DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Cl. No. Q6wM48 95.2

Ac. No. 18945

Date of release for loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 5 Paise will be collected for each day the book is kept overtime.

RANDALL
DAVIDSON

RANDALL DAVIDSON AGE 75

RANDALL DAVIDSON

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

By G. K. A. BELL

BISHOP OF CHICHESTER

VOLUME II

1935

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD

LIII (1917–1918). THE HEREFORD BISHOPRIC . . 851
Mr. Lloyd George's first nomination to a Bishopric. Dr. Henson's record. Reception of announcement Bishop Gore's protest. Letters in *The Times*. Archbishop's action. British Museum and Air Board. Dr. Henson's letter. Archbishop's reply to Bishop Gore. Withdrawal of protest. Consecration.

LIV (1917–1918). THE CLERGY AND CONSCRIPTION . 883
Reform of House of Lords. Invitation from Archbishop of Upsala. Conscription of the clergy. Voluntary system.

LV (1918). THE CRISIS OF THE WAR 891
League of Nations. Morals and health. Debate in House of Lords Fall of Zeebrugge. Letter of Sir F. Maurice. Tombolas. Spirit of hate. A week with Lord Haldane. Letter to Bishop Talbot.

LVI (1918). THE COMING OF PEACE. 910
Delivery of Palestine. League of Nations. Armistice

LVII (1914–1919). THE ARCHBISHOP AND GERMAN CHURCHMEN 917
Dr. J. R. Mott's visits to Berlin. German missionaries in Cameroons Answer to Dr Deissmann. German missions in India Letter from Archbishop of Upsala. Conference at India Office. Dr. Deissmann's appeal after the Armistice.

LVIII (1918–1919). AFTER THE ARMISTICE . . . 940
Proposed conference at Upsala Visit of Metropolitan of Athens. General Election. Second visit to the Front Service candidates. Archbishop and Covenant of the League of Nations Letter to Mr. Lloyd George. Letter from Bishop Gwynne. Railway Strike. Conscientious objectors and Civil Service. German prisoners of war.

LIX (1913–1919). THE ENABLING ACT . . . 956
Archbishops' Committee on Church and State Proposals for legislation. Life and Liberty Movement. Queen's Hall meeting Deputation to Lambeth. Meeting of Representative Church Council Bishop Gore's resignation. The Enabling Bill and Parliament.

LX (1918–1920). THE WELSH CHURCH 981
The Coalition Government. Resignation of Lord R Cecil The Government's offer to the Welsh Bishops Opposition of Lord Salisbury. The question of the Province. Announcement in Canterbury Convocation Enthronement of Archbishop of Wales.

LXI (1920). MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE . . . 991
Lord Buckmaster's Bill. The Law of the Church. Debate in House of Lords. Committee stage. Archbishop and Marriage in Church Question of admission to Communion Third Reading carried.

LXII (1920). THE SIXTH LAMBETH CONFERENCE . 1003
The critical questions. Modernism and Reunion Preparation beforehand. The personnel. The Appeal to All Christian People Resolution on Intercommunion.

LXIII (1907–1920). THE CASE OF BISHOP MATHEW . 1016

An Ex-Roman Priest. Old Catholics. Repudiation by Old Catholics. Various proposals. Interview with the Archbishop. Death. Lambeth Conference Resolution.

LXIV (1920). COLLATERAL ILLUSTRATIONS . . 1024

Anglo-Catholic Deputation. Impressions of Lord Rosebery. Proposal of Lambeth. Degree for Mr. H. A. Barker. Anglo-Catholic Congress. President of World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. Church Assembly. Convocation.

LXV (1921). AN UNSETTLED YEAR 1041

Student Christian Movement. Religious Drama. Coal Strike. Conversation with Archbishop of Upsala. Church of Scotland. Irish clouds. Illness.

LXVI (1920–1921). IRELAND 1055

Letter to Mr. Lloyd George. The Black and Tans. Archbishop's speech in House of Lords. Messenger from Mr. de Valera. The Archbishop's Thanksgiving. Criticisms.

LXVII (1918–1925). THE RUSSIAN CHURCH . . . 1067

A cry from Odessa Russian Famine The Patriarch Tikhon's appeal His arrest Archbishop's speech in House of Lords. United protest to Lenin. Correspondence with Soviet Government. Fresh outbreak of war on religion. Christians' and Jews' united declaration. Message from 'The Living Church'. Release of Patriarch. His death.

LXVIII (1918–1923). THE ARCHBISHOP AND CONSTANTINOPLE 1087

The Peace Conference. Archbishop's speech in House of Lords on Christian minorities. American Bishops' attitude. Dorotheus's visit to London and his death. Election of Meletios as Oecumenical Patriarch. His visit to London. His enthronement. Visit of M. Venizelos to Lambeth. Lausanne Conference. Archbishop appeals for preservation of Patriarchate in Constantinople. His Success.

LXIX (1919–1925). THE ORTHODOX CHURCH . . 1104

Anglican Declaration of Faith Constantinople Declaration on Anglican Orders. Case of Rumanian priest Request to consecrate Albanian Bishop. Sixteenth Centenary of Council of Nicaea. Celebrations in Westminster Abbey.

LXX (1920–1928). THE ARCHBISHOP AND THE FREE CHURCHES 1115

Appeal to All Christian People. Joint Conference of Free Churchmen and Anglicans. Points of Agreement. Question of 'reordination'. Anglican declaration on Free Church ministries. Archbishop's visits to Methodist Conference and Presbyterian General Assembly.

LXXI (1919–1923). RELIGION AND THE SCHOOLS . . 1125

Mr. Fisher's invitation. Joint Conference. Three fundamentals. The Fisher Proposals. Memorial Hall Conference. National Society's rejection.

LXXII (1920–1922). TOWARDS DOCTRINAL AGREEMENT. 1134

Previous Resolutions on Modernism. Younger theologians and Bishop Burge. Proposal for Commission. Archbishop's objection. Conference of Modern Churchmen at Cambridge. Bishop Gore. Resolution by Convocation of Canterbury. Memorial to Archbishops. Commission appointed.

LXXIII (1923). THE ARCHBISHOP AT SEVENTY-FIVE . 1151

Twenty years Primate. His personal reflections. Archbishop Lang on relationship with Archbishop Davidson. Letter from Bishop Gore. Diocese of Canterbury. Counsellors and friends. His religion.

LXXIV (1923). A YEAR OF CHANGE 1160

Extracts from Papers National Assembly and Diocese of Winchester. Six weeks in Scotland. First Labour Government. Mr. Bonar Law's death. Burials in Westminster Abbey.

LXXV (1918–1927). THE ASSYRIAN CHURCH . . 1179

The Archbishop's Assyrian Mission Settlement of Assyrians after the War. Visit of Lady Surma. British promises. Visit of Mar Timotheus Archbishop's Memorandum. The Boundary question. Education of Mar Shimun. No settlement.

LXXVI (1922–1927). VARIOUS EMPLOYMENTS . . 1193

Whitgift Hospital. Principal Trustee of British Museum Joanna Southcott. Marriage questions. League of Nations Archbishop's Sermon at Geneva. Broadcasting Drama Religious Plays Study of Queen Victoria Chancellorship of University of Oxford. Holidays.

LXXVII (1914–1925). THE LAST YEARS. MISSIONARY AND RACE PROBLEMS 1222

A Bishop in the Pacific Education in Egypt Development of autonomous Church in China. Indians in Kenya The White Paper.

LXXVIII (1903–1928). EPISCOPAL APPOINTMENTS . . 1236

Seven Prime Ministers. The Archbishop's method Examples. Proposal for a Committee. The Prime Minister's responsibility. Some difficulties.

LXXIX (1921–1928). THE MALINES CONVERSATIONS . 1254

Origin of first Conversation. A new Pope Cardinal Mercier's letter to the Archbishop Second Conversation. Memorandum about *pallium*. Archbishop's objection Correspondence with Cardinal Mercier. Enlargement of numbers for third Conversation. Relation of Pope to other Bishops Fact of Conversations published. Much controversy. The Prayer Book. Fourth Conversation. Death of Cardinal Mercier. Publication of Report End of Conversations.

A Footnote in verse.

LXXX (1926). THE GENERAL STRIKE 1304

Dispute in mining industry. Declaration of National Stoppage. Preparation of Appeal. Difficulty with B.B.C. Sensation caused by Appeal. End of General Strike. Various letters.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LXXXI (1927). THE ARCHBISHOP AND BISHOP BARNES 1319
Bishop Barnes's views on evolution. Address on Sacramental teaching. Scene in St. Paul's. Open Letter and Archbishop's Reply.

LXXXII (1920–1928). THE PRAYER BOOK . . . 1325
Completion of Replies of Convocations. Appointment of Committee of Church Assembly. Revision stage in House of Bishops. Alternative Order of Holy Communion. Reservation. Draft Book. Letter from Sir W. Joynson-Hicks. Prayer Book Measure approved by Church Assembly. Recommendation of Ecclesiastical Committee. House of Lords approves. Rejection by House of Commons. The Archbishops' Statement. Reintroduction Second Rejection by House of Commons. Archbishop's speech in Church Assembly. Reasons for failure.
Note.

LXXXIII (1928). RESIGNATION 1360
Lambeth Conference of 1930. Announcement. Tribute to Archbishop. Lord Davidson of Lambeth. Farewell and golden wedding.

LXXXIV (1928–1930). THE END 1369
Thoughts in retirement. Visit to General Assembly, Edinburgh. Illness. Death and Burial.

APPENDIX I. Principal Dates . . . 1382

APPENDIX II. A List of Appointments to Diocesan Sees in the Provinces of Canterbury and York between February 6, 1903, and November 12, 1928 . 1385

INDEX . 1391

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

RANDALL DAVIDSON, age 75, 1923. (*Photograph by J. Russell and Sons*) *Frontispiece*

A HOLIDAY AT ABERUCHILL. (The Archbishops of Canterbury and York) . . . . . *Facing page* 1040

THE ARCHBISHOP AND MRS. DAVIDSON, 1920. (*Photograph by J. Russell and Sons*) . . . . . *Facing page* 1125

CHAPTER XLV

THE OUTBREAK OF WAR

NORTHUMBERLAND. Alas! sweet wife, my honour is at pawn,
And, but my going, nothing can redeem it.
LADY PERCY. O! yet for God's sake, go not to these wars.
SHAKESPEARE, *2 King Henry IV*, II iii.

IT is for the historian, and not for the biographer, to analyse the causes of the world crisis and record the successive shocks which led to the outbreak of war in August 1914. Certainly there were few leaders in English public life by whom the tragic event was less expected than it was by Randall Davidson. As we have seen, he had friends in Germany, and on more than one occasion in recent years he had expressed the view that war between his country and theirs was unbelievable.

I

The thought of Christians in Germany and England being at war was peculiarly hard to entertain. and it so happens that the very last letter the Archbishop wrote to a German Churchman before war began dealt with this very point. It was in reply to Dr. Ernst Dryander—one of the most eminent Lutherans in Germany and chief Court Chaplain to the Kaiser Dr. Dryander had written on July 17, 1914, in a personal way, inquiring whether the Anglican Church would be likely to accept an invitation to take part in the Jubilee of the four-hundredth year of the Reformation in 1917.[1] He was anxious not to embarrass the Archbishop by later making an official request which might be difficult to grant. So he asked:

DR. ERNST DRYANDER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

17 July 1914.

Before, however, we take any further steps for the working out of the idea, it lies on our hearts that we should know, in quite a personal and absolutely confidential way, whether such a proposition would be able to reckon on a favourable reception and friendly treatment on the part of those Evangelical Churches outside Ger-

[1] Its beginning was reckoned as October 31, 1517.

many which have relations with us. Before all, we must learn whether we can have the sympathy and participation of the Anglican Church with its world-wide influence.

The Archbishop replied, on August 1, 1914, expressing his sense 'of the great value of your courteous considerateness in writing to me thus privately beforehand', and he explained the grave difficulty which he foresaw in official participation by the Anglican Church:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* DR. ERNST DRYANDER

Private. 1 August, 1914.

In accordance with your wish therefore I will tell you frankly and without reserve that there would in my opinion be very grave difficulty in arranging that the Anglican Church should officially and corporately identify itself with the movement for commemorating the words and acts of Martin Luther in the dawn of Protestantism. To one who has studied our history, and who understands our theological and ecclesiastical position so clearly as you do, I need not explain the significance of the double relation which our Church holds, both historically and actually, to European Christianity. We have, and I rejoice in it, a firm and assured hold upon the principles of the Reformation, and therefore a very definite and brotherly relation to the Reformed Churches of the Continent, especially to their Teutonic and Scandinavian branches. On the other hand we have, both historically and practically, a relation to the historic doctrine and system of the Western Church, a relation which is rightly valued intensely by great sections of English Churchmen. Your knowledge of England will enable you to appreciate the consequent difficulty which would arise were it proposed that we should corporately throw ourselves into a commemoration which might, however unintentionally, take the form, or at least bear some appearance, of a declaration of a coherent and solidly united Protestantism against a coherent and solidly united Catholicism. I do not think that such would be your endeavour or your wish, but I feel so certain that misunderstandings on the subject would arise in England that I am sure it would be on public grounds wisest that the Church of England should not officially or formally identify itself with your proposed celebration. Hence the very great value of your courteous considerateness in writing to me thus privately before-hand. My reply is, like your letter, personal and confidential. That there are important teachers and leaders within the Church of England who would rejoice personally to show sympathy with what you

propose to do, I do not doubt. But this, as you will be the first to recognise, is a different thing from the kind of corporate and official co-operation about which you make enquiry.

The inquiry which Dr. Dryander made, thus received a full and courteous answer, but it was prefaced with the following pregnant sentences:

> . . . The present condition of public affairs is such as to cause all of us the keenest anxiety and to absorb our daily interest. You are, I am very sure, joining together with us in daily prayer to Almighty God that by His mercy the possibility of international conflict may be removed far from us. War between two great Christian nations of kindred race and sympathies is, or ought to be, unthinkable in the twentieth century of the Gospel of the Prince of Peace.

The day on which Archbishop Davidson wrote this letter, and the days immediately before and after, were days of keen anxiety to him and to others. At the very moment when statesmen were striving for peace in the capitals of Europe, a conference of Churchmen of the different countries was assembling at Lake Constance—the fruit of the Anglo-German Society for Friendship between the Churches—and actually met to found, on August 4, the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches, a body which was not to meet a second time till July 1919, when the War was over, at the Hague.

Mr. Allen Baker, M.P., one of the leaders of the movement, on his way to Lake Constance, came to see the Archbishop on July 30, on behalf of a House of Commons Committee which was preparing a memorial to Asquith in favour of England's non-intervention in the war The Archbishop notes:

> I objected to much of its phraseology and also said that I could not possibly sign it without an assurance that it was on lines which the Government would find helpful and not harmful.

The Archbishop saw Asquith on July 31:

> Asquith was absolutely clear that for the next few days at least anything of the sort would be actively harmful. The position is this: That England is the one Power in Europe which has diplomatic weight at present, inasmuch as it has neither any axe to grind or any Treaty Alliances to hamper it, or any standing quarrel with any one of the great Powers. As a matter of fact the position, were it not so tragic, is almost ludicrous. The credit of Europe

has collapsed. Our Stock Exchange is to-day closed, the Bank of England is going to make an order which has not been made for half-a-century about paper currency, etc.; and all for what? Because of the vagaries of a wild little State like Serbia, for which nobody has a good word, so badly has it behaved. But though France and Russia, and still more Germany, are averse to going to War—and Germany is actively eager to the contrary—they are all more or less depending on one another Russia dare not, in view of popular sentiment, let the Serbians be completely smashed. France dare not, if it can help it, leave Russia unhelped; and Germany dare not let Russia and France join to smash Austria without German intervention All turns on what England may do, and the object of our Foreign Office at present is to keep Europe in suspense on that point. So long as Europe does not know what England is likely to do, there is a great steadying influence upon both France and Russia, for they both feel that Germany might be difficult to tackle unless the other Powers had us supporting them. Germany in the meantime shrinks from aggressive action—e g. through Belgium, because it does not know whether or not we should vehemently oppose; and, if we did, their task would be doubled in difficulty Hence the expediency of our not saying at present what we will or will not do We virtually hold the balance. For these reasons it would be most mischievous were the military party in Germany to be able to point out that England had shown such an expression of public opinion against intervention that it would clearly stand aloof, and therefore Germany need have no fear that its shipping would be interfered with in the North Sea Sir Edward Grey is doing all that he can to utilize this strong position of ours in favour of peace, and during the last few hours the horizon has grown a little lighter, inasmuch as Vienna is now talking to St Petersburg, whereas communications had been interrupted.

