

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

Brent, Herzog, Morayta and Aglipay

Pedro S. de Achutegui and Miguel A. Bernad

Philippine Studies vol. 8, no. 3 (1960): 568—583

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

Brent, Herzog, Morayta and Aglipay

PEDRO S. de ACHUTEGUI
and MIGUEL A. BERNAD

Charles Henry Brent, Canadian by birth, American by citizenship, was born in Newcastle, Ontario, on 9 May 1862. Having graduated A.B. from Trinity College of the University of Toronto in 1884, he was ordained an Episcopalian priest in 1887 and assigned to the Episcopalian mission of St. Andrew in Buffalo, New York. For two years (1889-1891) he lived with the "Cowley Fathers" in Boston, deriving from them a deeply spiritual outlook which he retained all through his life. The Cowley Fathers were an Anglican religious congregation, a fruit of the Oxford Movement, whose official title was the Society of St. John the Evangelist. The superior of their American residence in Boston was the Englishman Arthur Hall, who became Brent's spiritual father and his lifelong friend. In company with Hall, Brent visited England in 1891, and then took up the Episcopalian ministry at St. Stephen's Church in Boston, where he served for ten years.

In October 1901, after American civil government had been established in the Philippines, the Episcopalian House of Bishops, meeting in San Francisco, decided to send an Episcopalian mission to the Philippines. Brent in Boston was notified of his election as Episcopalian Bishop of the Philippines. He was consecrated an Episcopalian Bishop in Boston, with his friend Bishop Lawrence of Massachusetts as one of the con-

secrating prelates. The sermon was preached by Hall, who by this time had become Bishop of Vermont. Brent sailed for the Philippines in May 1902 in company with Governor Taft, who was returning to the Islands by way of Rome, for his historic conversations with the Vatican in the matter of the friar estates.

In the Philippines, Brent confined his spiritual activities and those of his church to the non-Christian tribes of the Mountain Province and to the Moros in Mindanao, and among the Protestant Americans in Manila and Baguio. He refused to proselytize among the Catholic Filipinos — an attitude not shared by other Protestant bodies in the Philippines. He established his cathedral church of St. Mary and St. John in Manila, organized the St. Luke's Hospital, the Columbia Club, and in Baguio the school which now bears his name.

Alarmed by the opium trade which was devastating the Orient and which was beginning to affect the Philippines, he threw his efforts behind the anti-narcotic movement. He was made President of the First International Opium Commission in Shanghai in 1909, and of the Second International Opium Commission in The Hague in 1911. He continued his efforts against opium until 1924.

In 1917, after fifteen years of service, he left the Philippines finally, and became Bishop of Western New York. But he continued his international work, first as chaplain in 1918, then as member of international conferences for Faith and Order. In 1920 he was chairman of one such conference in Geneva, and in 1927 president of another in Lausanne. It was in Lausanne, Switzerland, that he died in 1929.

Brent's civic leadership received ample recognition. He was decorated by four countries: Belgium (Order of Leopold), France (Legion of Honor), Great Britain (Companion of the Order of the Bath), and the United States (Distinguished Service Medal). He received honorary doctorates from no less than twelve universities or colleges. These included the honorary doctorate in divinity from Toronto (1901), Harvard (1913), Yale (1919), Columbia (1920), and Glasgow (1920), and the

honorary doctorate in laws from Toronto (1924) and New York University (1925).

It is unfortunate that Brent's biographers have made no mention of his dealings with Aglipay and Aglipayanism. The official biography, begun by his friend R. E. Ogilby, the first headmaster of Brent School in Baguio, and completed by Zabriskie, was published in Philadelphia in 1948.¹ There is no indication that the authors had consulted—or knew of the existence of—Brent's extensive correspondence on the subject of Aglipay and the Aglipayan movement with Bishops Hall and Lawrence and other ministers of his church, or with the Episcopalian House of Bishops, or with Bishop Herzog of Switzerland, or with the American Secretary of War, or with Aglipay himself. Some of this correspondence is in Manila, in the Aglipayan files, but much of it is in Washington, among the Brent Papers in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, and in the National Archives.

