

phenomena which the study of the inscriptions has brought to light" (p. 251). Then we are told of "a growing pride in honest industry . . . a new and healthy sign, a reaction from the contempt for it engrained in old Roman society"; and of how the workmen "were finding a means of developing an organization which at once cultivated social feeling, heightened their self-respect, and guarded their collective interests" (p. 253). Then we are reminded of the "laws of association," and how "down to the time of Justinian the right of free association was jealously watched as a possible menace to the public peace." Again, how "the primary object of a multitude of colleges . . . was undoubtedly the care of the memory of their members after death." Those who have wandered through the catacombs, and who call to mind the words, "This do in remembrance of Me," will not be surprised at the analogy which has been pointed out between the earliest Christian societies with their "common meal" and these *collegia* or brotherhoods. And those who read this chapter carefully will obtain much help in any effort they may make to realize the nature and the ideas of the society which Christianity was then penetrating, which it was affecting, but by which it was also as surely in turn being affected. A consideration of the rest of Professor Dill's interesting volume must be deferred until next month.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

SPAIN AND RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE.

IN the opinion of many thoughtful students of international politics Spain is destined to play an important part in the future of Europe. Its geographical position, mineral wealth, and increasing population point in this direction, and the intellectual and scientific revival of the last twenty years are too little considered by most Englishmen. During the present year the Nobel prize for literature was awarded to Don José Echegaray, and the most coveted scientific honour, the Helmholtz Medal of the Berlin Academy, was given to the eminent histologist, Señor Ramón y Cajal. In every branch of knowledge a renaissance is observed, and freedom of thought and discussion take the place of former apathetic acceptance of traditional beliefs.

The Madrid Athenæum gathers together the forces that form and mould thought. During the months of March and April the "religious problem" was discussed every week in the

Athenæum by representatives of the Ultramontane, the so-called "Liberal Catholic" party, and the agnostic Republicans and Socialists. The public galleries were always crowded, and impartial spectators declared that the applause of the audience was most heartily given to the speeches of men who declared themselves emancipated from Christian belief. The right of every man to worship God in accordance with his conscience was asserted, and, although in private life the speakers would not hesitate to show contempt for native Protestants, they publicly protested that Spaniards had the right to think and act as they thought best in religious as well as secular matters. This marked advance is not confined to Madrid. The Rector of the University of Salamanca, in a recently-published book, astonished his admirers by largely quoting Scripture, giving chapter and verse: it was a surprise to Spaniards to find anyone in his position referring to the vernacular version of Holy Scripture. The same thinker is responsible for the administration of the new Education Act in his province, and when an effort was made to influence him to close a school belonging to the native Reformed Church, he at once asked: "Are the sanitary and other conditions of this school inferior to those of the municipal schools?" When he discovered that they were not, he immediately said: "I shall not be any party to the injustice of condemning schools on account of their religious character." No more was heard of the agitation, for the enemies of freedom knew they would not find the Rector a willing tool in their hands.

Turning from the general trend of enlightened Spanish thought to the legal position of those who find themselves unable to follow Roman teaching, a contrast is at once seen. In the Concordat between Rome and Spain, made in 1851, Article I. maintains that—

"The Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion, which with the exclusion of every other form of worship continues to be the only religion of the Spanish nation, will be always preserved in the dominions of his Catholic Majesty, with all the rights and prerogatives which it ought to enjoy according to the law of God and the disposition of the sacred Canons."

This Concordat, according to Canonists, still remains the law of Spain, in spite of the famous Article XI. of the Constitution, which was made after the Revolution of 1868. This Article declares that—

"The Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion is that of the State. The nation is obliged to maintain its worship and its ministers. Nobody shall be molested in Spanish territory for his religious opinions or for the exercise of his own worship, saving the respect due to Christian morals. Nevertheless, no ceremonies or public manifestations will be permitted other than those of the State religion."

The Ultramontane Party has always chafed under the existence of this clause, but when a republic and the brother of Victor Emmanuel were in power they could do nothing. In 1876 Pope Pius IX.—seeing a son of Isabella II., to whom he had given the “golden rose,” on the throne—wrote to the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo :

“ We declare that the Eleventh Article completely violates the rights of Catholic truth, and of the religion, and, contrary to all right, the Concordat of this Holy See with Spain is abrogated in its principal and most precious part.”

Spain was then in a period of reaction, and much agitation was roused by the erection of a Protestant chapel in Mahon (Balearic Islands). Señor Canovas, who was Prime Minister, in response to the appeals of ecclesiastics, gave, in a Royal Order, an authoritative interpretation of the law. This Royal Order, to be distinguished from a Royal Decree, as the one is signed by the Minister alone, and the other is signed by King and Minister, declares :

“ All public manifestation of worships or sects dissenting from the Catholic religion is henceforward prohibited outside the limits of their temples or cemeteries, and in order to carry out this rule everything will be understood to be a public manifestation which is carried out on the public way or on the outside walls of the temple or cemetery, by which are made known the ceremonies, rites, uses and customs of the dissenting worship whether by means of processions, placards, flags, emblems, announcements or bills.”