All this being so, Asquith begged me to use my influence to prevent any demonstrations or memorials in favour of our non-intervention finding expression at present in a manner which might mislead the Continent into thinking that England had popularly made up its mind to have nothing to do with the matter. He thought that the next few days would show what chance there is of localising the conflict and preventing any spread. He thought Serbia deserved a thorough thrashing, but he feared that Russia dare not stand up and see the Serbs completely humiliated. If only Austria would consent to declare that she has no ambitions beyond proving to the Serbians that they cannot flout her with impunity, all might be well. But Austria at present is disinclined

to say anything of the sort. Austria is thus, among the great Powers, the chief obstacle to a speedy settlement. Asquith highly approved of my preaching if possible in the Abbey, with a view to saying something against the panic, and preventing a general sense of confusion and even panic.

That night one of the Royal Princesses was staying at Lambeth, and spoke of the seriousness of the situation, with the remark: 'Now we are all in it.' And the Archbishop replied, gravely: 'Princess, you must not say that. That must not be.'

The following are notes given as they were written in Mrs. Davidson's diary of those days. It will be remembered that the Lambeth Conference Consultative Body all this week had been considering the issues of Kikuyu:

Meeting of Lambeth Conference Consultative Committee on the Friday, July 31.

At Early service there seemed a sound in one's ears like a Bugle call—

Then at breakfast *telephone message from Craufurd*—he and Marjorie *must* be married at once, *as war was certain* and he would be ordered out

Arranged for marriage on Sunday in Lambeth Chapel.

The Consultative Committee ended—all left with heavy hearts.

Sunday, Aug. 2. Randall *thinking*—THINKING. In early morning, sent off message should he go to Buckingham Palace to preach to the King? *Answer yes—Went off 10 30 service* and sermon. *at* 12 marriage of Craufurd and Marjorie which he took *About 2 lunch.* The young couple went off at once to Camberley to join regiment. At 3 *Westminster Abbey. Randall preached*—TEXT 'OUR FATHER'. Just as he began—cries arose from transept seats 'Votes for women'. The Suffragettes had chained themselves to their seats! Randall waited *quite quietly* till they had gone out. Then preached—OUR FATHER.

The Archbishop preached in the Abbey on the text 'After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in Heaven' (Matt. vi. 9). His opening words showed what was in his heart—'What is happening is fearful beyond all words, both in actual fact and in the thought of what it may come to be. . . . This thing which is now astir in Europe is not the work of God but the work of the devil.'

He was present next day at the Debate in the House of Commons, and heard Sir Edward Grey's speech. When he came back to Lambeth, sad though he was that such a tragedy should

be, he was convinced that no other course was possible than that taken by the Government.

The Archbishop's own first words in the House of Lords on August 5 included an appeal to the public to abstain from acts of individual selfishness or gain, which made it harder for others to meet the difficulties 'which we should all try to face as well as may be, standing shoulder to shoulder'.

II

Throughout the afternoon of August 3 and the whole of August 4, on the Archbishop's summons to Lambeth, the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Chase), the Dean of Wells (Dr. Armitage Robinson), and Canon Bullock Webster were busy preparing special prayers; and these were issued in accordance with an order of the Privy Council of August 4, and were used all over England on the following Sunday, on the special Day of Prayer and Intercession on Friday, August 21, and continuously. They were grave, serious prayers, breathing trust and asking for guidance for the removal of 'arrogance and feebleness' as well as for the gift of 'courage and loyalty, tranquillity and self-control'. Some wished a sharper note to be struck, and the Archbishop was reproached by more than one correspondent for the want of a direct prayer for victory. To a peer who complained of this omission he replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* LORD G——.

27 August, 1914.

I thank you for your letter. Such criticisms are always useful, but I think I ought to tell you that, if there was one request which poured in more strenuously upon me than others from all quarters *when we were compiling these prayers, it was that we should* abstain from identifying ourselves with the Divine Will to such an extent as to claim that God is simply on our side, and that this is a matter of course. Surely our ordinary prayers in daily use—e.g. what is called the Second Collect at Morning Prayer ('O God who art the author of peace', etc), the Prayer for the King's Majesty, and, in the Litany, the third of the petitions for the King, and many others express a definite petition for victory. Then with regard to the new Prayers, will you look at page 10 on the small Form I enclose, and at pages 8, 9, 18, 23 on the gray-covered

Form enclosed? I think it possible that you have overlooked these. I am very grateful to you for sending me a copy of your own which I have added to others which we have in frequent use, for of course what we have suggested is only meant for a nucleus around which people will add such prayers as they individually feel to be appropriate and right.

Many strange suggestions as to the manner and the form of prayer flowed in to Lambeth, of which one may be quoted here from R. W. Raper, a Senior Fellow of the Archbishop's own College of Trinity, Oxford:

R. W. RAPER, ESQ., *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Hoe Court, Colwall, Malvern. Sept. 5, 1914.

Many thanks for sending me your rules for conferring degrees. I would not have troubled you if I had known of them, but nevertheless I am grateful. In proof whereof I trouble you again in a matter which does not seem at first sight to be my special province and does seem to be yours. It is for another national prayer to be used at the same hour on the same day (Sunday) in every Church in the land: very short and intense and to the point, and may be repeated with or without music, many times.

My point is that one of the greatest powers of prayer is that of the mind of man over the mind of man: be it direct or goeth it round by heaven, it is spiritual and from mind to mind through whatever medium;—it would be no use praying for a 16 inch gun to be an 18 inch gun—but most efficacious would be a prayer to confound the gunner: and I suggest something like this

> 'Strike the fear of God (at last) into the heart of the Kaiser (or our Enemy) so that he depart and go back whence he came: strike the fear of God into his hosts so that what is left of them may make haste to return with him' (even as Sennacherib, King of Assyria, and his remnant arose early in the morning and made haste to go back and dwell in Nineveh).

To achieve this end concentration of force and numbers of those praying are likely to be most effective, but the gift of concentration is limited, and therefore there is need of brevity to meet human nature while the numbers swell the mass and volume of spiritual power sent forth.

Please don't regard this as anything but the highest trust worthy of your high position. I have only expressed myself in chance and unprepared words but they are absolutely true, as you are sure to see. A wonder may be more easily wrought on William than on

most, because he believes in such things in a way—a perverted way—and is even at this moment impelled by a prophecy which rightly interpreted means his doom. Be our Isaiah and help to send him home.

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* R. W. RAPER, ESQ.

[September 1914.]

I thank you for your letter. The subject of the prayers to be used in our Churches is occupying a great deal of my time. I take due note of what you have suggested, but I do not, I think, share altogether the view to which you give expression as to the form which our prayers for the ending of this terrible time of warfare ought to take.

But other duties thronged the Archbishop of Canterbury, and his guidance and help were sought in all kinds of ways. He was very depressed at the tragedy and waste of it all—and hated the war. But there was little time for personal questions. Lambeth Palace was even more of a workshop than ever. At the very beginning of the war, the Archbishop offered it to the authorities for use as a hospital. The offer was considered but refused, most fortunately, as it would have been hard to know what the Archbishop could have done if he had left his house. There was no chance of a visit to Canterbury, where Cricket Week had begun and ended in a single day—Bank Holiday, August 4; but he was kept in touch with events there by letter, about the troops pouring into the place, about the soldiers having their sing-songs on the Green Court in the evening, and the extra hospital accommodation at St. Augustine's, and the recreation rooms in St. George's Hall and St. Peter's Parish Room. And for some weeks in the autumn the Archbishop lent the Old Palace as the head-quarters of the local military command.

III

So far as the Church was concerned, the immediate question was the duty of the Clergy, as a whole, in time of war, and the supply of Chaplains to the Army. Both questions were to cause a good deal of agitation in very different ways during the next few years. The Archbishop was in touch with the Chaplain-

General (Bishop Taylor-Smith) about the Army's needs; and the number of offers already made for service as chaplains was far beyond the number that could be used (900 beyond the requirements on September 1). On September 2, he wrote as follows to the Diocesan Bishops:

> I have been receiving, like many other Bishops, enquiries both from clergy and laity as to whether it is legitimate and reasonable that clergy should now volunteer for service as combatants. I recognise the *prima facie* arguments which can be used by the younger clergy, or by others on their behalf, in support of such action at a moment like the present, and I have given careful attention to a question which some people feel to be a very difficult one. By every line of thought which I have pursued, I am led to the conclusion that I have been right in maintaining from the first that the position of an actual combatant in our Army is incompatible with the position of one who has sought and received Holy Orders. The whole idea which underlies and surrounds Ordination implies this. We have a calling of our own of a quite specific kind, and throughout the whole history of the Church, authoritative expression has been given to the paramount obligation of that calling. Under this obligation those who have been ordained to the Ministry of Word and Sacrament ought, even in time of actual warfare, to regard that Ministry, whether at home or in the field, as their special contribution to the country's service.

This ruling with regard to combatant service gave rise to a certain amount of criticism, but was generally regarded at the time as both 'authoritative and conspicuously sensible'. With regard to non-combatant service, for example with the R.A.M.C., the Archbishop gave no such injunction, and he thus expressed his views in a letter dated September 22, to Surgeon-General Macpherson:

> Provided a man can rightly leave his home work, I do not think that the fact of his being in Holy Orders ought in itself to be a bar to his undertaking work which is explicitly that of caring for the sick and wounded, and is distinctly non-combatant.

The Archbishop's assistance was, however, asked in the general appeal for recruits. He had no desire to refuse any help he could properly give, but when he was invited on September 4, by the Parliamentary Recruiting Committee to say something in an 'Appeal for Recruits from Religious Leaders' he expressed some

hesitation. Lord Esher, in writing to Davidson about a British Museum matter, after a talk with Lord Kitchener, used these words:

VISCOUNT ESHER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Sept. 10, 1914.

Lord K. does not wish for any 'Campaign' on behalf of recruiting under the auspices of the Church. He would 'intensely dislike it'—his words.

The Archbishop had some correspondence with Mr. Percy Illingworth, M.P., Chairman of the Recruiting Committee, saying he was puzzled. The following was the explanation provided by Sir George Arthur, Lord Kitchener's private secretary:

SIR GEORGE ARTHUR, BT., *to* PERCY ILLINGWORTH, ESQ.

War Office, Whitehall, S.W. 1 Oct. 1914.

Regarding the 'Parliamentary Recruiting', I think I may assure you that a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury on the same encouraging lines observed by the Archbishop of York would in no way conflict with the remarks made by Lord Esher. I think these referred to the Church—as such—being made a vehicle for military purposes and especially to pulpit pronouncements.

One may be quite certain that the Archbishop—if he writes—will use words as felicitous as they will be useful.

IV

While this correspondence was proceeding, a manifesto of a very different kind had reached Lambeth Palace. Early in September a very earnest 'Appeal to Evangelical Christians abroad' from German theologians reached England through American channels. It had been drawn up in August by some of those who had been most active in the Anglo-German friendship movement, and especially in the World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh, 1910. Amongst its supporters were: Professors Harnack, Herrmann, Eucken, Wundt, Deissmann, Loofs, Julius Richter, Dr. Spiecker, Mission Director Axenfeld, Dr. Dryander, Pastor Bodelschwingh, and General Superintendents Kaftan and Lahusen.

The Appeal began by denouncing the network of lies which had endeavoured to cast on the German people and its Government the guilt for the outbreak of this war, and maintained that

only under the compulsion to repel a wanton attack had Germany now drawn the sword. It reminded 'Christian friends abroad' of the joyfulness with which 'we German Christians greeted the fellowship in faith and service which the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference left as a sacred legacy to Protestant Christendom'. If the fellowship with the Christians of other lands in obedience to the Universal Mission of Jesus were now irreparably destroyed, 'the guilt of this rests, this we hereby declare before our Christian brethren of other lands with calm certainty, not on our people':

> We know full well that through this sanguinary judgment God is also calling our nation to repentance, and we rejoice that she is hearing His holy voice and turning to Him. But in this we know that we are at one with all the Christians among our people, that we can and must repudiate on their behalf and on behalf of their Government the responsibility for the terrible crime of this war and all its consequences for the development of the Kingdom of God on earth. With the deepest conviction we must attribute it to those who have long secretly and cunningly been spinning a web of conspiracy against Germany, which now they have flung over us in order to strangle us therein.

As soon as the Archbishop saw the manifesto he felt that an answer should be made. He consulted some friends, especially the Dean of Wells, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Mr. W. H. Dickinson, and Sir Claude Schuster, who met him on September 11. He himself drafted what became the beginning and end of a long and careful reply, the middle portion of which consisted of two considered statements about (1) the Course of the Negotiations, (2) the Neutrality of Belgium.

After referring to the brothers and friends of our own in the Church of Christ, the reply expressed the 'amazement' of the Archbishop and his co-signatories:

> That those who occupy the positions held by the signatories of this appeal should commit themselves to a statement of the political causes of the War, which departs so strangely from what seem to us to be the plain facts of this grave hour in European history.

It continued (and these are the Archbishop's own words):

> It has not been a light thing for us to give our assent to the action of the Government of our country in this matter. But the

facts of the case as we know them have made it impossible for us to do otherwise. Of these facts we offer here a brief but a careful summary, derived from the official papers, the accuracy of which cannot be challenged. It is upon these facts that we rest our assured conviction that, for men who desire to maintain the paramount obligation of fidelity to plighted word, and the duty of defending weaker nations against violence and wrong, no possible course was open but that which our country has taken.

Then followed a statement of Sir Edward Grey's efforts for peace, from the White Book, and the obligations regarding the neutrality of Belgium. The reply continued (and here again the words are the Archbishop's):

God knows what it means to us to be separated for a time by this great War from many with whom it has been our privilege—with whom we hope it will be our privilege again—to work for the setting forward of the Christian message among men. We unite whole-heartedly with our German brethren in deploring the disastrous consequences of the War, and in particular its effect in diverting the energies and resources of the Christian nations from the great constructive tasks to which they were providentially called on behalf of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

But there must be no mistake about our own position. Eagerly desirous of peace, foremost to the best of our power in furthering it, keen especially to promote the close fellowship of Germany and England, we have nevertheless been driven to declare that, dear to us as peace is, the principles of truth and honour are yet more dear.

There is one phrase in the Archbishop's pencil draft which does not appear in the final version (the work of the little Drafting Committee already mentioned) but is important, especially as we look back from a long distance. It is this, which forms his conclusion:

While we must perforce leave to the future the disentanglement of these diplomatic controversies, the palpable facts are neither obscure nor difficult. They mean our adherence to an engagement to which we have solemnly been party, and the upholding of the essential condition of brotherhood among the nations of the world.

The Archbishop's reference to the need of 'disentanglement' at such a date is especially significant. It was, however, altered by

the Drafting Committee and the final paragraph ran in the complete text as follows:

> To have acted otherwise than we have acted would have meant deliberate unfaithfulness to an engagement by which we had solemnly bound ourselves, and a refusal of our responsibilities and duties in regard to the maintenance of the public law of Europe. We have taken our stand for international good faith, for the safeguarding of smaller nationalities, and for the upholding of the essential conditions of brotherhood among the nations of the world.

The reply was signed by the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Armagh; the Bishops of London, Winchester, Brechin, Dean Inge, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. T. M. Lindsay, Dr. J. Hope Moulton, Sir William Ramsay, Dr. John Clifford, Dr. W. P. Paterson, Dr. W. Sanday, Dr. G. Adam Smith, Dr. H. Scott Holland, Dr. H. B. Swete, Dean Armitage Robinson, Bishop Hassé, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Dr. F. L. Wiseman, Eugene Stock, and many others, and was dated September 23, 1914. It was translated into many languages, and had a very wide circulation. The Archbishop also sent the answer to Dr. Nathan Soderblom, the newly-elected Archbishop of Upsala, who had written to him and other Church leaders in Europe and America asking them to sign an appeal 'to all those who have power or influence in the matter . . . seriously to keep peace before their eyes in order that bloodshed soon may cease'. The Appeal drafted by Dr. Soderblom stated:

> Our Faith perceives what the eye cannot always see. . . . The strife of nations must finally serve the dispensation of the Almighty, and all the Faithful in Christ are one.

In refusing to sign the Appeal, Archbishop Davidson said:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

Oct. 9, 1914.

> You may be certain, however, that at the first moment when it seems to me that an opening is presented for securing a righteous and enduring peace, I shall do my utmost to urge it, but I am clear that that moment, greatly as we long for it, has not yet come.
>
> The conflict which has been forced upon Europe (I impute no motive but merely state a fact) must I fear, now that it has begun, proceed for the bringing to an issue the fundamental moral principle of faithfulness to a Nation's obligation to its solemnly plighted

word. The recognition of the moral validity of such an obligation is fundamental to the maintenance of peace and progress among the Nations of the World.