BRENT AND AGLIPAY

The initial conversations with Aglipay in 1904 are thus described by Brent in the "Private Addendum," a confidential memorandum for bishops of the Episcopalian church:

I pointed out to him (Aglipay) that he was not what he pretended to be... a bishop... and that his position was badly Protestant and not Catholic at all. He at once said: "That is true. We are only priests," justifying his assumption of episcopal functions on the score of necessity.

I stated the position of our church in such matters, referring to history as illustrative of the principle of organic and orderly continuity. After listening to the story of the establishment of the American episcopate through the medium of the Scotch Episcopal Church, *he asked me eagerly if I could confer episcopal orders on the bishops of the Independent Filipino Church.* (Emphasis supplied.) I replied that it was a matter in which the church as a whole would have to act, and that I as an individual bishop could only give an expression

¹ Alexander C. Zabriskie, *BISHOP BRENT, CRUSADER FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY*, Philadelphia 1948.

of opinion. In my judgment, if formal application was made by him to the General Convention, a commission would probably be sent out to confer and investigate and even then nothing might come of it, as a purely independent church could not be established on American territory, and it might not be possible to come to satisfactory terms of communion. I advised him therefore to think the matter over and consult with his advisers, adding that I would convey any message he cares to send to the General Convention. I also stated that I felt that I must be frank with him and say that up to that time I had heard nothing but bad of him, though I was glad to have an opportunity to learn his side of the story.

As both of us were leaving town for some weeks it was not possible to meet again for several weeks.

In subsequent interviews, the last of which was the night before I sailed for Europe I impressed upon him that if he and his fellows were to be any spiritual help to the Filipinos they must make high moral living their first goal, that political intrigues would be fatal, that as an independent church it stood as a sham and that God never used shams for His purposes.

In June 1904 Aglipay wrote the formal letter which Brent advised him to write. It was addressed to the Assembly of Bishops of the Episcopal Church of the United States. But the letter was couched in vague and general terms. It made no mention of episcopal consecration, or indeed of affiliation.

A la muy respetable Asamblea de Obispos de la Iglesia Episcopal de los Estados Unidos.—En nombre de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente, de la que soy, aunque sin merecimientos, humilde Obispo Máximo, y por conducto del dignísimo Obispo C. H. Brent, tengo la honra y verdadero placer de saludar a la venerable Asamblea de Obispos de la Iglesia Episcopal de los Estados Unidos de América, presentándola el homenaje de nuestra muy afectuosa confraternidad en Cristo Dios e impetrando sus oraciones para que nuestro Padre Celestial se digne guiar a nuestra naciente y pobre iglesia nacional por la senda de su voluntad divina con las luces del Espíritu Santo, lo que esperamos conseguir por los merecimientos del Señor Jesús, con tal que prediquemos con verdadero interés sus evangélicas enseñanzas de santidad, de amor y de redención moral y social. De todo corazón ofrecemos también a nuestros amados hermanos los cristianos de América, nuestros humildes servicios y muy especialmente nuestra desinteresada y entusiasta alabanza, en la humanitaria empresa de evangelizar a los Filipinos leyéndoles la Biblia en sus genuinas letras... En la creencia de que la respetable Asamblea Episcopal a la que tengo de afecto, me

suscribo de todos los cristianos de América, muy cariñoso hermano (Firmado) Gregorio Aglipay.²

Although episcopal consecration was not mentioned, that was what Aglipay had in mind as may be seen in a notation in his own hand in his file copy of the above letter which, translated, says: "Another letter was also delivered to Bishop Brent asking his help to bring to the Philippines one bishop from the Old Catholic Church, one from the Anglican, and one from the Episcopal Church of the United States of America for the bestowal of apostolic succession upon our episcopate."

Brent replied in a long letter on 10 July 1904, pointing out that Aglipay's letter, being vague and containing no specific request or proposal, could not be acted on by the Episcopalian bishops:

As I re-read your communications to the House of Bishops and myself respectively, I am convinced that they are too vague to justify any official action on our part—indeed I myself would advise against it.

First. Unless it be stated in exact and distinct terms for what a Commission is requested, no self-respecting body could think of sending one. A mere invitation for representatives of our church and others to come and see you is a pleasant courtesy—nothing more. If your letter had in it some such phrase as this: "A Commission to confer with me and the other bishops of the Independent Filipino Church or with the supreme council, and to examine into the possibility of establishing communion with you", the whole ground would be covered.