This is the law of the land to-day, and its enforcement is in the hands of the Central Government.

During the reign of Alfonso XII. Palace influence was always on the side of liberty. The King was a subscriber to *La Luz*, the periodical written by Bishop Cabrera, and, as far as lay in his power, His Majesty endeavoured to put in practice the lessons he had learned in England. On his death his able widow, Queen Maria Christina, became Regent, and as she had been an ex-lay Abbess of a Convent, and is a devout and bigoted Roman Catholic who is entirely in the power of her ecclesiastical advisers, every possible effort was put forward to increase the intolerance of Rome, and to ecclesiasticize national affairs. In direct violation of the Concordat the religious Orders were permitted to flood the country. Instead of the three Orders permitted by the Concordat of 1851, there were in Spain, in 1903, 2,656 communities of women, and 597 communities of men. The total number of nuns reached 40,030, and of monks 10,630. They overran the country, and as they paid no taxes, their activity in commerce under-sold their less privileged neighbours. The deportation of the monks from the Philippine Islands, and the influx of the ex-

pelled French Orders have added to their strength. The regular clergy are the most thoroughgoing enemies of freedom, and their presence acts as a direct stimulus to hostile demonstrations against the small Protestant groups.

This was the condition of affairs until the beginning of the present year, when public attention was called to official acts which showed glaring illegality. A young soldier in Galicia, who had entered the army as a Protestant, was asked to attend Mass. He replied that he was a Protestant, and a worshipper of God in spirit. His officer refused to accept his remonstrance, and he was placed under arrest and thrown into prison. He appealed to the Military Court, and, in consequence of the agitation, was promised a fair trial. Some evangelists belonging to the Plymouth Brethren were violently assaulted in a village, and, as they happened to be British citizens, an outcry was raised, and the Press denounced the village brutality that committed such excesses. No notice had been taken of former outrages, and even when the writer was fired at in Villaescusa it was considered a matter unworthy of attention. Had he been a Spaniard public opinion a few years ago would have said "serve him right for deserting the religion of his country and becoming a Protestant."

These events would have been soon forgotten were it not for the erection of the English Church in Barcelona. The English colony in that city had bought a piece of ground, and were there erecting, under the patronage of the Colonial and Continental Society, a little church. The plans of the church, made by one of the churchwardens, had been approved by the municipal authorities. No hostility was expected, as Barcelona prides itself on its liberality, and is in many respects more like a French than a Spanish seaport. It is the centre of Republican activity, and is noted for pronounced anti-clericalism. Although it is customary to make municipal grants in support of religious processions, Barcelona has refused any subvention, and neither ecclesiastical prayers nor threats moved the civic fathers.

The first signs of a coming storm were seen in a letter published last August, protesting against the sanction given by the Government to the opening of a building whose form proclaimed it to be a "Lutheran" or "Protestant" place of worship. The writer called for the removal of everything of a distinctive character, and endeavoured to set on foot a public movement to compel the authorities to do their duty. In last March the Catholic Associations of the city addressed a petition to the Prime Minister denouncing the form of the building, which has the exterior appearances of a temple of Gothic architecture, and two crosses, one over the roof and the

other surmounting the entrance-door. Attention was directed to a text, which did not exist, and the Prime Minister was asked to cause the disappearance of the crosses and text before the opening should be permitted. The petition was forwarded, and nothing more was publicly said until, on April 14, Don José Estanyol y Colom, Professor of Canon Law in the University of Barcelona, published in the *Diario* of Barcelona an article entitled "A Monument of Infamy." After calling upon—

"All those who work and live and breathe for Christ in the city to work without rest or truce until they secure that in this land, watered with the blood of martyrs and vivified by the heroism of our saints, we may not have to look upon . . . a temple which defies God, completely denying to Him what he values most—the worship which He demands from men"—

he added the staggering paragraph :

"Although our unhappy city is to-day the cesspool in which welter the foulest vices . . . let us at least work to avert that which is worse than this—that which would bring us face to face with the advance of heresy—manifested by that which would be the greatest monument of infamy in our religious city."