War was, beyond a doubt, to deepen the mutual understanding of members of different Christian Churches in England. And it is interesting to note that, early in the autumn, on October 9, the Archbishop summoned a Conference of Christian Ministers and Laymen to the Guard Room at Lambeth Palace, 'to study the deeper bearings upon our own country, Europe, and the world of this great war and convulsion of the nations'. Besides the two Archbishops and the Bishops of Winchester, Oxford, and London and other representative Anglicans, were Dr. Clifford, Dr. Shakespeare, Dr. Scott-Lidgett, T. E. Harvey, Arnold Rowntree, and other Free Churchmen and members of the Society of Friends. The Conference was followed by prayer in the Chapel. But the Conference revealed a good deal of difference, explicit or implicit, on the rightfulness of war.

V

In France also, there were tokens of kindly feeling between the authorities of the Roman Catholic Church and Anglican Chaplains to the Forces and the soldiers to whom they ministered. The Archbishop of Rouen[1] showed much personal courtesy, and also in the early months of the war gave his sanction for Church of England Services (including Holy Communion) in the Roman Catholic chapels attached to two buildings then being used as Military Hospitals.[2]

The following correspondence passed:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF ROUEN

Monseigneur, Lambeth Palace, 3rd November 1914.

I hope you will not think it intrusive on my part if I send you a few words of grateful acknowledgment and thanks for your abundant courtesy and kindness to our English soldiers who have been in Rouen during these eventful months. I have heard from several different quarters of the kindness of your action and the

[1] Mgr Fuzet.

[2] The first was in peace time a Home of Rest for working girls from Paris. the second (used as a Red Cross Hospital for officers only) Le Séminaire, a theological college, attached to the Archbishop's Palace.

helpfulness of your spoken words, and I am sure that the facilities which you were good enough to offer have been greatly valued by those who have been ministering spiritually to our men. We are passing through a time of profound solemnity, and the stress of bereavement and anxiety is pressing upon all our homes. It is well that at such a time we, to whom is entrusted the privilege of ministry, should everywhere be doing what we can to brighten and strengthen the lives of those on whose courage and high spirit so much depends for both our countries.

With the assurance of my high respect and grateful regard
I remain, Monseigneur,
Your faithful brother and servant
in our Lord Jesus Christ,
RANDALL CANTUAR:

The ARCHBISHOP OF ROUEN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

My Lord, Rouen, 15th November, 1914.

Your thanks are very precious to me. They are more than I deserve for what I have been able to do for the soldiers, your countrymen, stationed in Rouen It is nevertheless sweet to me to be assured on such high authority that the modest tokens of goodwill which I have shewn to the sons of England, at the hour when our two nations are suffering in like manner, have been welcome. We look to the bravery of our soldiers for the success of our arms; we look still more to heaven. That is why each one of us prays fervently, in perfect integrity of faith [en toute droiture de foi]; that is why also we seek to bring all those who are fighting to God, as often as we may, in religious worship. In lifting our souls towards God, we exalt our courage also. How much more ready we are to do and to die like heroes when we have just worshipped the All-Mighty, and when our consciences are pure Let us do what we can to keep our dear soldiers always thus! And may our common prayer also avail to bring about a speedy end to this terrible calamity! And may the victory of England, of Russia, of Belgium, and of France be complete and swift. Their cause is that of justice and of true civilisation; it is the cause, we do not doubt, that Providence has taken in hand.

I offer to Your Grace,
My Lord,
the assurance of my feelings of high esteem and of religious devotion in Our Saviour Jesus Christ
✠ FREDERIC, Archbishop of Rouen.

VI

In view of subsequent developments it is also worth noting the first occasion of the Archbishop's contact with Russia during the war. It has a curious significance to-day. A certain Mrs. Sonia Howe, the Russian wife of a Finchley vicar, begged the Archbishop for an interview in October 1914, and implored him to get English influence exerted to persuade the Russian Government to give some relief as regards their political prisoners. She was herself, she said, in touch with Prince Kropotkin—and was obviously a woman of sense and ability. The Archbishop passed the request on to Sir Edward Grey, who sent a somewhat chilling reply (November 10, 1914) to the effect that the British were always on the side of liberty, 'but to demand from His Majesty's Government promises to interfere in the internal affairs of another country is both futile and mischievous'.

VII

Other problems connected with the camps also engaged the Archbishop's attention. Within ten days of the declaration of war, disquieting accounts reached him from different places, in his own diocese and elsewhere, about the temptations to which the soldiers of the new Army were subject by the exuberant hospitality of their friends who offered them drink. He knew that the same thing was happening in almost every place in which troops were quartered; and he wrote to the Home Secretary (Mr. R. McKenna) on August 13, 1914, begging him to secure means for the earlier closing of public houses. 'So much interference', he said, 'with ordinary law and regulations has been apparently found possible at present, that I have thought it may be practicable in this matter also. It will indeed be a disastrous thing if, during the period when these lads are thus absent from their homes, they should get into disorderly ways, and one would like to reduce the temptations to a minimum.'

The Home Secretary replied that he entirely sympathized with the Archbishop's views, and that the matter was under consideration. The Archbishop also had a long interview with Lord Kitchener at the War Office on the subject—which he followed up with a letter:

The Archbishop of Canterbury *to* Earl Kitchener of Khartoum

23rd October, 1914.

I undertook at your kind request to send you a note to-day about what I meant as to the appeal which as it seems to us might at this juncture be made by you to the public with reference to the terrible mischief which is going on as regards Drink in the neighbourhood of our Camps, and indeed elsewhere.

With regard to the Women, among whom the new wave of Drink is most serious, we must ourselves fight the mischief as well as we can. It sounds horrid to say it, but the fact is that the women dependents of our soldiers are getting more money than they can wisely handle, accustomed as they are to dealing with shillings where they now have in some cases pounds at a time. However, this mischief we will do our best to combat.

There is a more general mischief which I believe no one in the land can stay or stem except yourself: I refer to the universal treating of men in uniform which is going on to a degree almost incredible and producing scenes about which I hear from almost every town with which I have to deal. And not towns only. It is rampant in some country places. A man told me last night of his having seen eight men in uniform lying in a ditch within one mile of road in a country place in Surrey. Waterloo Station has become proverbial, and I have seen a letter to-day from a young officer in one of the South Coast Camps (it would perhaps be unfair to mention the regiments or the place) who describes the terrible difficulties that he and other Subalterns are having in regard to the drunkenness among recruits and some of the Territorials. I believe the fault to rest largely with the public whose stupid and mischievous friendliness takes the form of making these poor fellows drink On the top of this, especially at night, comes the moral question. I have direct statements as to soldiers being taken from the public houses to brothels, when they are too drunk to walk, and to this our young men are liable, many of whom have been steady and respectable fellows until now. What is wanted so far as I can judge is a stirring, sharp appeal, not from parsons or social reformers as such, but from those responsible for the conduct of the War, and above all and pre-eminently from yourself. I believe honestly that a published note from you to the effect:

> We have to see this War through. We can do it provided our men remain fit. They cannot remain fit if they get into bad ways at the start; and the public helps to this by the stupid mischievous habit of treating them to Drink. If we are to do

aright what is now before us, we need fit men, and the public is doing its best to make them unfit. For Heaven's sake mind what you are about.

Of course you will put this in your own way ten times better than I can put it; but I honestly believe that that kind of utterance, coming from you at this moment, would go far to bring the mischief to an end. And probably you would add a word to the men themselves about self-control and right behaviour quite apart from treating.

Do not suppose that I am making any wholesale accusation against either the Territorials or the New Army, far less against our regiments generally. I have plenty of evidence as to places in which things have gone thoroughly well and drunkenness has been markedly absent. . . . A word from you to the effect I have suggested, that if the War is to be carried through this thing must stop, would I believe have untold effect. I should feel presumptuous in writing this to you but for the encouragement you gave me yesterday that I should send you such a letter for your private eye. Of course it would spoil it all if it were supposed to be suggested by men like me.

Lord Kitchener did not, however, feel inclined at the moment himself to write such a letter, having already written in general terms. But he encouraged the Archbishop to do so. The Archbishop issued an appeal in *The Times* for abstinence during the war. He repeated Lord Kitchener's warning to help men to keep clear of temptations, and he urged that as many citizens as could should undertake to be abstainers during the continuance of the war. He said:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EDITOR *of* '*The Times*'

Oct. 27, 1914.

By doing so they would strengthen the hands of those soldiers—the large majority of our troops—who are manfully resisting such temptation. They would be seizing the opportunity to bear a deliberate part in the self-denial and discipline of the hour. Their example would make the rough roadway a little easier for those wives and mothers to whom unusual circumstances and anxiety are, with sad effectiveness, bringing unusual temptation.

A few months later he joined in a further appeal to a similar effect, with the civilian population even more markedly in view. Drink was having disastrous results, not only in camps but in fac-

tories and docks. In March 1915, Mr. Lloyd George received an important Deputation from Shipbuilders lamenting the deplorable results of the increase of wages on the amount of work done and the vast quantities of drink consumed. Many members of the Deputation stated that the only remedy was total prohibition. Lloyd George got into touch with the Archbishop and told him of his anxiety to rouse public opinion in favour of total abstinence. Could the Church give a lead? And he similarly asked the leaders of the various professions whether they could give a lead. The King announced on March 30 his intention to 'set the example by giving up all alcoholic liquor himself and issued orders against its consumption in the Royal household' during the War. The Archbishop, after a great number of interviews and communications, secured the publication of the following statement on April 6:

> In view of all that is now happening, and following the unprecedented lead of His Majesty the King, we desire to press seriously upon the minds of those whom we can influence the duty and privilege of bearing voluntary part in the Nation's self-discipline and self-sacrifice by abstaining from all alcoholic drink during the continuance of the War. Some definite act on the part of us all is due to our brave men, to the Nation at large, and to God.
>
> RANDALL CANTUAR:
> COSMO EBOR:
> FRANCIS, CARDINAL BOURNE.
> JOSEPH COMPTON-RICKETT.
> (*President of the Free Church Council.*)

VIII

A problem of a different kind but, as the Archbishop pressed upon politicians, social rather than military, was that of the unmarried mother. To the wives and dependants of the sailors and soldiers serving, separation allowances were given. It was clear that dependants, who had been in fact living with men as their partners, though not married to them, ought not to suffer extra hardship through those men's patriotism. But it was also clear that unmarried mothers could not be treated as in all respects on a par with the married. Extremists on one side pressed for great generosity, and no over-strictness about technicalities like marriage lines. Extremists on the other side declaimed against the

breaking down of the sacredness of marriage. And, an extra complication, there was a multiplicity of authorities, local and central, statutory and voluntary, eager to help, but sometimes most unscientific in their activities. The Archbishops and Bishops, at their Meeting in October 1914, pressed for a real consideration of the problem. The Archbishop had interviewed Asquith, Bonar Law, and others, and took an immense amount of pains in getting to the bottom of the matter by seeing not only statesmen but many social workers. The magnitude of the problem was not recognized at the outset. A preliminary Committee was appointed in December, and the strength of its membership shows the importance attached to the subject. It consisted of Lloyd George, McKenna, Bonar Law, Austen Chamberlain, T. P. O'Connor, and G. N. Barnes. The Archbishop himself appeared before it on March 4, 1915, and gave his evidence with a great amount of care, information, and persuasiveness. The Archbishop made the point throughout that 'in acting generously to those dependants of soldiers, who had the place of wives without being wives, there must be the utmost care taken not to break down the distinction between the married and the not married'. And in the end he claimed that the distinction drawn in the official paper subsequently issued, and the procedure followed, were due to the efforts he and others had made. By these arrangements, the married woman with her children came as a matter of right to claim her allowance, while other allowances would be given by the War Office to *other dependants* 'only after considering the recommendations made by the local Old Age Pension Committee', and on the distinct condition that the dependant must also be receiving a definite proportion of the soldier's pay assigned voluntarily by himself.

The relief of dependants was but one, though the most exhausting one, of the many domestic war questions which claimed the Archbishop's attention. He had also to do, and often in considerable detail, with recreation rooms, the moral safeguarding of camp surroundings, the concentration camps of interned Germans, and the safety of East Kent in case of invasion.

CHAPTER XLVI

THE FIRST YEAR OF THE WAR

He this day again defended duelling, and put his argument upon what I have ever thought the most solid basis; that if publick war be allowed to be consistent with morality, private war must be equally so. Indeed we may observe what strained arguments are used to reconcile war with the Christian religion. But, in my opinion, it is exceedingly clear that duelling having better reasons for its barbarous violence, is more justifiable than war in which thousands go forth without any cause of personal quarrel, and massacre each other. BOSWELL, *Life of Dr Johnson* (1773).

THE first Christmas of the war was spent at the Old Palace, Canterbury. As he looked back in December, the Archbishop's general impression of the course of events was that 'the Government has done exceedingly well considering the extraordinary difficulties due to the suddenness with which the whole catastrophe came upon the world'. What he did criticize at the end of four and a half months was 'the readiness of some Government departments to shelter themselves against severe criticism by pleading the hurry and confusion of the first weeks', and he complained that some subjects like the relief of the dependants of soldiers and the appointment of chaplains, which ought to have received much more quiet consideration, were still 'chaotically unsolved'. (Memorandum dictated December 13, 1914.)

The Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson kept open house at the Old Palace for friends, new and old, for soldiers of different regiments, and for young officers fresh from the University. Here too they offered sympathy and a welcome for more than one of those who had lost a husband or a son; and sometimes, in the evening, a chaplain would read *John Inglesant*, or Tolstoy's tale 'God sees but waits'.

I

On New Year's Day 1915, Mr. Asquith, his wife and their daughter, Elizabeth, came to lunch at the Old Palace. At lunch Mr. Asquith spoke of Oxford, and painted pictures of the horrors of the War for the Germans in Poland—the snow covering those that fall and the wolves coming by night to devour them. Afterwards the Archbishop took the party round the Cathedral,

where the Prime Minister showed a keen interest in Heraldry. The first Sunday in the year, January 3, was observed all over England, not, as some had desired, as a day of national humiliation, but as a day of humble prayer and intercession. It had been settled after communications between the Archbishop and the King, and with the full support of the Roman Catholic authorities and of the Free Churches. Indeed the observance, partly through the help of Cardinal Bourne, partly by direct communication from the Archbishop to the authorities of other Churches, was extended to the Church in France, Belgium, and Russia, and even to neutral countries, especially America. The Archbishop preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on the Peace of God which was to guard ('garrison') men's hearts from unworthy fear, from depression, the love of ease, and (he added this at the end) 'against the peril of letting anger—even if it be righteous anger—be fanned and cherished into something like an un-Christian hate'. It was a sermon nobly thought and built up, nobly spoken, and heard with absorbed attention by the vast congregation.

On January 5, the Archbishop married the Dean of Wells and Miss Amy Faithfull in Lambeth Palace Chapel. Miss Faithfull for many years had been a most intimate friend and helper, both at Farnham and Lambeth, living with the Davidsons as Mrs. Davidson's secretary. Then—the first break since war had been declared—he and Mrs. Davidson went off for a fortnight's rest to Sidmouth. Here he played golf, went to see friends and did, to a certain extent, take a little ease from the pressure of Lambeth. It was characteristic, however, that when he learnt that Stephen Reynolds, author of various books, half literary, half sociological, lived in the town, he got him to breakfast and had a good talk with him. But though he was much attracted by Reynolds personally, the Archbishop was not impressed by his thinking power or his preparedness to defend the views he had expressed in *Seems So*, which the Archbishop had read the previous night. He besides had a full talk with the local Excise Officer, whose various duties as Secretary to the Old Age Pensions Committee, and to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Families Association, enabled him to give the Archbishop most useful information about the problems of unmarried mothers and soldiers' dependants, of which the Archbishop's mind was then full. He also worked at the draft of his statement on Kikuyu.

II

In February, the Archbishop took the opportunity of a talk with Asquith about the Welsh Church, to discuss the question which he had already raised in a previous conversation before Christmas, as to the publication of untrue statements under Government authority. His note is as follows (Feb. 4, 1915):

I brought before him the disquiet which many of us are feeling about the publication of untrue statements under Government authority. He was taken aback by the bluntness of the form in which I put it. When I mentioned the 'Audacious' he gave me once more the explanation that the facts about the loss of the ship had not been made public because no lives were lost, and it was certain the Germans were themselves puzzled as to what had happened with regard to the actual sinking or non-sinking of the ship. He went on to say that he had himself wished from the first to make everything public, but that he had been over-ruled in the Cabinet and, to some extent, convinced. I answered that I had no wish to re-open that question, although I have my own opinion, but that I regarded the publication in the Navy List of the account of the 'Audacious', with her armament and her crew, as a definitely untrue statement put under the Royal authority by the King on the 1st January. He said 'Are you sure it is in the Navy List?' I assured him that it was so, and begged him to send for a copy. He said he would take my word for it, but he was unaware of it and thought it open to criticism. I was veay frank about it and said that criticism was not the word: it meant direct condonation on the part of all of us of a statement which could only be regarded as a deliberate untruth—deliberate because it must have been carefully thought out whether it should appear or not, and untrue because the book has the definite imprint that it is corrected up to Dec. 31st, 1914, and is published under authority of the Government. I asked what reply I should give to American friends who said that they had hitherto believed English official documents to be absolutely trustworthy and were confronted now with the Navy List for January. He said he would think it over and consult Winston Churchill. I said that I wanted an answer which I could give to critical friends, and he replied that he was afraid he could not help me. He made some lame explanation that in war-time facts about ships and guns were often concealed in order not to inform the enemy, and that this was so in the history of all our wars. I said I should be interested, perhaps relieved, if he could show me examples of the publication in past years of

Navy Lists or Army Lists giving definite statements which were untrue, though I should be surprised to learn that these had been accepted by public opinion as justifiable. He said he was not prepared with any such. As a matter of fact he offered no defence and was obviously uncomfortable.