Second. I have read with care your statement of doctrines and morals and church polity. Considering the important place in government accorded therein to your supreme council, it would appear as though any steps looking toward inter-communion should have some endorsement of that body. I am of the opinion that the House of Bishops would hesitate to do anything unless it had the endorsement of that body. Of course I may be mistaken as to the extent to which authority may be vested in you.

² Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Brent Papers, file 1904. The letter in Spanish is in the Private Addendum. An English translation appeared in *THE CHRISTIAN REGISTER* (official organ of the Philippine Independent Church), December 1956, p. 3. Copy of the Spanish original in the Achútegui Collection.

But the point is this—your letters call for nothing. I understand that, taken in conjunction with what you have said to me in conversation, the second one has a significance which it would not possess otherwise; but that is neither here nor there. If you are in earnest you ought to be as frank on paper as you are in conference. In matters that pertain to the church of God, honesty of motive and straightforwardness of action must go hand in hand. If you trust me and the honorable body which I represent, you must commit your case to us in intelligible language. If you are desirous of having a Commission, please say so and I shall use my influence to secure its appointment.

Of course I might fail; and there is also the contingency that the Commission when appointed might come to the Philippines only to discover that terms of communion cannot be agreed upon. But in any case no harm would result.

As I understand your position, you desire to place the Independent Filipino Church in organic relation with historic Christianity. There is but one way to do this, viz. that which I have already indicated. Neither the Greek, Anglican, Old Catholic or our own Church would take any other course.”³

Thus the conversations fell through because Aglipay, who spoke candidly in conversation, would not commit himself on paper. He never wrote a formal petition to the Episcopalian bishops for either affiliation or consecration, and even Brent’s letters he left unanswered. On his return to the Philippines, Brent wrote to his colleague, Bishop Lawrence: “Aglipay came to see me since I returned and said that the reason he did not answer my second communication was because he was away in the provinces: I do not believe him for a minute.”⁴

There was another reason why these negotiations with the Episcopalians fell through: but this we shall take up later in this paper.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE OLD CATHOLICS

Simultaneously with these negotiations with the American Episcopalians, Aglipay was also carrying on secret negotiations

³ Brent Papers, Private Addendum. Also in *CHRISTIAN REGISTER*, *loc. cit.*

⁴ Brent Papers, file 1905. To Lawrence, 26 April 1905. Excerpts from general correspondence.

with the "Old Catholics," and in particular with Bishop Herzog of the Swiss National Church.

When the Vatican Council defined the dogma of papal infallibility in 1870, a number of German, Swiss and Dutch Catholics, about 1400 in number, seceded from the Catholic Church in protest, and called themselves the Old Catholics. Among their leaders were Döllinger and Friedrich von Schulte. The sect elected Dr. Reinkens as bishop. He was consecrated by a Jansenist bishop and established his see at Bonn where he enjoyed government protection and support. In 1875 the Swiss members of the sect organized a Swiss National Church and elected Dr. Herzog as bishop. In 1876 he received episcopal consecration from Dr. Reinkens and established his see at Berne.

Strangely enough, the person who showed the greatest concern in putting Aglipay in contact with Herzog was a Spaniard and a layman, a deputy in the Spanish Cortes, representing Madrid: Don Miguel Morayta. He had, however, an official interest in the Philippines, for freemasonry was strong in the Philippines both before and after the Revolution, and Filipino freemasonry was under the jurisdiction of the Spanish Grand Orient, of which Morayta was the head.

Morayta's interest in Aglipay's episcopal status was Machiavellian, as is readily apparent from his letters which will be quoted presently. Morayta was quite frank about his motives: the best way to destroy the power of the Vatican was to foster the growth of a schismatic church that could sustain a vigorous religious life by possessing the apostolic succession and the sacraments.