The day for the opening of the chapel was drawing very near when the Cardinal Bishop "published a pastoral on the construction of a Protestant chapel, which the Press says will soon be opened." The Cardinal stated that he had appealed to the Government to have the opening prevented, but was still ignorant of the result of his protest. Having proved to his own satisfaction that Roman Catholics should agree that Romanism is the only religion which has a right to be respected and accepted by a Catholic State, and that it alone has the right to propagate itself, he proceeds to discuss the teaching of the Church on liberty and tolerance of worship. Liberty of worship is not allowed in Spain, for

"The word Liberty carries with it the conception of right and faculty of doing a thing; the word tolerance considered in itself consists in supporting patiently an evil. Accordingly liberty of worship would signify right, or a faculty of embracing any worship whatever; whereas tolerance of worship signifies that the authority, to avoid the very grave evils that the prohibition of false worship would cause the Church or State permits—which is the same as saying suffers or tolerates that anyone may follow a false worship."

"Liberty of worship is in itself impious and absurd—for it is an impiety and absurdity to suppose that anyone has the right not to adore God and not to give Him the worship with which He wishes to be honoured. The faith teaches us that Jesus Christ, God and very man, instituted the Church, and that outside of it there is no salvation. To affirm that man has the right to embrace dissenting worships is a heresy—is to have shipwrecked in the faith."

It is unnecessary to quote further a document which is full of the intolerant spirit of the sixteenth century, and upholds the absolute claims of the Church to show no "condescension" to the Protestant sects.

On May 2 the Prime Minister replied to the Cardinal that the Ministers had determined to observe the law, and would not "consent to the opening of the chapel until all the exterior symbols disappeared. There will therefore be no 'condescension,' and the laws of the kingdom will be faithfully observed. In this sense the Government will reply to the note received from the English Government." The crosses were removed (according to *El Nuevo Mundo*, which published two excellent photographs of the church) as an act of tolerance and courtesy, and by desire of the Bishop of Gibraltar, and the church was consecrated and opened on May 5.

The Liberal Press made the Pastoral of the Cardinal the starting-point of a vigorous campaign against the Government and religious intolerance. And among the many remarkable articles that appeared, none was more striking than that in *El Pais*, one of the most important Madrid papers. In the course of an earnest plea for liberty, it said :

"The nation is indignant in seeing how the Catholics (Roman) cannot say *evangelical* chapel, but 'Cabrerized,' alluding to the name of the Protestant Bishop, whom they insult as market women, without respecting the sacredness of the family, since they direct the same or even greater insults to his wife and daughters in return for the correct attitude they observe towards Catholicism, in return for the silence, the patience, and the forgiveness of injuries of which they always give an edifying example, an undeniable proof that they are a hundred times more Christian than those Pharisees."

The agitation would probably have had an early and unfruitful end had there not appeared in print on May 17 the following private letter from the young King to Cardinal Casañas, of Barcelona :

"MADRID, May 1, 1905.

"VERY REV. SEÑOR CARDINAL,— With great interest and profound sympathy I read the letter which your Eminence was so good as to send me on the 22nd ult., and the contents of which confirm the notices already received concerning the intention to open a new Protestant chapel in the Catholic city of Barcelona. I am earnestly endeavouring to have the matter settled in accordance with the text of the law fundamental and its consequential dispositions, and in proof thereof I have had it discussed some days ago by my Council of Ministers, to find in union with them the most effective means of correcting an abuse incompatible with the legislation now in force and the unanimous sentiments of the Spanish nation. As Catholic King and a submissive son and believer in the only true Church, this new attempt against the faith of our ancestors and the religion of the State, which has been confided to me now by Divine Providence, profoundly grieves me, and I do not hesitate in assuring you, Señor Cardinal, that it is my duty, within my attributes as Constitutional

Sovereign, to do all in my power that the projects which your Eminence exposes may be overthrown by my Government. I implore your blessing, repeating all my respectful esteem and affectionate goodwill,

“ALFONSO XIII.”

This letter—undoubtedly the work of a secretary and a private communication—added fuel to the flame. The Government at once assumed responsibility for the note, and the Conservative and Liberal press called for the censure of the Cardinal. Many refused to believe that the King who had decorated with the Order of Alfonso XII., the brilliant naturalist, Don Angel Cabrera—whom he personally knows—could be guilty of a wish to prevent the English colony in Barcelona worshipping in their own church. They saw in the letter the usual respectful, if not obsequious, tone adopted by Spanish monarchs in addressing Princes of the Church, and an allusion to the evident violation of the intolerant law which forbids the erection of crosses outside Protestant places of worship. The colony had unwittingly broken the law, believing that the approval of the municipality covered all the conditions that had to be observed. They were convinced that a monarch who in a few weeks proposed to visit England would not be guilty of an intolerant desire to deprive the countrymen of his future hosts of the opportunity of worshipping God in accordance with the ritual of the national Church of England.