The Archbishop had a special object in desiring an answer to his criticisms (and he instanced another at the time), as he had recently seen two extremely intelligent Americans who were passing between Germany, England, and the United States during the war months, on disinterested philanthropic or missionary errands, and were in touch with important leaders of religious thought in Germany.

Convocation met, for the first time since the war, in February, and the Agenda paper contained as its first item, repeated session after session for four years, 'The Church and the War'. There were various questions, of the relief of dependants, army chaplains, prayer—all came up; and the Archbishop explained the action he was taking or had taken. And there were other general subjects, such as Prayer Book revision, the care of ancient churches, and training for the Ministry.

On March 4, John Parker died, after thirty years' service as porter at Lambeth Palace. He was one of the inner circle of the Archbishop's domestic staff, a charming character, willing, and not without humour. When he took Americans round Lambeth Palace he often stood before Morton's Tower and said 'This tower, ladies and gentlemen, was built about 1486—six years before America was discovered.' He was greatly appreciated by the large number of visitors both from home and abroad, who came to see the Palace, and had some awkward moments, for example with the suffragettes, in which his good sense and humour were of great service to the Archbishop. A tablet to his memory was placed on the ante-chapel wall in Lambeth Palace with the following inscription:

In Loving Memory of
JOHN PARKER,
Born 29 *August*, 1845. *Died* 4 *March*, 1915.
Porter and Custodian of Lambeth Palace, 1883–1915.
He threw into the performance of his duties such real readiness and good humour that he enjoyed the confidence and affectionate regard of the three Archbishops under whom he served; while all

alike, whether household or visitors, valued and remembered his courteous and cheerful welcome, his exact and eager knowledge of the antiquities and traditions of the Palace, and his friendly and faithful good-will.

Erected by Friends at home and abroad, 1916.

III

The Archbishop had already seen signs of an 'un-Christian hate' when he preached at St. Paul's. As the War went on, the difficulty of distinguishing righteous indignation from hatred increased a hundred-fold. It was not the men at the Front who were haters. The Christmas fraternizing between British and German soldiers hardly suggested that. But there was often great bitterness at home, in quarters where it might have been least expected. To a Worcestershire clergyman, who sent a violent and cruel letter to an English Princess, the Archbishop wrote as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. N— F—

26th April 1915.

You are I believe aware of the fact that Princess ——, feeling deeply the character of the letter which you wrote to her a few weeks ago, sent it to me. Not having the advantage of knowing you personally, I informed the Bishop of Worcester, sending him a copy of the letter and asking him for some information. He told me that he thought the letter must be a malicious forgery on the part of someone who wished to misrepresent your character. He now tells me that he finds on enquiry that this is not so. I confess I had thought with him that it was almost incredible that a letter so coarse and even brutal in its rudeness could have been addressed by a clergyman or a gentleman to a lady who from her position is absolutely helpless to reply or to protect herself from that kind of insult—a lady, too, who has during a rather long life been an active leader in untiring effort of every kind for the benefit of her English fellow countrymen and countrywomen—a lady, further, whose dearly-loved son laid down his life in the service of our country.

I shall be obliged if you will kindly acknowledge the receipt of this letter, adding anything that you may desire to say. I will then consider what further step, if any, I ought to take, either by the publication of the letters or otherwise. My hope is that you may be able to say that you wrote that intolerable letter when in a

condition of overstrain or excitement and that you have since realised its actual character. You will notice that I have said nothing whatever to suggest any restriction as to opinions which a thoughtful man may entertain on public questions. Such opinions ought of course to be based on adequate knowledge of details, but the responsibility rests simply with the man himself. I have referred solely to the character of the letter which you allowed yourself to write.

The clergyman was impenitent. He replied that 'you must remember that in this matter you are writing as man to man, there being no question of ecclesiastical law or discipline in the case': and 'the fact remains that she is a Princess of Germany, having a son serving in that army of savages'. One or two more letters passed. The Archbishop saw the Princess again, and they decided 'to leave the man to his own reflections'.

During the opening months of 1915 the War spirit grew fiercer. The Archbishop from the first took an active interest in the condition of prisoners of war, whether in England or in Germany—and set his face firmly against retaliation. In a debate in the House of Lords on March 15, 1915, on British Prisoners in Germany, he said:

> There are many ways in which this war may possibly do harm to England and the English people, but one disaster would be greater than any other that I can imagine. I mean this and I say it with my whole heart. If once we became infected with a lower spirit and adopted a lower ideal in this matter by imitating bad habits and bad ways of which we might hear elsewhere, it would be the worst misfortune that the war could bring upon us.

The first Zeppelin air raids on the east coast in April and May, the sinking of the *Lusitania* with the loss of 1,189 lives, the publication of the Bryce report on German atrocities in the same month—all had their influence. There was a deepening of resolve, but also a hardening of temper. We find a growing evidence of the increasing determination, in the language used by the Archbishop and his brother Bishops at Whitsuntide. In the Homily which had been read all over the country on January 3, there were words of self-examination, humility, repentence; and side by side with prayer for a speedy and decisive victory this paragraph stood:

> We shall have no desire to see our enemies crushed merely for the sake of their humiliation. We shall wish for them as for ourselves

that their eyes may be opened to know what is true; and we shall pray that the day may come, by the mercy of God, when we may learn to understand and respect one another, and may be united as friends to pursue the common good.

At Whitsuntide the note of determination was far more strongly struck. It is the severity of the national ordeal that is most emphasized in the Pastoral Letter issued by the whole diocesan episcopate:

> After 10 months of war we see more clearly than at first the greatness and the severity of the ordeal which is putting the spirit of our nation to the test. . . . The spirit arrayed against us threatens the very foundations of civilized order in Christendom. . . . It can only be decisively rolled back if we, for our part, concentrate the whole strength of body, mind, and soul which our nation, our Empire, holds.

But we also find, though less conspicuous in the same Pastoral, and little quoted, a warning against reaction in spiritual things:

> We have more to say, and it matters most of all. It is the office of the Church of Christ to quicken and to guide the spiritual forces on which the strength, the stedfastness, and the nobility of the national spirit depend. Are these forces as alert, as watchful, as persistent now as they ought to be? We have cause to fear that they have languished a little since the earlier weeks of the war. A reaction comes. . . .

It was at this time that the Government's policy against aliens increased in its severity. Many pathetic instances came to the Archbishop's notice of hardship to aliens, and he did his best to secure consideration and mercy, in many cases by personal communication with the Aliens Department at the Home Office, both now and later. It was also at this time that the use of poison gas was first foreshadowed and then determined; and the first signs appeared of that reprisal policy against which Dr. Davidson was to protest, quietly but firmly, every year the war continued.

IV

On May 6, having heard of the proposal to adopt asphyxiating gas, in reply to the German use of it, he wrote a strong letter to Lord Stamfordham. He urged that it would have been regarded a few weeks ago as altogether out of the question 'a barbaric act,

impossible for English soldiers', and that 'the fact that our barbarian-like opponents have sunk to that level' was no reason why we should sink with them. Lord Stamfordham replied sympathetically but not holding out much hope. 'I have read letters from General Officers', he replied on May 6, 'who say, for the first time in the War, the men are getting impatient and cross at being thus sacrificed while we do nothing to retaliate.'

The Archbishop then wrote to the Prime Minister:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. H. H. ASQUITH

May 7, 1915.

May I write to you with frankness about a matter which is causing me the gravest concern. From what has been said, both in Parliament and outside, I gather that our authorities, military and civil, who have the responsibility for the conduct of the War, are at present contemplating as a practical matter the question whether the conduct of our enemies in the barbarous employment of poisonous gas as a means of warfare ought to be met by corresponding action on the part of our own Army. I have not seen any official statement to the effect that this is definitely intended, but the words used both in Parliament and outside seem to show that it is at all events not out of the question. The infamous conduct of the German military authorities in deliberately organising this mode of warfare, and the fact that it has been put into effective operation in defiance of every principle of international ethics, have aroused a burning sense of indignation among all reasonable men. I am no soldier, but as a Christian citizen I try to understand the situation as it exists, and I confess that I am profoundly disquieted by the indications that our own Army may be bidden to meet the new situation by itself adopting these inhuman tactics. I suppose that if anyone had suggested a few months ago that the British Army would use poisonous gases for creating fatal disease among its enemies, the notion would have been scouted as preposterous. What has happened to change our view? Nothing, so far as I know, except that our opponents have sunk to that level of misconduct in defiance of International Conventions and of the dictates of common humanity. Is the reason adequate? They have degraded the traditions of military honour and the good name of the German Army by adopting these vile practices. We can no doubt follow their example if we choose. If we adopt that line of reprisal (and this is a really important point) how far will the principle carry us? If they are poisoning the wells in South Africa, and perhaps ultimately in Belgium, are we forthwith to do

the like? If so, can we retain self-respect on the part either of the Army or the Nation? It seems to me that international agreements for securing the honourable conduct of war would then be obliterated in a brutal rivalry as to the horrors which can be perpetrated by both sides. The result would be such a tangle, that the world will soon be saying, and history will say hereafter, that there was nothing to choose between the nations who were at War, and it would become a matter of small importance, and probably of disputed fact, who it was who began the general course of adopting these vile usages. That is how the matter strikes me. I have, as I say, no knowledge whatever of military matters and I may be making some blunder of thought, but I try as a Christian man to look fairly at these things, and I own that the vision of what may be about to happen disquiets me profoundly. I wonder what the real effect would be were our Sovereign through the proper channel to make it known that he was so horrified by these barbarities that he desired definitely that his Army should—do what?—resolutely abstain from any such foul conduct, and, while taking every precaution possible to secure our soldiers from the effects of this infamous weapon, leave the indelible disgrace of its adoption upon the Germans alone?

You may say that I am an ignoramus and that this is a matter for experts But is it not really the sort of question on which the average intelligent citizen of a Christian country is entitled to have an opinion? Do you think we should be satisfied ten years hence as a people if we had to look back upon having done these things ourselves?

The letter was acknowledged, and was followed by an interview between the Archbishop and Asquith, and by a letter which dealt in a broader and milder way with the same situation, giving the protest a general framework of assurance that the Government had behind it a united people, unhesitatingly sure of the rightness of their cause, and their conviction of the true nature 'of the fight we have to wage against the unbridled forces of cruelty and wrong'. The milder letter was published, together with Asquith's reply, which appreciated the assurance but said little about poison gas. On May 18, Lord Kitchener spoke of the use of poison gas as 'diabolical', and in the next sentence said: 'His Majesty's Government feel that our troops must be adequately protected by the employment of similar methods'. The Archbishop was seriously disturbed, and wrote to beg the Prime Minister for a definite assurance that the 'diabolical' method

would not be used by British soldiers. But the battle was lost. On May 24, the Prime Minister's Private Secretary wrote:

MAURICE BONHAM CARTER, ESQ., *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

10 Downing Street, Whitehall, S.W. 24 May 1915.

I showed the Prime Minister your letter with regard to the use by our army of poisonous gases.

Leave has been given to Sir John French to make use of gases, for urgent military reasons, the French having already taken this decision.

It is one which on humanitarian grounds cannot but be regretted, but we cannot deny to our soldiers the use in self defence of a weapon which has proved *effective* in the hands of our enemy.

We are ready at the earliest moment to agree to the abandonment by both sides of their use, and steps are now being considered to secure this.

More than this cannot at the moment be said, but you may rest assured that no-one is more aware than the Prime Minister of the objections to their use and no-one more anxious to bring to an end or at least to limit such hideous methods of warfare.

On May 27 the *Princess Irene*, an auxiliary ship, was blown up in Sheerness Harbour. It was a calamity without an explanation. Only one man was saved. The Archbishop with unfailing sympathy went off to Sheerness and conducted a memorial service on June 1. He preached on a favourite text, 'A Faithful Creator'. It was a fine, simple sermon, much read and full of comfort at the time, and a few sentences may be given here:

Faithful Creator! We hold our service to-night at a time of national strain and stress and widespread sorrow. In the height of a great war every day's news, whether its prevailing note be of anxiety or of good cheer, every day's news when we at last get it in full, must carry grief to many homes; for it is certain to be weighted with tidings of the earthly close of dearly loved lives—lives of buoyant sunshine, lives valorous and full of hope.

The mass of human sorrow thus accumulated is almost incalculable. Usually the sorrow is distributed widely over many places; now and then the day comes when the sorrow is concentrated in great volume in one place. Last Thursday night, after the thunderous roll of a great explosion, that dark pall of sorrow fell in Sheerness. I have been anxious, as the chief pastor in this part of

England, in our own historic Kent, to come here to-night and join my prayers with yours, that we may together face the calamity in the right way and not in the wrong way.

V

There had been a great deal of dissatisfaction with the supply of Army chaplains during the first months of the War. It came to a head in June and July 1915.

The Archbishop had asked a question in the House of Lords on June 16 about the number of chaplains—more as a signal than as a criticism. The Bishop of London followed with a long, critical speech in Convocation on July 6 and 7. He had himself visited the troops in France in the Spring, and was in close touch with much that was felt and said. He asked for a private conference between the War Office authorities and certain of the Bishops upon the whole question of religious ministrations to the army. Without doubt the most important outcome of the discussion, and of the conference which resulted, was the appointment of a Bishop for the Troops in France. Bishop Llewellyn H. Gwynne, Bishop in Egypt and the Soudan, was made Deputy Chaplain-General, and at once took up his office with the British Expeditionary Forces—an office which he discharged with conspicuous sympathy, courage, and ability. Hardly any man in the Army was more welcome than he, wherever he went, and no priest or bishop in the whole Chaplains Department was more appreciated in his pastoral ministry. Through him, from the date of his appointment to the end, the Archbishop, as we shall see, was kept in the closest touch with the religious and moral needs of the Army.

In July the first step was taken towards compulsory service, by the passing of the National Registration Act. Under this Act the following question was asked of every person, other than sailors and soldiers, between the ages of 15 and 65: 'whether he is skilled in, and able and willing to perform, any work other than the work (if any) at which he is at the time employed, and, if so, the nature thereof.' During its passage through Parliament two suggestions were made to the Archbishop: (1) That the Church might undertake through the Clergy the whole of the analysing, tabulating, and indexing of the returns made under the National Registration Scheme. (2) That as it had been decided that the

Clergy should be exempt from military service, they should have authoritative guidance as to what service they ought to perform.

As to (1) the Archbishop did not feel that he could encourage the clergy to undertake that particular task. Such work, he argued, required skilled knowledge, and an offer from the clergy to do it could only be justifiably made if there were the certainty that they had, as a body, both the ability and the time to do it thoroughly. He feared that many clergy in country parishes, who might have the time, would not be able to tackle the work successfully; and clergy with large parishes, either in town or country, had their hands full with all the work that was peculiarly their own in that grave and anxious time.

As to (2), the two Archbishops gave the following guidance to the Bishops for their clergy. Premising that 'the work of the clergy amongst the people in their parishes is national service in the highest sense of the word', the Archbishops said that (*a*) the clergy might offer any special skill or experience outside their pastoral work, in their own neighbourhood, and especially help in dealing with the needs of sailors, soldiers and their dependants, and encouraging thrift: (*b*) the clergy might serve as chaplains in the Navy and Army with the Bishop's approval; or volunteer—again with the Bishop's approval—for *non-combatant* service with the R.A.M.C. or the Red Cross. But in answer to the plea, continually repeated, that the young clergy might join the fighting lines, the Archbishops said (Aug. 6, 1915):

> We still hold that it is unsuitable for the Clergy to serve as combatants, and we believe that, at the present juncture, the work of the Clergy in their parishes is certainly as necessary as other kinds of 'necessary work' which exempt from Army service those who are so employed. The task of the Clergy is a task which no other man can discharge. Let this be rightly understood, and we are sure that many of the perplexities which have been felt will disappear.