Thus, in his letter to Aglipay dated Madrid, 9 April 1904, he argued with great insistence that Aglipay must lose no time in getting himself made a bishop by a valid consecration. The situation was not without an element of humor, for Morayta was a layman and presumably not a very religious man, while Aglipay was a priest who was also the head of a church, yet it was the layman who was lecturing the priest on the need of episcopal consecration:

It is the belief of Rome, and this you know better than I, that Christ consecrated His apostles as bishops in order that they could transmit this power to their successors duly consecrated.—To obtain ecclesiastical jurisdiction, an appointment is sufficient; but episcopal order demands episcopal jurisdiction. The appointment granting jurisdiction can be granted by the supreme pontiff, by the secular authority, by popular acclamation, briefly in any form, but episcopal consecration must necessarily be done by a bishop.

In passing, it might be remarked that Morayta's statement about ecclesiastical jurisdiction was not quite accurate. He was confusing two things: episcopal election and the granting of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The manner of election or choice of a bishop has differed in different countries and at different periods. In some cases a bishop is appointed directly by the Holy See; in others, the election is done by the cathedral chapter, or, in the earlier years of the Church, by the people; or where there is a Concordat or agreement with the Holy See permitting the practice, the bishop is nominated by the secular authority. But the ecclesiastical jurisdiction as such can be conferred only by ecclesiastical authority, howsoever the bishop might have been chosen. Morayta continues:

You are a priest, duly ordained, and you will always remain a priest no matter what heresy you preach. Even Rome will acknowledge the validity of your actions as a priest. But not having been consecrated a bishop, your actions as a bishop will always remain doubtful in their validity; like your consecration of other bishops, or your ordination of priests and deacons, your blessing of temples, chalices, etc. Obviously you can be respected and appreciated by your followers, and you can continue in the task you have begun, without following the sacred canons; but it will be a potent weapon in your fight against Rome and for the progress of your church if you follow the sacred canons as closely as possible.

For this reason, it would be a tremendous victory for the Philippine Independent Church if you could become a bishop duly appointed and validly consecrated.

Morayta then offers two suggestions by which Aglipay could obtain valid episcopal orders. He might negotiate with the Greek Orthodox Church, or might negotiate with the Old Catholics in Switzerland, where Morayta had friends who could help in the negotiations:

The Greek Orthodox Church is ready to win friends away from Rome; but if no Greek bishop is willing to do you this honor, there may be one at Geneva who would be willing to consecrate you. Once consecrated, you could consecrate your colleagues. And thus, being real bishops and real priests, you can win a great victory over the papists.

Morayta concludes by offering to find out, as a precaution, if Bishop Herzog had been validly consecrated or not.

I have good and reliable friends at Geneva who will ascertain whether or not Bishop Herzog is a legitimate bishop. If he is, I can also find out if he would be willing to consecrate a Filipino priest as bishop. I shall do this very discreetly, without mentioning your name, and shall give you a report of my findings.⁵

On 24 November of that year, Morayta was able to report to Aglipay that Herzog was a validly consecrated bishop:

I have discovered that Bishop Herzog was consecrated by other Roman Catholic bishops and is thus a perfect bishop in accordance with the canons of the Church . . . A Swiss friend has talked about you to Bishop Herzog and he expressed himself highly disposed to consecrate you. . . As your old friend I dare to confess that if I were in your position I would accept the offer without vacillation . . . Please consider slowly this matter and consider my intervention as token of affectionate help and how much I appreciate your task.⁶

The following month, in a letter of 16 December, Morayta forwarded to Aglipay more detailed information about Herzog which he had gathered from pamphlets and newspapers sent to him from Switzerland. Herzog was born in 1847, seceded from Rome in 1870, was elected bishop of the "Catholic Church of Switzerland" in 1876. He was consecrated a bishop by Dr. Reinkins. He was thus a bishop for twenty-eight years. He was a good writer and was held in high respect by both the Swiss and the Germans. Morayta added that the only difficulty in the way of Aglipay's consecration was one which he could easily overcome: namely, he must subscribe to the Utrecht Convention.⁷

⁵ The original of Morayta's letter was among Aglipay's papers. Photostatic copy in Achútegui Collection through the courtesy of Fathers Patrick O'Connor C.S.C. and de Persio C.S.C. English translation in CHRISTIAN REGISTER, January 1957, pp. 3-4.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

HERZOG'S INTEREST

Meanwhile Aglipay had gotten in touch with Herzog. In June 1904, when Aglipay sent a formal letter to the Assembly of Bishops of the American Episcopal Church, he likewise sent a similar letter to Herzog.⁸ Letters were exchanged between Herzog and Aglipay in the course of 1904, with mutual expressions of friendship. To the convention of the Swiss National Church to be held in Berne in January 1905, Aglipay received an official invitation. So did Brent.