The country was, however, roused, and saw in the unauthorized publication of the letter a desire to interfere with the *rapprochement* between England and Spain. Even the reactionary press published articles from priests who had lived abroad, contrasting the state of religion in Protestant countries with the superstition and deadness of the Church in Spain, and *El Universo*, a leading Ultramontane organ, went so far as to prefer England to France, for although the “English live in the lamentable error of Protestantism, they have some affinity with us, since they preserve the common Christian basis.” This statement is most surprising, for in Spain the free-thought schools are permitted to have large placards outside their walls, and no obstacle is placed in the path of the materialistic propaganda, for custom prescribes that in the majority of instances they “should be baptized, married, and buried by the Church.”

The Rev. Don Fernando Cabrera, seeing the time was ripe to draw once more public attention to the fact that the front door of the church in Calle Beneficencia, Madrid, had been kept illegally closed for more than ten years, wrote a letter to the leading newspaper, setting forth the facts. He told how Ministers had asked the door to be kept closed, and that the

congregation had been compelled to enter by the door of an adjoining house, pass through a courtyard and the vestry before reaching the interior. For obvious reasons he did not state that the Ministers had regretfully acknowledged the illegality of the order, and had refused to put it in writing, for they said they had received command from above (the Queen Regent) to have the law violated. The publication of the plain history of the different prohibitions led the Ministerial organ to remark that it had been closed by orders of Liberal Ministries, not by the demand of the Conservatives, who were not intolerant.

As Bishop Cabrera had arranged to leave Madrid on a visitation tour to Andalucia, he entrusted the task of approaching the Civil Governor to his son, who determined that the front door of the church should be opened in accordance with what seemed to be the official declaration of the Government. Don Fernando Cabrera sought an interview with Count de San Luis, who received him most kindly, and asked him to narrate in detail all that had happened. It appears that the President of the Council of Ministers had already been consulted; and when the Civil Governor heard all his visitor had to say, he not only gave his consent that the door should be opened, but also promised to take precautions that no disorder should take place. On May 28, the door was opened, and on the following day a leading newspaper wrote :

“With great surprise and no little satisfaction we saw yesterday, on passing through Calle Beneficencia, that tolerance of worship was yesterday a reality in Madrid. . . . Yesterday the Protestant chapel in this street had its doors wide open—a thing that had not been observed since the opening day. Two policemen respectfully placed on the doorstep sanctioned by their presence the legality of the opening. The church was filled with the faithful. We take a note and celebrate this breeze of liberty, which appears to be the consequence of acts of hostility recent and censured.”

It is rash to prophesy concerning the future of religious liberty in the home of the Inquisition. One of the great political parties—the Liberal—has lately placed religious liberty as the first article of its programme. The action of the present Government commits the Conservatives to the maintenance of the present tolerance as a reality, and not as it has too often proved, an excuse for repression and persecution. Public opinion, now becoming an active factor in Peninsular life, is strongly in favour of the removal of all restrictions on liberty of worship. Spain once more seems to be at the parting of the ways. The Bible Society reports a greatly increased circulation of the Bible during the past year.

The little groups of reformers are more hopeful than they have ever been, and if the land is to be saved from the effects of the reaction from superstition and idolatry, it can only be rescued by the spread of primitive Christianity in a form that appeals to the historic instinct of the people—by a Church framed on the Apostolic model and essentially Spanish. The Spanish Reformed Church with its able Bishop is, above all things, marked by its devotion to the teaching of Holy Scripture and all lovers of Gospel truth will pray that it may have grace to seize its opportunity and to go forward. English and Irish Churchmen have a duty in this great work, which the Spanish and Portuguese Church Aid Society, so long and faithfully presided over by the late Archbishop Plunket, tries to perform. THOMAS J. PULVERTAFT.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER ON EDUCATION.

THE fact of the Rationalist Press Association having some little time back published a sixpenny reprint of the above work, of which more than 60,000 copies are apparently by now in circulation, challenges some criticism of its contents, and I should like to offer the following papers by way of a small contribution to the task.

Amidst much that is admirable and exhibits great powers of observation and of independent thought, it strikes me as a decidedly weak point that Mr. Spencer does not seem clearly to decide for himself, and keep before his mind, whether the object to be aimed at in education is to *acquire the knowledge* most likely to be useful to the learner in life, or to *train the faculties* for subsequently acquiring that knowledge by such a discipline as is most calculated to develop and strengthen them. The curriculum of public schools in England is based on the latter supposition. The study of language (the dead languages by preference, Greek and Latin) and the study of mathematics hold the chief place in it, as the best mental gymnastics. It is believed that, when the instrument of thought has been forged by this discipline, it can be applied to the acquisition of special knowledge, such as the learner requires for his particular career in life, with greater advantage than if his studies had *commenced* with that object.

Mr. Spencer criticises this theory, but he does not seem to me to go to the root of the matter, nor to be quite consistent in his objections. At one time he argues¹ that the things it

¹ Cf. chap. i., *passim*, especially pp. 22, 23, 39, 40.