At the end of August (the 23rd) the Archbishop had a long private talk with Lord Curzon. Of recent months he had not been able to get in close touch with all the actual facts about public affairs for various reasons. Asquith, for some reason, had not been either very responsive or very illuminating. Curzon welcomed the talk, and gave the Archbishop frank and confidential information on the situation as a whole. He told him about the

different fronts, and also about the division in the Cabinet upon compulsory national service, as to which he said 'Kitchener is cryptic and does nothing to commit himself'. While Asquith was strongly opposed to conscription, Lloyd George was in favour, and Balfour insisted on handling the question philosophically! There followed some criticism of the colossal blunders made by the War Office, of which, however, 'we are not allowed to say that this can be in any degree Kitchener's fault. He is sacrosanct, and I am not dwelling on that point now.'

Then came a question and answer:

Archbishop: 'What do you personally feel as to the certainty of our ultimate success?'

Lord Curzon: 'I have never regarded as impossible the idea of our failure to conquer Germany in the sterner sense of conquering, but our resources against Germany's conquest of us are very great and far-reaching.'

VI

Almost immediately after this interview, the Archbishop was taken ill. The strain of the past twelve months had told upon him. It was a serious illness—a recurrence of the trouble which had attacked him in 1913—and for some weeks he had to be nursed most carefully at 'Tremans' in Horsted Keynes—the home of Mrs. Benson. His friends were alarmed, and there was at one time grave cause for anxiety. A note or two written to Mrs. Davidson will show the affection in which he was held:

The Bishop of Oxford *to* Mrs. Davidson

August 31, 1915.

There is no man more necessary to England—of that I feel sure.

Sir Michael Sadler *to* Mrs. Davidson

Sept. 2, 1915.

One feels that through him one is in the presence of such accumulated stores of wisdom in Government—with Queen Victoria's judgment immediately behind his, and layer after layer of personal tradition lying behind that again. But all this knowledge is, with him, deepened into wisdom by the presence of some more sacred influence, and one learns from him the infinite depth of simple things.

There is no doubt that Dr. Davidson, patient as he was, felt his

illness acutely. He did not like being laid aside, away from affairs and the possibility of intimate knowledge of what was going on. And when the War news was bad, he took a rather unusually gloomy view and seemed prepared for all eventualities. Indeed one of those who knew him best remarked at the time that he was sure the Archbishop had thought out exactly what he would do if the Kaiser came to England after a decisive march, and went to Buckingham Palace!

In October he published a small collection of War sermons—*Quit you like Men* (S.P.C.K.) They are mentioned here becaure, though they had no large sale, they were greatly appreciated by some of those who knew good literature when they saw it. Much treasured was a letter from his old friend and teacher, Dr. Montagu Butler, Master of Trinity:

The MASTER OF TRINITY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

October 27, 1915. Trinity Lodge, Cambridge.

The 'Quit you like Men' series has, if possible, knit me to you more closely than ever, and made me feel how exactly—how loftily and how tenderly—you have struck just the right chord, Christian and patriotic, that we all needed for our Country, for our Families, and for ourselves. I thank God that you have been able to employ your great office for this priceless service. . . .

With the winter, the second stage was taken on the road to Conscription. Lord Derby was put in charge of a new Recruiting Scheme which began in October and lasted for two months. It was frankly the last attempt to see whether the necessary number of troops could be raised without Conscription. Everybody of military age was to be asked whether he would enlist, except the men whose names had been starred by the local officers. The clergy were also amongst those who received the appeal from Lord Derby. But the Archbishop held to the line he had already followed, and, even when asked to write something for the Recruiting Supplement of *The Times*, he made a special point of the 'task of the Clergy' as a separate task, outside the combatant ranks. Nor was he willing, in spite of Lord Derby's request, to ask the clergy to make an appeal from their pulpits on the last Sunday in November, begging men to enlist. The Archbishop saw Lord Derby on several occasions, and found him most considerate throughout. In a letter meant for publication, he assured

the Archbishop that in his view the clergy, 'however much they may wish to enlist, equally do their duty when obeying the directions of those who are set in authority over them': though he thought—and the Archbishop agreed—that candidates for Ordination ought to be encouraged to enlist. He could not, he said, go further than this, and did not know what the House of Commons might later decide in case of Conscription. The Archbishop's view did not pass without criticism. There was restiveness on the part of certain Clergy, and some Bishops were more favourable than others to the idea of combatant service. It was indeed sometimes suggested by laymen that the Bishops were hindering recruiting. Mr. Snowden asked in the House of Commons whether the provisions of the Defence of the Realm Act might not be put in motion against them (November 30, 1915); and Lord Derby himself privately asked the Archbishop whether 'you do not think it would be a good thing to allow all Curates, if they so wish, to be attested under the Scheme'; and added, on November 22, 'I find there is a very strong feeling growing up on this subject, not only amongst those who are opposed to our Church, but also amongst those who are its chief supporters. They feel the Church is being very much weakened by this exceptional treatment that is being meted out to the Clergy.' A conversation took place, and the following correspondence was made public, and settled the question:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EARL OF DERBY

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 3 Dec. 1915.

I am sorry to trouble you again upon the subject of the enlistment of clergy as combatants. But there is clearly so much confusion of thought and variety of action among many local recruiting authorities that I feel compelled to re-state the matter.

In accordance with your published letter to me of 29th October and your conversation with me on November 17th I and other Bishops have instructed clergy who have sought our advice that they are following a perfectly legitimate course if, in reply to recruiting officers, they say that acting under the instruction of their Bishops, they are unable to offer themselves for combatant service. I now learn that clergy who have so acted are in some cases informed that their names, not having been starred by the local tribunals, will be placed on the list of those who while at liberty to offer themselves for service have declined to do so—in

other words among those who are popularly described as 'shirkers'. This seems to be an intolerable position in which to place men who are eager and willing in whatever way is fitting to serve their country at this time. It is obvious that Parliament alone can ultimately decide on the terms of any Compulsion Act, should such an Act become necessary. Meantime are we at liberty to state that in your judgment the men who have followed the instruction of their Bishops and relied upon your own words ought not to be discredited either by being placed upon any such list as I have indicated, or by being classed among those who have without due reason refused to offer themselves for combatant service? We have repeatedly drawn the distinction between such combatant service and the non-combatant branches of Army work. In such work clergy who can rightly be spared from their parishes may, in our judgment, most properly take their part.

The EARL OF DERBY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

War Office. 3 December, 1915.

In answer to your letter of the 3rd December, I would repeat what I said to you in my letter of October 29th, namely that 'I am strongly of the opinion that Ministers of all denominations, however much they may wish to enlist, are equally doing their duty when obeying the orders of those set in authority over them'. That was my personal opinion then; it is my personal opinion now, and no slur can possibly be attached to any individual Minister who, acting under your Grace's instructions, declines to join the Army. He is only doing what I, in my letter, said I thought it was his duty to do—obey the orders of those who are set in authority over him in the Church to which he belongs.

I gladly recognise your Grace's statement that where it is possible to spare men in Orders to join non-combatant branches of His Majesty's Forces, you will be prepared to sanction, and indeed will welcome their doing so.

CHAPTER XLVII

THE NATIONAL MISSION

'The Church of England is a fine church,' said I; 'I would not advise any one to speak ill of the Church of England before me.'

'I have nothing to say against the church,' said Peter; 'all I wish is that it would fling itself a little more open, and that its priests would a little more bestir themselves; in a word, that it would shoulder the cross and become a missionary church.'

GEORGE BORROW, *Lavengro*, ch. lxxix.

I

THE first year of the War had revealed, in some measure at home, and in a far greater degree abroad, an unsuspected capacity for religious faith and devotion. On many sides men asked, though too lightly, 'Is there a religious revival?' and here and there efforts were made to deepen the response to the religious spirit, for example by pilgrimages of prayer, started by women in the villages, or through the newly formed 'League of the Spiritual War'. The Archbishop decided to invite twelve priests of different schools of thought to report to him on 'The Spiritual Call to the Nation and the Church—what is being done by the War and what should be done.' Four of the priests afterwards became Bishops[1] (W. Temple, W. H. Frere, E. A. Burroughs, G. C. Joyce), and others were Canon Peter Green and Canon V. F. Storr. The Chairman was Dr. A. W. Robinson. The outstanding recommendation of this Committee in October 1915 was 'a National Mission led by the Archbishops . . . through all the cities and towns and villages of the land'. Such an effort is much more easily recommended than accomplished, but the Archbishop decided to do what in him lay to carry it out, after it had been approved by the Bishops as a body. It cannot be said that it was started with overwhelming enthusiasm, and very early in the preparation Dr. A. W. Robinson reported:

The REV. A. W. ROBINSON *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

24 Nov. 1915.

It was extremely difficult to make any progress in face of the determined pessimism of the Bishop of Oxford and Peter Green.

[1] Archbishop of York: Bishop of Truro: Bishop of Ripon: Bishop of Monmouth.

The Bishop maintained that there was 'a rot amongst the clergy', who chiefly desired to flee from their spiritual duties; and that the Church was in such a state that any talk of a Mission to the Nation was quite out of the question. Peter Green was sure that the influence of the clergy in the community was nil.

The Bishop of London directed us most patiently and sympathetically, and the results arrived at were better than could at one moment have been expected. . . .

It was a Mission of an unusual kind, to the Nation, undertaken by the Church of England, though the Archbishop informed both Cardinal Bourne and the Heads of the Free Churches of what was planned, in the hope (not altogether realized) that the authorities of those Churches might see their way to take some corresponding action. It was a Mission of Witness by the Church of England. It was carefully distinguished from anything like Parochial Missions. Its aim was 'the removal, if it may be, of popular misconception as to the character of the Gospel Message and its relation to the daily life of ordinary men and women', and especially 'to call the men and women of England to earnest and honest repentance of our sins and shortcomings as a nation and to claim that in the Living Christ, in the loyal acceptance of him as the Lord of all life, individual and social—lies the one sure hope'.

An immense organization was set on foot, and a large volume of literature was poured out, the Bishop of London throwing himself with unselfish enthusiasm into the task of Chairman of the Central Council. There was also a special Panel of Archbishop's Messengers. The date of the Mission itself was fixed for October and November 1916, each diocese making its own arrangements, the preparation of the clergy coming first. And, after the special effort had been made, it was agreed that the Mission should go on in a less intensive form with the help of five Archbishops' Committees of Enquiry which were set up, and a general Consultative Committee with the Bishop of Lichfield in charge.

II

There were naturally difficulties in the course of the Mission, and to one objection, expressed with some violence at the time, we ought perhaps to refer. A Resolution had been carried by the Central Council, urging upon the Bishops 'the importance of

giving definite directions as to the best ways of using the services and receiving the message of women speakers, whether in church or elsewhere.' Miss Maude Royden, a prominent speaker and writer on the Women's Movement, was a member of the Council, and naturally interested in the Resolution. Mr. Athelstan Riley, another member of the Council, protested vigorously to the Archbishop that this Resolution was 'the first recognized step in an organized movement to claim the priesthood for women'. In the same letter he objected to the interest taken in the Labour Movement by the Council. Mr. Riley was supported by a large number of Church people, especially by prominent members of the English Church Union, and (at the opposite end) Dean Wace. the Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* ATHELSTAN RILEY, ESQ.

Lambeth Palace. 22nd July 1916.

I thank you for your letter received two days ago. I think that your summary of what has passed in the Council and its Committees would convey to readers a somewhat different impression from that which was left upon the minds of some at least of those who took part in the discussions. But, what is more important, you take exception, if I rightly interpret your words, to the action of the Council in requesting the Bishops to give definite direction as to the best ways of using the services and receiving the message of women speakers, many of whom are, in the Pilgrimage of Prayer and otherwise, giving such real and acceptable help in our little rural parishes. To me it seems very desirable that the Bishops should thus direct what is being attempted. For example, I have observed with much appreciation what is being done both in England and in France by women who have quietly gathered a few girls and children in church and helped to guide their prayers, and I think it is on the Bishops that the responsibility rightly devolves for seeing that such endeavours are duly regulated. It does not seem to me that the apprehensions you entertain as to what may ensue are based upon adequate grounds.

Again, you criticise, if I do not misunderstand you, the invitation we extended to some of those who know and understand labour movements, to take part in the Council's deliberations as to how the Church can best promote the common good of the English people. I welcome their aid and I believe it may prove helpful to us in all ways.

But to discuss these questions would lead us into wide fields, and

I will only add that I welcome the assurance you give me of your feeling that the two Archbishops will, to the best of their power, 'guard the Apostolic Faith and Discipline' in the protection of which they have, as you remind us, a grave responsibility.

And writing a few days later to the Archbishop of York, he expressed himself as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

8 Aug. 1916.

I have just been reading the reports in my own Diocese from the parishes in which the Pilgrimage of Prayer has been taking place. The good that is done is beyond all question, and the welcome it has met with from unexpected people is remarkable. In not one single instance has there been any attempt or desire on the part of any of the women to give the sort of general Address in Church which Riley imagines to be part of what is contemplated if women are allowed to help their younger or simpler sisters and children. When I was in France, there was scarcely a single Church without women in little groups praying together, one of them leading the others, and the Roman Bishop of Southwark, speaking to Burge the other day, said 'Your people seem afraid of the very thing which we are trying to encourage as much as we can'. I certainly should feel it to be wrong to restrain this simple mode of teaching people in little country villages to use their own churches for prayers, and I do not believe that it is going to lead to what Riley and his friends suppose. But he has whipped up a mischievous agitation about it and men like Lord Victor Seymour and George Russell and others are trying to beat a big drum about it.

III

A very particular illustration of the Archbishop's own share in the National Mission was shown in his determination to meet the clergy of his own diocese face to face. It is never easy for one with all the cares of the Primacy upon him to be in constant personal touch with his parish priests. Of necessity he left much of the individual visitation and counsel to his Suffragan Bishops, of Croydon[1] and Dover. He had just secured a new Bishop of Dover

[1] Dr. H. H. Pereira had been consecrated Bishop of Croydon in 1904: and was in 1916, 72 years old. Dr. Bilbrough was 49.

in Harold Ernest Bilbrough, Rector of Liverpool, who, for the next eleven years, served him and the diocese with an affectionate and unselfish enthusiasm which would be difficult to over-value. Personal touch with the majority of the clergy was harder than ever in the war years, when public affairs claimed every moment of Davidson's time and thought. But now the need of seeing his clergy and speaking to them as a father to his sons came to the Archbishop with special force. How were these men who were receiving exemption from combatant service discharging their own special task? Were they rising to their trust? In what way could he help them to do their peculiar service with a greater seriousness of purpose and a greater readiness for sacrifices?

Accordingly from January 11–14 all the clergy of the diocese were summoned to Canterbury Cathedral, meeting separately in the two archdeaconries for the better part of two days and a night. The gathering, as the Archbishop told them, was unique. The Cathedral itself was strangely altered from days of peace. The lovely ancient glass had, for safety's sake, been taken from the windows, and was buried. The Black Prince's monument and all the beautiful tombs were surrounded with sandbags, a protection against attack from the air. And right down the Nave a huge Velarium was hung for the better hearing of lesson and sermon at the vast Soldiers' Parades held every Sunday morning. Never before in the thousand years of their history had the walls of the Cathedral Church looked down on quite such a gathering. *Totus Clerus*—the whole clergy of the diocese met, not for conference, not for visitation, not for synod, but to draw nearer to God in prayer and thought and penitence, and go back to their work with a deeper inspiration, a clearer hope, a firmer and less faltering tread.

It is not possible to repeat the whole series of the three addresses which the Archbishop gave. They were very solemn, very moving, and piercing too. And, as so often with him, a deep note of personal sympathy was struck from the start, with peculiar effect. He felt much—perhaps most of all—for the clergy in the remotest country parishes who found it specially difficult to let the new thoughts, the new conditions, in. 'These parishes make, *me judice*, a more anxious, if not a heavier, call on a man's *spiritual* resources than the busiest town parish makes. The plea of such a vicar is one of the most pathetic, when he says

like the old monk in the rural monastery in Tennyson's *Holy Grail*:

> I trust
> We are green in Heaven's eyes: but here too much
> We moulder.'