Brent and Herzog were likewise in correspondence concerning Aglipay. In a letter of 24 July 1904, Herzog told Brent that he was willing to dedicate a special session of the Berne Convention to discuss the Philippine question.⁹ Indeed, Herzog had gotten so interested in the Aglipayan movement that he was disturbed by the report that it was about to be suppressed:

The papist newspapers announce that the independent movement is on the point of being suppressed. I would be infinitely sorry to hear of such an ending to the efforts of the poor Filipinos. But if the American courts drive them away from the churches in order to restore the church buildings to the Roman Church, it would be difficult for the young and weak church to remain in existence. We in Switzerland would also be in a sorry plight if the cantonal governments were to follow the example of the ultramontane governments which regard us as apostates without any right to exist or to own church property. I hope very sincerely that the United States do not adopt the canon law of the papist Church. It seems to me a duty to render every assistance to the poor Filipinos who are seeking to free themselves from the yoke of Rome and to establish a better order in the ecclesiastical and moral sphere.¹⁰

But by mid-1904 Herzog had begun to entertain doubts about the genuineness of Aglipay's position as "bishop". From Berne on 4 June 1904 he wrote to Aglipay that he had learned from Catholic newspapers that the Aglipayan church had given up the apostolic succession. "I presume that that is not

⁸ The letter to Herzog was dated June 1, 1904.

⁹ Herzog to Brent, 24 July 1904. Brent Papers; original in French.

¹⁰ Herzog to Brent, 31 July 1904, *ibid.*

true. We Old Catholics of Europe would be quite lost if we renounced this essential characteristic of Christianity."¹¹

In the letter of 31 July 1904 to Brent, previously quoted, Herzog states quite frankly that he was shocked to hear that Aglipay was not a true bishop:

I have read your account of the situation. I am particularly shocked to learn that Señor Aglipay has not received episcopal orders. I was afraid that was the case. Certain bits of information that I had received had raised doubts in my mind before, but the success of Aglipay's movement seemed to me a proof that the people regarded him as a real Catholic bishop. I am impressed by the frankness as well as the charity with which you explained to Aglipay your point of view. For this reason I cannot do otherwise than to approve of your insistence that the bishops of the Independent Church must remedy the defect in question.¹²

To Aglipay himself on 1 September 1904 Herzog addressed the following appeal:

Without wishing to derogate from the independence of your church or to forestall your own judgment as to that which benefits your church, we beg to call your attention above all to our adhering to the apostolic succession; we therefore are of opinion, that a church can only be considered a Catholic church, if its bishops have been consecrated by another Catholic bishop. If the bishops of your church should hitherto have not received the Catholic consecration, we would address to you the urgent entreaty, to be mindful of supplying this want.¹³

Herzog had no illusions as to the person of Aglipay. He did not think that Aglipay was a man of much education, but he felt that, with all the man's limitations, his movement had to be supported, otherwise the Roman Catholic Church would win the day. To Brent on 16 August 1904 he wrote:

I understand perfectly that Señor Aglipay, who from his youth has been reared in such a milieu, is not a Christian gentleman who has had the advantages of being born into a good Oxford family. But I still think that the movement which he heads deserves support and encouragement. Liberty is a good mistress; but the education of a

¹¹ English translation in *CHRISTIAN REGISTER*, January 1957, p. 1.

¹² In Brent Papers. Original in French, dated from Kandersteg.

¹³ *CHRISTIAN REGISTER*, January 1957, p. 2.

nation cannot be accomplished in a few years. Only the Roman Church would gain if the movement were to fail.¹⁴

HERZOG'S CONDITIONS

Although Aglipay himself did not attend the Berne Convention which took place on 24 February 1905, his formal request for episcopal consecration was presented at the Convention by one of the members of the conference, Emile Barrell. Barrell said that Aglipay wanted to know under what conditions the Old Catholic hierarchy would be willing to confer the consecration. The Convention agreed upon a reply which Dr. Herzog then sent directly to Aglipay. Miguel Morayta in Madrid also received a copy of the reply, apparently through one of the members of the conference, the parish priest of Chaux des Fons.

