops; (*b*) Not to alter or add to the doctrines, formularies, or discipline of the said Church without the previous approval of the Provisional Council; (*c*) To submit for the examination and sanction of the Provisional Council every resolution of a fundamental character that may be proposed for the adoption of a future synod.

3. No Bishop consecrated shall have power to consecrate for another Church without the consent of the other Bishops forming the Council.

On Sunday, September 23, the solemn service of the consecration of the Rev. Juan B. Cabrera, who had been a Roman priest, and is now the trusted leader of the Spanish Reformers, took place in a crowded church, built by the munificence of Irish Churchmen. The Irish ordinal was used, and the solemnity of service will never be forgotten by those who witnessed the stately Archbishop and his two loyal colleagues —still, happily, in our midst—laying hands on the deeply-moved Spaniard, who had suffered much for his devotion to the faith of the Gospel. The Bishops have seen no reason to regret their action, for the consecration has consolidated the work of the Church, and the wise rule of the Bishop has done much to remove difficulties and stimulate activity.

No Bishop has been consecrated for Portugal. The late loved and brilliant President of the synod, the Rev. Canon

Pope, D.D., refused to accept his unanimous election by the synod, as he felt the Church would do better under a native Bishop. After the death of Lord Plunket, the Reformers petitioned the Irish Bishops to do for them what had been done for Spain, and they resolved "That the Bishops of the Church of Ireland desire to express their sincere sympathy with the members of the Lusitanian Church in their brave struggle in behalf of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Evangelical faith, and trust that, with the blessing of Almighty God, they may increase in numbers and in influence, and become a great power in their own land. The Bishops are most anxious to assist them in any way in their power, but regret that at present they cannot proceed to the consecration of a Bishop."

It may fairly be surmised that the Bishops felt the time had not come, and that the necessary Episcopal acts, confirming and ordaining, might for some time longer be performed, on invitation, by a visiting Irish Bishop, or by Bishop Cabrera. This has been done: the Right Rev. the Bishop of Clogher and Bishop Cabrera have performed Episcopal acts in Portugal, and the synod has worked with commendable wisdom and discretion. The Portuguese service-book has been revised, and the chief points of difference from the manuscript translation are found in the Baptismal and Ordination services. In the Baptismal Office the minister may say after the baptism of the child:

"Dear brethren, let us now give thanks, and say the Lord's Prayer;" or, "Dearly beloved brethren, seeing this child is now regenerate," etc., as in the Anglican service.

As the only formulæ used in the laying-on of hands in Portugal were the Spanish and Anglican, the Portuguese Church has followed the example of the American Church, and has adopted alternative formulæ to be used at the discretion of the Bishop:

*Spanish:* "God Almighty grant thee the gift of the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Presbyter in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen;" or, *Anglican:* "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Irish Churchmen will note with interest that the Portuguese Reformers have adopted in the text the liberty which their Church gives its ministers in the preface to the Irish Prayer-Book. This liberty of interpretation of the baptismal formularies and the ordinal has been one of the most precious benefits the Church of Ireland derived from Disestablishment, and has made the position of many of its ministers much easier. What has been secured to English Churchmen by the Gorham judgment is officially declared by the Church of Ireland to be the right of all her sons.

THOS. J. PULVERTAFT.

(*To be continued.*)

## ART. VI.—AFTER THE CHURCH CONGRESS: "ONE THING IS NEEDFUL."[1]

IT is a vivid and touching picture which is presented to us at the close of this evening's Second Lesson, of our Lord's reception in the household of Martha and Mary. "He entered into a certain village, and a certain woman named Martha received Him into her house. And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus' feet and heard His word. But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to Him, and said, Lord, dost Thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me." It is evident that the two sisters were similarly devoted to our Lord, and thankful to have Him with them. But their devotion to Him took very different forms. In Martha it took the form of eagerness to serve Him. "She was cumbered about much serving," or, as our Lord said, she was "careful and troubled about many things." The Lord whom she loved and honoured was in her house, and she could not do enough for Him; no anxiety or care or toil could be too much to bestow upon Him. But the other sister was chiefly sensible of the supreme privilege of being able, in the quiet of the home, to sit at His feet and hear His word. Both sisters had heard Him in His public ministry, and He had won the devotion of both their hearts. But Martha's instinct was at once to make some return for the blessings she had received,

[1] A sermon preached in Peterborough Cathedral on the evening of Sunday, October 12, 1902.