He spoke of the *pathos* of the trust on the Nation's part, which had led to the exemption from military service, in the Bill that week before Parliament, of men who 'at the date of the passing of the Act are in holy orders, or regular ministers of any religious denomination'. Why had it happened? 'Because of the general sense on the Nation's part (1) that there is a higher side of life, whether in war or peace, than the material; (2) that therein a greater thing has been given *us* to do; (3) that the call on its officers in their own department is supreme and paramount, for the good of all.' He begged his hearers to take quiet, deep, detailed, most solemn thought, prayer, counsel, as to how far they were answering the trust reposed in them. And speaking very simply, and with pauses for silence, and with prayer, he said 'Thou, Lord, who livest and wast dead—Make us feel and know Thy Presence with us now.' 'Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth.' In a second address he brought his clergy face to face with their Ordination vows, and bade them examine themselves as to how far they were faithful messengers—watchmen—stewards in their own immediate work. Looking at the manhood of England, 'What is the proportion of those who feel *active* responsibility as Christians? as Churchmen? When we face these facts, these proportions, is it not a cause of thankfulness, an avoidance of despair, to feel that we can say "No, no". It is not that these men are all inaccessible to the stir, enthusiasm, of God's message, or hardened against the Saviour's love, or deliberately deaf to His call. That would be desperate indeed. But it is not so. It is *we*. It is *I* and *I* and *I* who have failed, been inadequate, in our part as *messengers, watchmen*. Give me, by thy grace, O God, power to make a new, redoubled, quadrupled, endeavour in Thy strength, and then the Gospel message *can, will*, win its way.' In a third address he spoke of the wartime and its opportunity 'almost impossible to overstate' with the manhood, the womanhood, and the children. 'For all these things our inadequacy, our weakness, is known to *Pastor Pastorum*—He knows.... But see for your cheer what the old Apostle who knew man's weakness says.

"God did the most wonderful thing in the world's life when he raised Christ from the dead. Well, that is the power, the same power, which he wants to wield, use, for you."'

Perhaps the reader may catch some shadow of the profound impression which the Archbishop, now in his sixty-eighth year, made as he spoke from the great throne in the Cathedral choir to his sons in the Church, from the sentences quoted above. And another piece of evidence from a former chaplain, then Vicar of Ramsgate, may, from a different angle, bring the same thought home:

REV. E. L. A. HERTSLET *to* MRS. BENSON

The Vicarage, Ramsgate. 13 January, 1916.

You took, I know, so great an interest in the Archbishop's gathering of Clergy, and in the message which was thought out under your roof, that I think you may like to have an impression of the Days from one of the insignificant Clergy who went to Canterbury this week.

Well—the first impression one got of *him*—and it remained strong to the end—was *Power*: he seemed to have regained completely mental and physical strength, and sureness of grip. He was quite certain of his message. There was no hesitation or parenthetical insertion. It was all very deliberate, very simple, very grave. He managed to convey to us straight away on the first evening his own sense of the almost overpowering opportunity of such a moment.

His division of the message, was, I think, exactly right,—putting the 'war-time' to the forefront in the first and last address, and concentrating the whole of the centre one on the individual personal life of the Clergy. He spoke entirely from his heart, with extraordinary gentleness and frankness, and one felt very close to him indeed. A large gathering of Clergy is always a bizarre and somewhat depressing sight, and yesterday's was no exception. They ranged through every type—the decrepit, the rugged, the bulgy, the hearty, the suave, and the grim; the grubby scholar, the gray saint, the young spike, the hairy protestant—they were all there with their very different views and standpoints and problems,—but they all melted into a very real and touching unity as soon as they got settled down to listen; all seemed to be fused into one body of hushed and reverent hearers, and I really think before the end—of touched and penitent men. There was a *really* spiritual atmosphere about the whole thing, and to my mind the Devotional time, with the Archbishop leading the prayers with intervals of

silence, was the finest bit of all. For many of the men there, it was probably the first experience they had ever had of any sort of 'Retreat',—and it was more that than anything else. And I am certain it was exactly what everyone wanted. From the men's attitude in betweenwhiles, and their remarks, I know that they were really impressed and grateful. Even such trifling things as 'He got in there'—'He had us all round'—'There was no getting away from *that*' etc. mean a great deal when one knows the men who say them. From all this you will see that I am quite enthusiastic over this great experiment: you would have thought that the Archbishop had been taking Quiet Days for Clergy all his life. Nothing could have been better. I wish all the Bishops would do it—or better still—that he were able to get at Totum Clerum himself. I know you will be glad to know how once again the Peace of Tremans has been the prelude to the putting forth of Power from on high. I think of it—and you—very often.

CHAPTER XLVIII

THE WORK OF THE CLERGY. THE ARCHBISHOP VISITS FRANCE

I wish, quoth my uncle Toby, you had seen what prodigious armies we had in Flanders. LAURENCE STERNE, *Tristram Shandy*, Bk. II, ch. xviii.

I

A FEW days after the gathering of the clergy in Canterbury Cathedral the Military Service Bill, No. 2, which called unattached single men and childless widowers, from the age of 18 to 40, to the colours, came before the House of Lords. The clergy and all regular ministers of a religious denomination were in the schedule of exemptions. There was some criticism at the time—and the Archbishop felt it right to speak on the subject. He said that the Bishops' approval of the exemption was not due to any desire that the clergy should 'evade the obligation of bearing their part and doing their share in this mighty national effort to roll back a great wrong'. He referred in passing to the canon[1] law of the Church which forbids the shedding of blood by those who are in Orders, but 'it is not upon that that I, and those who think with me, rest our concurrence in the provision which this Bill makes'. He preferred to state his reason thus:

> The nation at this moment has, I believe, recognized to the full that there is something other than physical force required for the

[1] Sir Lewis Dibdin writing in the *Guardian*, February 24, 1916, supplements the Archbishop's remarks with reference to Church Law thus. 'The general Canon Law again and again forbade Clerks to bear arms. In England the prohibition is to be found so early as Archbishop Theodore's Penitential (668–90) and is formally laid down in Provincial and Legatine Canons by Archbishop Lanfranc (1070), by the Legate Alberic at Westminster (1138), by Archbishop Richard (1175), and by the Legate Othobon (1268).

'That the rule was frequently broken is as true of this as of other laws, but its existence was never open to doubt. That it was not abrogated at the Reformation as "contrarient or repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm" we have the authority of Coke himself, who, writing in the seventeenth century, lays it down as clear law that clergymen "ought not in person to serve in war". Thus whether you inquire as to English ecclesiastical law (for instance, the constitutional conditions under which the Established Church enjoys its status and property), or as to English Canon Law pure and simple, or as to the general Canon Law of the West, the answer is the same.'

successful conduct of this war—moral earnestness in our corporate life, deliberate self-denial and self-discipline in our homes, quiet and buoyant courage in hours of stress, anxiety, and sorrow, and an eager and high resolve on the part of a united people on behalf of what is just, righteous, and true. These, it goes without saying, in this House at least, are assets not less important to our cause than even ships and guns, and every whit as vital to our securing the right kind of victory and the right kind of peace. I venture to say, my Lords, that if these assets are to be safeguarded they need to have a religious basis behind them, and if that basis or background is to be unimpaired at such a time as this, we must have men in the field of war, in the preparation for the field of war, and in the home life of the country, whose special business, or I would rather say whose special privilege, it is to help to make those principles a reality and to further and strengthen them in every possible way. The clergy are such men. They have that special duty, that special privilege, assigned to them. They may have inadequately discharged it many a time. But they have that obligation upon them, and the nation, quite rightly in my view, declines to relieve them of it.

Here was the main argument advanced by the Archbishop. He spoke of the work to be done by the clergy as chaplains in the Navy and the Army—in camps and hospitals—and in the parishes which indeed, in the anxiety and sorrow pressing so heavily on so many homes, called out to the parish priest for his help, which no other could give, in a special way. He said that for the religious ministry to the troops, in the field and at home, the Bishops would eagerly and gladly continue to send all that were wanted. He would not hold men back from non-combatant service if really wanted ('it has not been clearly shown'), and if their places could be adequately filled at home. His speech ended thus:

We are bound to remember that, to their calling, these men have been solemnly set apart on the greatest day of their lives—set apart in a sacred fashion to which no other profession or calling offers any parallel. I wish our critics, and our people generally, would read afresh the Ordination Service in our Book of Common Prayer. To take wholesale from those duties at the very moment when they are more urgently needed than ever they were before the men who have been thus solemnly set apart, would be to misunderstand or miss one great part of the meaning and character of a time of war, one great part of the nation's need, one great secret of what will be the nation's path to victory.

II

While the Military Service Bill was passing through Parliament—and indeed earlier—an agitation was going forward in the press 'to urge upon the Government a declared policy of air reprisals for Zeppelin raids on London and other open cities'. Mr. Joynson Hicks,[1] for example, urged: 'If our airmen dropped bombs upon the open towns of Germany, and insisted upon an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, the Zeppelin raids would soon cease.' Sir Arthur Conan Doyle was equally violent, though he could 'well imagine that our airmen would find such work repugnant'. There were others, like Lord Bryce and Sir Edward Clarke, who took a very different view. On February 17, the Archbishop felt it right to raise the question in Convocation. He proposed the following motion which was carried unanimously:

> That this House, while fully recognizing that it does not lie within its province to express any opinion on matters purely military, desires to record its conviction that the principles of morality forbid a policy of reprisal which has, as a deliberate object, the killing and wounding of non-combatants, and believes that the adoption of such a mode of retaliation, even for barbarous outrages, would permanently lower the standard of honourable conduct between nation and nation.

The Archbishop, in a long speech, was careful to emphasize the limiting clause with which the Resolution opened. He did not underestimate the difficulties, but he felt it to be the duty of the Church to give guidance as to the moral and ethical considerations involved. He referred to the extreme forms of advice recently given in the public press: and he uttered a grave warning against a gradual debasing of our moral currency:

> We can imagine even lower levels of degradation of honourable rules of warfare than we have yet seen. Poisoned wells, deliberate ill-treatment of prisoners, and the like, were not unknown in certain kinds of warfare in ancient days, but such things were long banished, as we had hoped, from the standards possible for Christian nations of to-day. Can it be said that, if—God avert such a thing occurring—such things were adopted by those opposed to us, we should in retaliation adopt like measures? If not, let us take care that at an early stage of the wrong doing we stand across

[1] Afterwards Viscount Brentford.

the path and warn people that there are ethical as well as military considerations which attach to action such as is now being suggested—not adopted—in our own land.

The Archbishop's words—and the Debate in Convocation—were effective at the time, though bitterly resented by large numbers of his fellow citizens. There was one message from an unknown correspondent in the Midlands, which he specially treasured. It ran thus (Feb. 18, 1916):

The German View

Frau Schmidt: Another Zeppelin raid over England, Gretchen! Isn't it lovely to think of those hideous English women and children being killed and tortured by our patriotic airmen?

Frau Schwarz: Yes, but suppose that the wicked English should make reprisals on us!

Frau Schmidt: Ach! that's all right. Gott bei Dankt! Our Kaiser's God has raised up fool-friends for us amongst the English themselves. They have two old women, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, who have ordered that their young men shall stay in safety at home and that their Government shall make no reprisals.

III

In May 1916, the Archbishop, by special invitation, spent eight days with the troops in Belgium and France. He had been asked to go the previous year, but his serious illness had made it impossible. But now, at a comparatively quiet time, before the June offensive on the Somme, he went, at the urgent request of the Deputy Chaplain-General, with the warm concurrence of the Commander-in-Chief, for the visit which he always regarded as 'very memorable in my own life'. He has left a vivid account of his time, in a sort of diary of 100 pages, with maps and photographs of the different places seen. And his interest and keen sympathy with all he saw is clear in every line. His passport caused 'some amusement at the different places of examination and check, as my portrait, which had to be stuck in it, was a postcard portraying me with cope and crozier—not quite usual in a passport office'. Bishop Gwynne, the Deputy Chaplain-General, was with him most of the time, and his old chaplain, J. V. Macmillan,[1] C.F., throughout. He worked very hard. He saw 'more or less the whole front line held by the English from north of

[1] Bishop of Guildford, 1935.

Ypres to the Somme', and much of the hinterland twenty or thirty miles back. It was right that he should spend some time in seeing the men who occupied the positions of greatest responsibility, and he was the guest in one form or another, at their headquarters, of all four Army Commanders, and at G.H.Q. of the Commander-in-Chief.

But the Archbishop's visit [J. V. Macmillan writes] was, to borrow a phrase from the language of the country where it was paid, something quite different from a 'visite de cérémonie'. He had come for two quite definite objects. The first was to do what he could to cheer and encourage the Chaplains—his own clergy—to let them feel that he was anxious to understand their problems and their difficulties and their opportunities; and the second was, so far as opportunities could be given, to let the men of the Armies themselves see that the Archbishop of Canterbury, leader of the Church of England, wanted to see something of what they were going through.

At four different centres, one in each of the four Armies which then made up the B.E.F.—at Poperinghe, at Corbie (on the Somme), at S. Pol, and at Bethune—the A.C.G. of the Army concerned had got together as many of the C. of E. Chaplains as could be got together for conferences with the Archbishop. There were also present, to the Archbishop's own delight, Chaplains of other Denominations—of the Church of Scotland and of the English Free Churches. At each of these centres there was a short Service at which the Archbishop himself spoke, but the central feature was the conference itself in which he drew out what the Chaplains had to say about the attitude of the men to religion and to the Church. To one who listened to those conferences, what remains most vivid is the impression made by the simplicity and real anxiety to learn of the Archbishop himself. It has been said of him again and again and in many connections, that it was his power of being completely at the disposal of those to whom he was talking and his obvious readiness to hear and weigh what anyone had to say to him, that were no small part of the real greatness of the man. I doubt if that ever came out so clearly as in those conferences with the Chaplains in France, and, as has been said at the beginning of these notes, there must have been many a man amongst those who afterwards came home, as well as others who did not, who then first learnt to love the man Randall Davidson and to trust the Archbishop of Canterbury as they had never dreamed of doing.

One of the conferences of chaplains took place in the garden of Talbot House, Poperinghe; and after it in 'an exceedingly upper room' in the house, a long garret transformed into a chapel, the Archbishop took a Service for the Chaplains, and then confirmed about 36 or 40 men presented by P. B. Clayton. J. V. Macmillan says:

> That place is a place of many memories, and among them both here on earth, and beyond, there must surely remain that of the old Archbishop sitting in his chair, with the lighted candles behind him as the darkness came on, and the candidates kneeling before him, while outside in the street there was the ceaseless rumble of troops moving up to the Salient and the intermittent sound of firing.

A few notes from the Archbishop's Diary follow:

> We walked about Poperinghe and found Norman Davidson[1] at Headquarters office, and *his* car then took us, i.e. Norman, Mac, Neville Talbot and myself, to Ypres. It is an absolutely straight road of about nine miles, and we were now within the near sound of the constant guns, and as we approached Ypres the road grew more and more war-strewn, the trees all broken, every house smashed and uninhabited—the road itself ploughed up by shell marks everywhere and being constantly repaired. It is the only road into Ypres this way and consequently has at night to be used for all the road transport, and the Germans therefore shell it continuously. Before getting near Ypres we had to put on steel helmets, furnished to us at Poperinghe, and each to carry the gas mask in a bag ready for use at a moment's notice. The shelling at Ypres was still going on, but was quiet at the time we were there, or at least not severe enough to make General Fielding prohibit our going about the shattered streets. I afterwards learned from General Plumer, in command of the Second Army, that if he had been in France he would have forbidden my going to Ypres. Fortunately he was not. . . . (May 17).
>
> I think I had talk with every man, and some of them were full of interest. I was very much struck with the quiet simplicity, and even the unconscious dignity of the chaplains, some of whom I had known quite well; and all of them seemed to me to have 'grown' in the best sense. . . . (May 17).
>
> I had rather a wakeful night, meditating upon all the new things I had seen that day, and listening to the artillery at inter-

[1] The Archbishop's nephew; he fell in action.

vals! One felt more and more the fearsomeness of all this going on between Christian peoples, and the helplessness of religious leadership to intervene, and *per contra* the gain and opportunity which is coming to the manhood of England and of France, and our obligation to use it. . . . (May 18).

I also got a good deal of talk with the Tommies who were billeted in the village where we broke down. One of them a very interesting quite young soldier from Tooting, who had got some keen and rather original thoughts about the war and its lessons for him and others. I felt when I got to bed that the day had been a fruitful one. . . . (May 19).

At 4.45 the Generals of the Army, whom Blackburne[1] had invited from all the region round, began to arrive and soon we had in the garden about 40 Generals. I managed to get a short conversation—sometimes quite short—with nearly everyone of them, and in the majority of cases I got to the point about which I greatly cared, the work of our chaplains, their fitness for it, any suggestions which could make matters better, and the help the Generals are giving and can give. As before I was immensely struck with the keen appreciation shown by everyone of these leading officers as to the first-rate character, capacity, courage and perseverance of the chaplains and how very much has now come to turn on their work. Nearly every General spoke of them as being just the men who ought to be there and of having got a real grip upon their troops and cheering them in every way. The gathering in the garden was a striking instance of the pulling together of padres and officers and their mutual appreciation of one another. . . . (May 20, at Béthune).