Herzog demanded that Aglipay must go to Switzerland accompanied by two other bishops-elect of the Philippine Independent Church, and that all three must receive episcopal consecration. The reason for this was clear, and was explained in the letter. Canon law demands that a bishop must be consecrated by three bishops—a consecrator and two co-consecrators. If therefore Aglipay wanted to consecrate other bishops of his church in the Philippines, he must have two co-consecrators with him who, like himself, must have been validly consecrated. It was important, said the letter, that the hierarchy of the Philippine Independent Church must be consecrated in a manner that Rome could not possibly impugn as invalid. Otherwise, Aglipay's position as a rival of the Roman Catholic Church would be extremely weak.

From Aglipay and the other two bishops-elect, the Berne Conference demanded four documents, as follows: (1) The curriculum vitae of each one, indicating date of birth, parents' names, studies, date of sacerdotal ordination, name of ordaining prelate, etc. (2) A diploma certifying the election of each to the office of bishop, signed by the authorities of the Philippine Independent Church and notarized by either the Swiss or any other duly authorized legation in Manila. These dip-

¹⁴ Herzog to Brent, 4 August 1904, Brent Papers.

lomas were to be drawn up in solemn form, as they were to be read in public at the ceremony of consecration. (3) A statement concerning the status of the Philippine Independent Church, the number of dioceses, the names of the bishops of each, the number of the faithful, the names of the members of the Supreme Council, relations with the Philippine Government, and the financial status of the church. (4) Finally, a formal declaration of acceptance of the Declaration of Utrecht, signed by each of the three bishops-elect. Upon receipt of this signed acceptance, Herzog would communicate with the Old Catholic archbishop of Utrecht, and the bishops of the Old Catholic communion would then meet in conference to decide on the Aglipayans's request for consecration. If the decision was favorable, the consecration could be held in August 1906.¹⁵

The letter added that of the six articles of the Utrecht Declaration, the sixth concerned only the bishops of Europe. Acceptance of the other five articles would make it desirable that ecclesiastical students of the Philippine Independent Church be sent to study towards the doctorate in theology at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Berne.¹⁶

MORAYTA'S INSISTENCE

On 19 November 1905 Morayta wrote again to Aglipay with great insistence and a note of impatience. Aglipay had said that while he wanted to go to Switzerland for the consecration, he had no funds for the trip; nor had he sent the documents demanded by Herzog. Morayta is impatient of the delay, urges Aglipay to go to Switzerland and offers to act as cicerone during his visit there. The letter is worth translating in full:

To the Supreme Bishop, Aglipay. — My Respected Bishop and Friend: Bishop Herzog has written from Berne to the parish priest of Chaux des Fons a letter which may be translated as follows: "I

¹⁵ Photostatic copy of Spanish translation in Achútegui Collection.

¹⁶ Spanish translation of the Utrecht articles in Aglipayan files. Photostatic copy in Achútegui Collection. The Utrecht Convention took place on 24 September 1889.

have received your good letter and I am informing you that I have received these days a few lines from Bishop Aglipay. He assures me that he intends to come to Switzerland, but that for the present he cannot afford it for lack of money. I have told him in reply that I hope to receive as soon as possible his replies to the questions which we proposed in our conference. He must not forget that I cannot act without consulting with the bishops of Holland and Germany, and I cannot take up the matter with these bishops without the information and declarations which we asked for."

The same parish priest has also received another letter, from the Professor of Theology at Berne, Mr. Michaux, who says: "The important thing is that Aglipay, when he comes to Switzerland, should bring with him (if he has not sent them ahead, which would be better) the official documents which were asked of him, concerning his parishes, dioceses, his clergy, his finances, in short, everything necessary for the consecration. Please see to it, and this is of capital importance, that your friends in Madrid should insist with Aglipay on these points."

With the matter thus, I take it that you have not received the documents which I sent you last April, which included a detailed questionnaire and another set of documents with instructions relative to each.