Tea was over at 5.40, and Sir Henry Wilson had arranged to have a strong rapid car waiting in which he whirled off Mac and me, together with his own aide-de-camp, Locker-Lampson, who had been at Eton with Mac. We drove to the ridge of Notre Dame de Lorette, some miles off. It is a long ridge which Wilson compared to the Hog's Back, but it is not so steep or high. As we went up the side road near Bovigny, through villages greatly broken by shell fire and among the dug-outs of the wayside, a shell of the smaller sort, which Lampson called a 'pipsqueak', burst not far behind us, to the surprise and, I think, a little to the disquiet of our military hosts. Locker-Lampson tried hard to find out where it fell, but it was not clear, only it was not far away. I was glad to have the experience. It was an isolated spot with no special

[1] H. W. Blackburne, afterwards Dean of Bristol.

reason for being shelled. We got to some open ground on the top of the hill, with a French cemetery of rows and rows of little graves, many hundreds with little crosses, about half the crosses having names. They are some of those who fell in the gaining of the ridge by the French. It is said to have cost them 150,000 casualties. We walked along the ridge near the edge of the Bois de Bovigny, and there Sir H. Wilson pointed out the whole lie of the land—with Loos in the distance on the North-East, down towards Arras South-East on the right, and the Vimy ridge in the left foreground, a little south of east, and the shattered village of Souchez, between the Lorette and Vimy ridges, corresponding, as Wilson pointed out, to the position of Guildford on the Hog's Back. We were standing just above a farm called Marqueffles, in which, as Sir H. Wilson explained, he had three 9·2 guns concealed, which the Germans were always trying to find 'Now and then they have shelled the neighbouring fields, but they have never found the exact place of the guns which are there in those buildings, just below us'—say 250 yards. He had hardly said this when Locker-Lampson called out 'I hear a German shell whistling,' and the great shell came with a scream and whistling sound and landed plump among the buildings which we were looking at, with an earth-shaking explosion. The General was much excited—'The brutes! They have got us What splendid shooting! They have the very spot.' Then came another shell almost on the same spot. We went a little nearer after this so as to observe better, and two more shells came. It was all as if it had been got up as an exhibition for us, and nothing could have been clearer or more absorbingly interesting. There was nothing to show us the exact effect of the shooting upon the hidden guns. We could only see the considerable smashing of earth and buildings, and the General said he would not know till later on at night when a report would come in to him. Then we went on examining the English and German trenches through our glasses and could watch the rifle fire going on between them, and occasional guns, ours and theirs, further off, but well within sight. Meanwhile a very plucky airman of ours was circling just overhead and the Germans kept firing shells at him, all of which we could watch quite close. It was a wonderful object lesson of a varied sort, and, as Locker-Lampson said afterwards—'You had simply an extraordinary exhibition because of your higher standpoint and the visibleness of everything.' . . . (May 20, Béthune).

I never saw so many partridges—we were putting up pairs of them everywhere along the road. They were basking in the dust,

and the outcome of so many pairs must be prodigious. . . . (May 21, a drive from St. Omer to Hesdin).

I found Haig rather shy and difficult to talk to at first, but when he thawed he was delightful in his quiet, earnest frankness of conversation. I pressed him for criticism about the work of the chaplains, but I could not elicit anything except laudation. He was strong on the great value of the changed administrative order which now encourages the chaplains to go forward into the trenches, if they will do so, instead of being, as formerly, kept behind at the casualty clearing stations, or even further back. Haig was enthusiastic about the fine type of young Padre now at work in all parts of the line. There was hardly one whom he knew whom he would wish changed. He has himself a great affection for the Presbyterian Chaplain, Duncan, who is attached to Headquarters, and whose ministry Haig himself, who is I suppose a semi-Presbyterian, often attends. Both Haig and Fowke spoke in terms of real affection about Bishop Gwynne, and the tact and vigour of his administrative work. It is remarkable how Gwynne's simple goodness has evidently been his passport to the affection of these people, while his efficiency wins their respect. . . . (May 21, near Montreuil).

We discussed the question of visits of Bishops. He was very emphatic and spoke with a quiet gravity about it. 'We don't want books written about visits to the Front. We don't want our men and their ways exploited, and we certainly don't want men of a different type to come out for joy rides about the country.' [This referred, not obscurely, to * * *.] But he went on—'Visits like yours for quiet consultation with us and for giving stimulus to officers and chaplains, and speaking to the gatherings of men which you come across naturally, are of very real good.' . . . (May 21, continued, conversation with Haig).

[In the ruined convent chapel at Arras.] The whole scene was striking—the service so perilously surrounded, so noisily accompanied, the soldiers growing quite used to it, and Bailey, the Chaplain, one of our Edmonton men, under Boyd, arranging all quite simply and happily. When they sang 'There is a green hill far away' I found it difficult to restrain myself. . . . (May 21).

So ends, as I rough-hew it in the train which is crawling into London, the record of a journey unique in my own experience as a man, and I think unique historically in the experience of an Archbishop. I have seen more or less the whole front line held by the English from north of Ypres to the Somme, and much of the

hinterland twenty or thirty miles back. I have not seen the great Bases at Rouen and Havre, and this is a distinct loss, but it was impossible to do everything. We have been blessed throughout by splendid weather, by the extreme kindness of everybody without exception, and by the smooth working of the carefully made arrangements. To Bishop Gwynne I owe more than I can easily express. Unfailing in kindness, inspiring in work and good spirits, and, above all, continuing instant in prayer, he has impressed me more and more each day. I thank God for all the lessons of these nine days, and I trust I may find it possible to do my work a little less inadequately in consequence. *Quod faxit Deus.*

CHAPTER XLIX

POLITICAL PROBLEMS. THE FALL OF ASQUITH

There is an idea among some of your acquaintances which I partly acquiesce in, that you are in general somewhat of a procrastinator. I believe I have noticed the same thing myself. LOCKHART'S *Life of Scott*, ch. xlii.

THE summer of 1916 confronted the Archbishop with grave questions of a very different kind.

I

On the Irish question, for example, he was very unexpectedly asked to advise Lord Curzon, on June 27, whether or not he should resign from the Cabinet on the ground that Lloyd George had exceeded his commission as negotiator with Sinn Fein:

> He began by saying that, strange to tell, the fate of the Government and possibly of national affairs seemed to turn upon a decision which he must make within the next two hours. The person whose advice he wanted was myself.

A full story of the crisis followed—and of the division in the Cabinet. Of the nine Unionist members of the Cabinet, four had decided to resign, and four were against resignation, including Balfour and Bonar Law. Curzon therefore held the balance:

> Such was Curzon's statement, and he then said 'I have put the facts fairly before you. I want your definite judgment as to what I ought to do'. I replied that it was a fearfully grave thing to be asked to give such an opinion the moment one had heard the case stated, without any time for reflection. My clear feeling, however, as he had told his story, was that Arthur Balfour is right: the War is what matters just now, and almost anything is preferable to the wild confusion which might ensue if the Lloyd George settlement were now thrown to the winds by the action of the Unionists and our hands therefore paralysed in the War. I could not think it likely that the House of Lords would force an Election in September, unless indeed the War conditions had vastly changed for the better. And if that risk be removed, a temporary settlement of the Irish affairs seems to me at all costs to be expedient, one might almost say necessary, to success.

We discussed several points in detail, but 4.30 arrived, and Selborne was actually on his legs in the House. Curzon thought I had said enough to give him real help, and he left me, saying that his judgment on the whole coincided with mine and that he thought he would certainly act upon it.

II

There was also the very painful case of Sir Roger Casement, sentenced to death for high treason in connexion with the Irish rebellion of Easter 1916. The Archbishop had known Casement's work in connexion with the Congo atrocities a few years before, had seen something of him then, and been much impressed. When, therefore, an appeal was made for a reprieve on account of his great services in the past to the subject races of South America and Central Africa, the Archbishop, while declining to join in a petition, wrote a personal letter to the Home Secretary:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. HERBERT SAMUEL

Private. 14th July, 1916.

Like other people I am receiving a good many requests from different quarters that I should sign some document or protest or petition in favour of a mitigation of the capital sentence passed on Roger Casement. I am refusing to do this, feeling that the matter is safe in the hands of the legal authorities and yourself, and that the relation of his criminality, about which there can be no doubt, to the political situation is one which you are well qualified to settle. At the same time I think perhaps I ought to write a few lines to you on account of the relation I formerly had to Casement when I was promoting the protests or agitation about the Congo, and subsequently when the Putumayo atrocities were being investigated. At each of these times I saw something of Casement and was always impressed by his capacity, his enthusiasm, and his apparent straightforwardness. I find it difficult not to think that he has been mentally affected, for the man now revealed to us, in the evidence which has been made public, seems a different creature from the man whose actions I knew and watched. . . .

He went on to say that he knew of certain other charges made against Casement's moral character which, if proved, might be taken as further evidence of his having become mentally un-

hinged, and begged that Mr. J. H. Harris, a close friend and collaborator of Casement in the Congo days, might be consulted.

Mr. Harris was sent for, and the details of a very sad story were made known to him. The Archbishop, who had also seen Mr. Justice Darling who tried the case, as well as the niece and secretary of Casement, after a further talk with Mr. Samuel, saw the Lord Chancellor, and followed up his conversation with a letter:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. VISCOUNT BUCKMASTER

Lambeth Palace. 1st August, 1916. 11.30 p.m.

I have been thinking over the conversation I had with you a few hours ago upon this wretchedly distressing and perplexing business of Sir Roger Casement.

I think that perhaps, in my talk with you, I overmuch concealed the strength of the *instinct* I find stirring within me to the effect that the really *courageous* course for the Government to adopt would be the commutation of the death sentence. The case presents itself to me somewhat thus:

As a question of *policy* there can, I suppose, be no doubt that a reprieve would be wiser than an execution. Ireland, America, and possibly other countries would find people to make mischievous capital of the execution, and far more so if they could (as they would) spin a tale to the effect that after hanging a 'political prisoner' the authorities had been privy to the trumping up of an infamous story about the man's immorality, an accusation with which he had never even been confronted—far less had the accusation been proved after proper investigation. Such would be the shape the accusation against the Government would take.

Of course you can, in one sense, afford to ignore all such attacks. But they will, none the less, be mischievous, and in America especially they will do real harm. As a question of pure *policy* therefore, the avoidance of an execution is to be desired.

In the present circumstances of the world it savours, I think, of pedantry to contend that 'policy' has nothing to do with the decision you should, as a Government, come to, and that 'justice' only has to be considered. The thing is not so simple as that. The object of an execution is to deter offenders. Whom would this execution, as a matter of fact, deter? Whom would a commutation of the sentence encourage in evil deeds? No one.

What would doubtless happen would be an outcry on the part

of a good many people who would say 'It is sheer cowardice which has let this man off, after the shooting of weaker or less important rebels. If ever a man deserved hanging it is this man.'

The other rebels were shot, so to speak, red-handed after court-martial. This man was not red-handed in that sense, though no doubt, as the wire-puller, he may be regarded as more guilty than any. I certainly do not attempt to deny that he *deserves* hanging. But when we think of the results which would almost certainly follow, we ought, I believe, to have the courage to be apparently inconsistent and to send him to Broadmoor instead. The sound argument would, I think, be 'Here is a rebel who has done things worthy of death. But his case is peculiar. For many years beyond all possibility of doubt, he battled nobly on behalf of the oppressed native folk. He had infinite difficulties to contend with, but, at the cost of his health, he fought on. He succeeded, and his name will always, and rightly, be held in honour for what he there did, whatever may have happened afterwards. All sorts of complications as to the rebel's real life came subsequently to light. Investigation showed perplexing contradictions in his behaviour, and though not technically (according to the experts) a man out of his mind, he is shown to have been mentally and morally unhinged. In these complicated circumstances we believe that the more sane and fair course is to choose the less irreparable of two acts, and to commute the sentence, and we accordingly do so.'

Of course the more *obvious* course would be to send him to the gallows. But is it not really the less courageous line to follow? It is followed 'lest we seem inconsistent'. I should brave *that*, and do what is really in the truest interest of the country and the Empire. 'Policy' in the largest sense of the word *can't* be excluded, if those on whose shoulders the responsibility rests are facing their duty from the highest standpoint. After all, the whole thing concerns the well-being and safety of the Empire and nothing less or lower, or more merely *technical*. I have purposely not dwelt upon all the complexities of immoral morbidities, about which I have so much unpleasing experience every month of my life. Though my experience is abundant and varied, we must *in the main* be guided, in that field, by professional mental experts. '*In the main*', but not to the exclusion of the unprofessional but solid experience of actual facts which is possessed by some of us, and forms an element, no more, in our consideration of the question.

I feel that I owe you an apology for this intrusion into the field of jurisprudence. But I must plead in defence your own encouragement, and your express wish that I should tell you how it all presents itself to me. And 'jurisprudence' after all when widely

interpreted, shades off into political ethics wherein the most amateurish of us may have a voice.

The reprieve, however, was not granted. The Archbishop saw the Lord Chancellor on August 2 in the House of Lords:

He told me that the matter had then been settled by the Cabinet. He had been impressed by my letter. He did not say whether he agreed with my conclusions or not, but he had felt the letter to be so important that he had laid it before the Cabinet that morning, and they therefore had my views in full before they reached their decision. He did not say or imply that the decision had been easy or unanimous: he rather implied, though he did not say, the contrary. He was specially full of the fact of certain Irish prisoners in Germany, some of whom had now returned to England invalided, their illness being due to German ill-treatment consequent on their refusal to listen to Casement's treasonable blandishments. This he thought had weighed strongly in favour of the execution taking place.

III

The summer holiday of 1916 was spent by the Archbishop in Scotland. In accordance with his habit, he and Mrs. Davidson visited various friends in their homes, spending a week or so with each. One old friend, who particularly valued his sympathy at this time, was Lord Haldane, who, in the shuffle of the Cabinet in the spring, had lost his place owing to unfair attacks on his supposed pro-Germanism. They had many talks together, and Haldane showed the Archbishop the Memorandum which he had drawn up, on his part in policy and preparations before the War. The Archbishop took care to let his own appreciation of Haldane and his work be known in quarters where a word was likely to be useful. There is an interesting letter after the holidays from Edmund Gosse, following upon an article by St. Loe Strachey in *The Spectator*, which shows the value attached by intimate friends to Dr. Davidson's sympathy:

EDMUND GOSSE, ESQ., *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

17, Hanover Terrace, Regent's Park, N.W.
6 November, 1916.

When I saw the *Spectator* on Saturday, my first thought was that your benevolence had operated with miraculous celerity—

and then I realised that St. Loe S. had acted 'on his own'! I am greatly pleased with the article, and so will Haldane be. I am to see Haldane alone this afternoon, and we shall go over the whole situation. But I must repeat, what I said to you on Wednesday, that I regard you at this moment as the most useful friend he has, and that I hope you will see him as often as you can.

There were many other calls for the Archbishop's sympathy in the tragic losses of the War, and he never failed in speaking words of comfort and healing. Two letters may be quoted. One was to a vicar in his own diocese who had just lost a son; and the other is from Mr. Asquith, who lost his son at the same time:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. H. E.——

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 26 Sept., 1916.

We were absent yesterday. Hence the delay.

You will know how our hearts go out to you in this hour of cloud.

May Our Lord in His love have you and G. in His keeping.

These are the times which test the fibre whereof we are made. What must it mean to those who in S. Paul's words are οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα?

We shall remember you steadily in our prayers.

I have just come from sitting with Asquith, whose frame is sore stricken, for he was wrapped up in Raymond.

Tonight I go to see ——, whose son and heir, intensely loved, was killed yesterday—and so it is, day by day. The sense of life being a larger thing than we can see must surely be burning itself in upon great circles who have thought less of its meaning hitherto.

τίς οἶδεν εἰ τὸ ζῆν μέν ἐστι κατθανεῖν, τὸ κατθανεῖν δὲ ζῆν,

Give my love and paternal blessing to G My wife has, I hope, by this time written to her. She is at both Canterbury and Sheerness today, and I am not sure of her possibilities. Her special link with J. brings it home to us both.

The RT. HON. H. H. ASQUITH *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Personal.

The Wharf, Sutton Courtney, Berks. 22 Sept 1916.

I cannot thank you sufficiently for your letter which was a real help.

Apparent waste is the real tragedy, and one is bound to cling to and cherish the larger hope.

Anyway it is not they—the young, who lived well, and, with

promise still unfulfilled, died nobly—who are to be pitied, but we who remain and wait.

I hope to be back on the quarter deck on Monday, and we can then talk of business.

Another letter written by a Bishop at the same time, whose daughters were nursing at St. Thomas' Hospital and formed two of the contingent of nurses for whom the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson made special sleeping provision at Lambeth, shows an appreciation of another kind:

The BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD *to* MRS. DAVIDSON

Bishopgarth, Wakefield. Sept. 24, 1916.