I sent those by registered mail, and they were copies and amplifications of those which, it seems to me, were sent to you by Herzog.

It is unlikely that both sets should have been lost. But, in case they were and you are in the dark as to what you must do, in order to save time send me a telegram saying simply *Write me* (escribame). The three words are enough: MADRID MORAYTA ESCRIBAME, and I shall reconstruct if not all the documents, at least the most important of those I sent you, and in this way we shall gain two months' time.

It is really quite easy for you to send the needed information and the necessary documents. With these requirements fulfilled, the consecration will be conferred. A month's residence in Europe will be enough, and you will be able to return to the Philippines with all the canonical authority that you deserve.

As I once told you, I consider it very important that you and two other bishops should be consecrated together, and that you should come accompanied by an entourage and with some ostentation. This is not as expensive as it might seem, and more, I shall accompany you to Switzerland serving as your guide and helping you to live properly there but without too much expense. In short, I do not think the metallic question will be too much of a problem.

I understand that if you come here before everything has been arranged, you might have to stay two or three months in Europe.

This would happen if you came without the documents that they have asked for, drawn up in proper form so that there would have to be no further need for new information from the Philippines.

In fine, you have had in your hands, for a long time now, the means to make yourself impregnable to attack in matters of no small moment, and yet you are allowing time to slip by without using the opportunity.

About ten days ago I received a very interesting letter from you. You should have informed me, from the beginning, of that entire situation, because, although my contacts with the United States are few, there are many masons there, and a considerable number of them belong to the Spanish Orient. Through them we could reach the proper authorities and create opinion.

To obtain one thing and another, an official letter has been sent to them.

Life is short, my respected friend, and we must make haste. If you had answered my letter of last April, you could have been officially proclaimed two months ago [as bishop elect] and this would have given you great power to fight your battles. Do not fail, therefore, to send an immediate reply to this letter of mine.¹⁷

The great leader of Spanish freemasons would have given anything to see the destruction of the Catholic Church. And nothing would contribute to that destruction more than a real schism in which bishops of the Catholic Church, validly consecrated, should break away with their clergy and faithful from the Roman communion and continue to flourish as a rival church in defiance of Rome. It is understandable, therefore, why Morayta should have felt offended at Aglipay's non-cooperation.

Thus, on 22 January 1906, writing to Isabelo de los Reyes who had sent him a copy of the *Lecturas de cuaresma*, Morayta said: "I have received the first pamphlet of the Lenten Lectures, and frankly I finished by not understanding you. There is an abyss between it and your last letter. . . I have written to Father Aglipay about this matter but I do not know if he will answer me, since I told you, he can count on me absolutely except for assistance in handing a triumph to the Vatican."¹⁸

¹⁷ Spanish text in Epifanio de los Santos, "Don Miguel Morayta."

¹⁸ Translation by Patrick O'Connor in *THE SENTINEL* (Manila), 6 June 1959.

have received your good letter and I am informing you that I have received these days a few lines from Bishop Aglipay. He assures me that he intends to come to Switzerland, but that for the present he cannot afford it for lack of money. I have told him in reply that I hope to receive as soon as possible his replies to the questions which we proposed in our conference. He must not forget that I cannot act without consulting with the bishops of Holland and Germany, and I cannot take up the matter with these bishops without the information and declarations which we asked for."

The same parish priest has also received another letter, from the Professor of Theology at Berne, Mr. Michaux, who says: "The important thing is that Aglipay, when he comes to Switzerland, should bring with him (if he has not sent them ahead, which would be better) the official documents which were asked of him, concerning his parishes, dioceses, his clergy, his finances, in short, everything necessary for the consecration. Please see to it, and this is of capital importance, that your friends in Madrid should insist with Aglipay on these points."

With the matter thus, I take it that you have not received the documents which I sent you last April, which included a detailed questionnaire and another set of documents with instructions relative to each.

I sent those by registered mail, and they were copies and amplifications of those which, it seems to me, were sent to you by Herzog.

It is unlikely that both sets should have been lost. But, in case they were and you are in the dark as to what you must do, in order to save time send me a telegram saying simply *Write me* (*escribame*). The three words are enough: MADRID MORAYTA ESCRIBAME, and I shall reconstruct if not all the documents, at least the most important of those I sent you, and in this way we shall gain two months' time.

It is really quite easy for you to send the needed information and the necessary documents. With these requirements fulfilled, the consecration will be conferred. A month's residence in Europe will be enough, and you will be able to return to the Philippines with all the canonical authority that you deserve.

As I once told you, I consider it very important that you and two other bishops should be consecrated together, and that you should come accompanied by an entourage and with some ostentation. This is not as expensive as it might seem, and more, I shall accompany you to Switzerland serving as your guide and helping you to live properly there but without too much expense. In short, I do not think the metallic question will be too much of a problem.

I understand that if you come here before everything has been arranged, you might have to stay two or three months in Europe.

This would happen if you came without the documents that they have asked for, drawn up in proper form so that there would have to be no further need for new information from the Philippines.

In fine, you have had in your hands, for a long time now, the means to make yourself impregnable to attack in matters of no small moment, and yet you are allowing time to slip by without using the opportunity.

About ten days ago I received a very interesting letter from you. You should have informed me, from the beginning, of that entire situation, because, although my contacts with the United States are few, there are many masons there, and a considerable number of them belong to the Spanish Orient. Through them we could reach the proper authorities and create opinion.

To obtain one thing and another, an official letter has been sent to them.

Life is short, my respected friend, and we must make haste. If you had answered my letter of last April, you could have been officially proclaimed two months ago [as bishop elect] and this would have given you great power to fight your battles. Do not fail, therefore, to send an immediate reply to this letter of mine.¹⁷

The great leader of Spanish freemasons would have given anything to see the destruction of the Catholic Church. And nothing would contribute to that destruction more than a real schism in which bishops of the Catholic Church, validly consecrated, should break away with their clergy and faithful from the Roman communion and continue to flourish as a rival church in defiance of Rome. It is understandable, therefore, why Morayta should have felt offended at Aglipay's non-cooperation.

Thus, on 22 January 1906, writing to Isabelo de los Reyes who had sent him a copy of the *Lecturas de cuaresma*, Morayta said: "I have received the first pamphlet of the Lenten Lectures, and frankly I finished by not understanding you. There is an abyss between it and your last letter. . . I have written to Father Aglipay about this matter but I do not know if he will answer me, since I told you, he can count on me absolutely except for assistance in handing a triumph to the Vatican."¹⁸

¹⁷ Spanish text in Epifanio de los Santos, "Don Miguel Morayta."

¹⁸ Translation by Patrick O'Connor in *THE SENTINEL* (Manila), 6 June 1959.

It is ironic that everyone—the masons in Spain under Morayta, the Old Catholics in Switzerland under Herzog, and the Episcopalians under Brent—should all have been anxious to have Aglipay consecrated a bishop, and that the only thing that prevented their schemes from succeeding was Aglipay himself.

He pleaded lack of money to go to Europe, which was true enough. To Brent he offered excuses which were flimsy, such as that he had to go and visit the provinces. But there was a deeper reason that made Aglipay hesitate, when it was in his power to receive episcopal consecration from foreign bishops.

What was it?

It was at this time that Aglipay was showing himself receptive to efforts to bring him back to the Church. Could it be that Aglipay was uncertain, that he wanted time to think, that he did not want to lock the door completely against his return to the Catholic fold?

Or could it have been ambition of an even greater prize? In 1904 and 1905, the dioceses of the Philippines were being taken over by American and European bishops. The Spanish friar-bishops were gone. Filipino bishops would eventually be appointed. Already a beginning was being made, with the appointment of Bishop Jorge Barlin of Naga in 1905. After three centuries of Christianity in the Islands, the first Filipino bishop had finally been appointed. There would certainly be more. Why not Aglipay—if he returned?

Or could it have been fear? It was bad enough to masquerade as a bishop when he was not one; but to have himself made a real bishop, and to consecrate other bishops in turn, while he was in a state of schism and of excommunication would be a frightful sacrilege. Was conscience still so far alive in Aglipay as to make him fear to commit such a sacrilege although he had already committed others just as frightful, such as that of saying Mass while under ban of excommunication?

We do not know. The matter is known to God, the searcher of hearts, alone.