. . . I cannot tell you how deeply I have appreciated and felt the altogether unusual hospitality you have shown to my two children —Margaret and Dorothy. It seemed stupid to keep on writing, and I am slow to express the things that go deepest. But I have often wanted to tell the Archbishop and yourself all that Lambeth has been to me and mine for so long. It is a unique place—a huge business establishment with resident clerks and secretaries, telephones and offices, and a constant tide of Church affairs surging through it. And yet you both manage to make your guests feel that they are in a home, where they are welcome, where all their wants are studied, and where the whole household is striving to make them comfortable and happy. Many people, even strangers, have said the same thing to me. It is a very rare kind of grace . . .

IV

In December the Archbishop was in close touch with some of those who were most deeply concerned in the ministerial crisis. On December 4, after reading the newspaper tales of Cabinet disputations, he went to dine quietly and alone with a friend who knew the latest news:

A more tangled situation can hardly be conceived. Meanwhile some members of the Cabinet seem to be wholly disloyal to the Army . . . Poor —— is having a tempestuous time—but he seems to me to be doing it all extremely well, and the King is behaving with wisdom and circumspection—and with complete fairness for Asquith, who is evidently touched thereby.

He saw a good many others, anxious to hear all that was passing, but purely spectatorwise, between December 4 and 10. Lord

Buckmaster told him that Lord Reading was likely to succeed him as Lord Chancellor and that if he were appointed, by the law with regard to Jews, all the Patronage of the Lord Chancellor would have to be exercised by the Archbishop of Canterbury. This increase of Lambeth labours, however, did not come to pass. He saw a former Lord Chancellor, Lord Loreburn, in the House of Lords on December 5:

> I saw, in the Princes Chamber, Loreburn in a great state of excitement, denouncing the Liberal Cabinet men for not offering their services to Lloyd George—not that Loreburn had a good word to say for Lloyd George. His line was (and it was emphasised by violent walking up and down the room)—'These fellows who dragged us into this war ought to be thankful to be allowed now to serve as bottle-washers or bootblacks, if they are wanted. The country has a right to keep them to see the thing through. Asquith naturally enough could not serve under Lloyd George, but why not these men? Every one of them is guilty of mere selfish cowardice if he declines to bear his part, supposing the new Prime Minister wants him', and so on and so on in anything but a judicial vein. . . .

On December 9 he lunched with Asquith at 10 Downing Street:

> It struck me as interesting, though I did not have an opportunity of referring to the matter with him, that I had been in Downing Street when he came back from Biarritz, and was the first to greet him there, and now I was present on his farewell day in the house, for he is leaving it 48 hours hence, or at latest on Wednesday morning . . .

He had a good deal of private talk with Asquith:

> The strain has been in every way so great for him that the personal relief at being, by no fault of his own, relieved, is incalculable. 'I have not', he said, 'had one single day, literally not one single day, since Whitsuntide 1914, without the burden pressing ceaselessly upon me, and I have found, especially since Raymond's death, a lack of resilience (that was his exact phrase) which makes everything terribly trying.' He went on to say that he intends to go to the House of Commons regularly, and to bear his part in supporting Lloyd George. It would be quite easy for him, and I gather that some of his friends had advised it, to abstain largely from the Commons, and let the new Government wrestle with its own difficulties. But he does not think that this would be patriotic, and I very warmly commended his resolve

to go to the House regularly to bear his part in the way that he will as a supporter of the Government of the hour. I told him that I had had a good deal of thought about whether he ought to resign, but that I had come to the conclusion that he was right, and that I thought his conduct in the matter, so far as the facts are revealed, correct and honourable in every way. I think he was glad that I should say this, and we had some rather earnest private talk in which he showed genuine feeling and, I think, warm personal regard. He agrees with me in discrediting any prophecies that Lloyd George would try to use his opportunity as Prime Minister to harm the Church of England. . . .

The only word of sarcasm or taunt which he used was that he said that 'Lloyd George felt he must turn me out in order to have a Cabinet of three people, the Prime Minister not being a member of it. He has now got a Cabinet of six people with the Prime Minister as chairman!' . . . He spoke with grave regret, rather than anger, about newspaper domination and a country ruled by Northcliffe. . . .

The following day, Sunday, December 10, the Archbishop wrote a letter to the new First Minister of the Crown:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE.

Private. 10 Dec. 1916. *Lambeth Palace*, S.E.

It is not fair to write to you at this moment, and yet I want to speak out at once.

Your call, at perhaps the most critical hour in English History, to the place you hold is an event which would be *solemn* to any man, and to a man of your temperament and 'make' must be, in the most literal sense, almost overwhelming. May God endue you with such a 'spirit of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and strength' as may enable you to rise to so mighty an opportunity and to utilise it to the full. I suppose there is no instance in English public life commensurate with this in some at least of its characteristics.

It would be of course unreal were I to pretend to see eye to eye with you in regard to *some* of the affairs and 'policies' of our country in its home life, either civil or religious. But I am eager that you should realise that in any way in which I can at this juncture give you support, I shall be most anxious so to do. The offices of high trust which we respectively hold have many points of contact, direct or indirect—and I have had the privilege, ever since I came to Lambeth nearly 14 years ago, of being on terms of

active and sometimes close friendship with your four predecessors. I do not ask more than that you should count upon my willingness to be helpful, at such a time as this, wheresoever I rightly can.

Again assuring you that I do not forget you and your literally 'tremendous' burden when I say my prayers.

The RT. HON. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE, *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

10, Downing Street, Whitehall, S.W.
December 14th, 1916

I was deeply touched by your letter and the kindly message which you sent me at such a difficult time, I assure you, will not be forgotten. Your warm sympathy and encouragement will be a source of strength and inspiration in the difficult task which I have been called upon to undertake.

CHAPTER L

THE ARCHBISHOP'S POLICY. RESERVATION

I will not enter into the question, how much truth is preferable to peace. Perhaps truth may be far better. But as we have scarcely ever the same certainty in the one that we have in the other, I would, unless truth were evident indeed, hold fast to peace, which has in her company charity, the highest of the virtues. EDMUND BURKE, *Speech on the Act of Uniformity.*

ON Christmas Day, 1916, the Archbishop fell ill. He was laid up in his bedroom for over three weeks. He did not really get back to work till the end of January, and it was not till February 18 that he was again attending Prayers in the Chapel.

I

While he was ill, he dictated some notes about the aims he had set himself as Archbishop during the fourteen years of his Primacy (January 1917):

Suppose someone were to ask me what, if expressed in a summary way, had, while Archbishop, been my aim as regards Church administration, I should find it a little difficult to answer categorically. I do not think that either at the start, or since, I have had before me a clearly defined purpose intended to be pursued *coûte que coûte* in face of opposition. On the other hand, I have had an underlying and, I think, continuous policy, the outcome partly of my general way of looking at things, partly perhaps of my upbringing, and partly of my sense of what is needed in the Church of England to-day, and of the opposite things which offend my sense of what is the will of God for us and for our Church.

If I were forced to put it in a single phrase, I suppose it might be described as a desire to assert in practice the thoughtful and deliberate comprehensiveness of the Church of England, as contrasted with the clear-cut lines and fences of demarcation which mark the rulings of the Church of Rome, and the corresponding, though quite different, rulings of protesting sects in England, Scotland, America, and presumably Germany in the 17th century and since.

This comprehensiveness, as I understand and value it, is assertible in three directions, affecting severally our boundaries of legitimate doctrinal belief, our boundaries of would-be denominational

differences, our boundaries of legitimate ritual and devotional variety—this last including what become very nearly credal differences.

In all these fields it has, I think, been my earnest endeavour to cast the net wide, and to be slow to draw its boundary line very rigidly. I venture to think that in the first two of these three my fourteen years of Archiepiscopate have been useful, and that I have personally contributed a good deal of the usefulness.

In the course of his reflections on the first head, Dr. Davidson refers to the critical discussions on the Creed in 1914, which might have issued in the resignation either of himself or of Bishop Gore. And he sums up:

This specific instance is only an example of what has been a continuous and deliberate endeavour on my own part to avert putting forth by authority 'cocksure' definitions and boundary lines at a time when scientific thought and the growth of historical criticism render such action not dangerous only, but unreasonable. Under this head, therefore, I believe that I have contributed something to the maintenance and assertion of what I believe to be the true principles of thought within the Church of England and English Christianity generally.

Dealing next with the question of denominational differences, he speaks in a general way of the Lambeth Conference of 1908. Of Kikuyu he says:

I do not defend what was done at Kikuyu. I think it was rash and that it lacked appreciation of large principles which cannot be put out of sight. But to denounce it in the way that it was denounced by the Bishop of Zanzibar, and those who followed him, was preposterous.

But the important note upon this is as follows:

All this, however, was simply one incidental object lesson in a wide field of controversy. It is not easy at present to formulate exactly what are the two sides of the controversy about our relation to fellow-workers in the Christian field who do not belong to our Communion. On the one hand there has been in S.P.G. circles and elsewhere a growing nervousness about our relation to, or our conference with, Nonconformists. Or perhaps it may be more true to say that the greater life and vigour of the missionary societies has brought into prominence the feelings of ring-fence exclusiveness and Anglican self-containedness which were there

all along, but had less scope in the quieter days a generation ago. My own feelings have always been strongly in sympathy with a desire, not only to confer with, but, so far as possible, to work with, Christians outside our own Church, and this, as I have always contended, can be done without any compromise of our own distinctive principles, if the difference between undenominationalism and interdenominationalism, is kept prominent and clear. The Missionary Conference in Edinburgh was a notable example. It was to my mind simply lamentable that S.P.G. was not officially represented there. True, Bishop Montgomery, Mrs. Creighton, and others were present, but they did not go as formally representing the Society, which thus seemed to be holding aloof from a Conference on which so much turned. My own action in going was widely criticized, but I am certain that I was right.

He refers to 'the question (not alien from the Kikuyu debates) of the sanction we give to the admission of, e.g., an isolated Presbyterian or Lutheran who desires to communicate with us'; the controversy about the use of Anglican Churches in India and England for Presbyterian regiments, and he sums up:

Summing it up, I feel pretty clear that I have, during my Archiepiscopate, contributed steadily and with considerable effect to the maintenance of a reasonably comprehensive spirit in our Church's polity. Bishop Gore of Oxford regards me as perilously lax in what I teach and practise as regards the National character of the Church of England, a phrase to which he has a special antipathy. I am increasingly certain that the rigorist attitude is a mistaken one, and that we rightly inculcate and use an elasticity in these matters—an elasticity which I have sought not only to condone, but even to encourage in certain credal matters referred to above, wherein I have stood upon one side, and the rigorist Bishops on the other.

In this department, therefore, of my general Episcopal purpose and practice, I think I have to a large extent succeeded in what I have tried to do and say.

On the Ritualistic issue, however, he is unable to give so satisfactory a report:

I come to the question of boundaries of legitimate ritual variety, and here I must sadly confess to myself that, whether it be my misfortune or my fault, I have been quite unsuccessful in introducing a comprehensiveness of a reasonable and, in a large sense, law-abiding kind. At this moment, January 1917, there is I think

a larger body of clergy than there has ever been before who quite deliberately resent, and even defy, the exercise of episcopal authority for inculcating, or, if need be, enforcing compliance with what may be largely called Prayer Book rules. The contrast between that school to-day and the corresponding school in Tractarian days is not merely wide, but the two things are almost contradictory, and the very men who attach the most vital importance to episcopal succession and the episcopal system, are those who in practice are now turning to scorn episcopal direction or rule which they dislike. At this moment, January 28th, 1917, I am awaiting with genuine alarm discussions which may take place in Convocation ten days hence about Reservation, which would give evidence of a defiance of episcopal authority on the part of many hundreds of clergy who mean to insist on the right of priests and congregations to insist on the use of the Reserved Sacrament for purposes of devotion (as contrasted with Communion) in a way which would have been not only surprising, but repellent, to Lancelot Andrewes, or William Laud, or E. B. Pusey, or John Keble. What exactly is going to happen I do not know, but the controversy of these weeks gives good exemplification of our failure, I must certainly say my failure, to keep within bounds the vagaries of men who are, I honestly think, inculcating doctrines and usages distinctly repudiated by the Church of England in practically, with the tiniest exceptions, all its schools from the days of Cranmer and Parker to our own. I think the matter is stated with reasonable fairness in the Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906. Of course the phraseology of that Report is the result of some measure of compromise. The legal spirits would have liked it to be much more rigid and less sympathetic, and some of the clerical spirits would have softened some of the criticisms as to ritual extremes. But speaking generally, it is, I think, a fair statement, and, if so, our failure to gain general support among High Church clergy for the verdict it pronounces, and perhaps even for the recommendations it contains, is both obvious and melancholy. I do not think it is so much due to a widespread spirit of lawlessness among otherwise sober men, for I doubt whether there is such, as to a wisely manœuvred accentuation of the difficulties about Ecclesiastical Courts etc. which has been cleverly used by E.C.U. officers and the like to discredit the duty of obedience to authority exercised by the Bishops in any formal manner. Things are likely to develop quickly now, and there are undoubted elements of danger which may even lead to schism. All that I am here concerned to say about it, is that I can claim no success in any endeavours that

I have made to produce a truer spirit of loyalty and harmony in these matters among the extremer Church partisans on the High Church side.

II

From these reflections in his illness, and especially his own sense of his lack of success with regard to ritual questions, it is natural to pass to Prayer Book Revision, and especially to the issue of Reservation, at that very time in his mind, which was to form the topic of a very important debate in the following month.

In the first two years after the outbreak of War, the Convocations had continued their work of preparing an answer to the Royal Letters of Business dealing with Prayer Book Revision. In 1915, the Report of the Joint Committee of Convocation of Canterbury, which had been appointed in April 1914 to harmonize the material of the two Houses, was published. It was entitled '1915. Royal Letters of Business. No. 487' and consisted of forty-eight pages. It included the Upper House's proposal for 'a diversity of use' in the matter of vestments; and a proposal (agreed to by the Lower House only, in February 1914) for a rearrangement of the Prayer of Consecration in the Order of Holy Communion, as follows:

> Permission shall be given for the rearrangement of the Canon as follows: The Prayer of Consecration shall be said immediately after the Sanctus, the *Amen* at the end being omitted; the Prayer of Oblation shall follow at once (prefaced by the word *Wherefore*) and the Lord's Prayer; then shall be said the Prayer of Humble Access, followed by the Communion of Priest and People; after the Communion shall follow the Thanksgiving, the Gloria, and the Blessing.

These, and certain other proposals, aroused alarm among Evangelical Churchmen. A memorial was presented to the Archbishop by Sir Edward Clarke (a signatory of the Royal Commission's Report) signed by many members of the House of Laymen and others, begging the Archbishop 'to postpone until after the war any further action or discussion in Convocation respecting the Revision of the Prayer Book'. A counter-memorial, signed by a number of fellows of Cambridge Colleges and others, begged the Archbishop to go forward notwithstanding the war. The Archbishop replied to Sir E. Clarke that nothing should be settled without the House of Laymen—and agreed that the

House of Laymen, many of whom were on active service, could not take part in Prayer Book discussions while the War was still in progress. But he went on (23 April 1915):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* SIR EDWARD CLARKE

I do not think that this difficulty is operative within the Convocation itself. We are approaching the close of deliberations which have occupied an inordinately long time. Very few members of Convocation are prevented by duties connected with the War from giving us their help in completing, so far as Convocation itself is concerned, the task assigned to us.

Obviously and rightly our thoughts and energies are concentrated at present on problems and anxieties very far removed from things liturgical, and it would be wholly out of place for us to inaugurate just now the handling of Prayer Book questions as though these were in the foreground of our thoughts. For example, our Convocation Agenda Paper for next week directs us primarily to matters connected with the War. But that is not to say that in the further time at our disposal we clergy should refuse to carry forward to its provisional conclusion the consideration of questions with which we have so long been dealing. We want Convocation to be ready, by the time the War is over, to submit its suggestions for the consideration of Churchmen generally, and it would I think be detrimental to our doing this effectively were we altogether to set aside, for perhaps a considerable time, our unfinished task.

It may be added that on April 28, 1915, the Upper House rejected, by 15 votes to 5, the proposal for a rearrangement of the Prayer of Consecration (as set out above), the Archbishop himself taking no part in the debate.

A year later (April 1916) Lord Halifax visited the Archbishop at Lambeth, with a special proposal about the Order of Holy Communion. He had for a great many years (he said) used the Liturgy of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI (1549) in his private chapel at Hickleton, with the sanction of successive Archbishops of York.

His communication is summarized by the Archbishop as follows:

April 1st, 1916.

His real point is a definite suggestion.

'Will you intimate to me, tacitly if not openly, that you would not regard it as disloyal were a priest to use what is practically

> the Communion Office of Edward VI's First Book in lieu of the Prayer Book use? We do it at Hickleton with the sanction of successive Archbishops. I have had three conferences of the extreme men there, purposely inviting those who are accustomed, as I know, to interpolate (*secreto*) the Latin Canon in order to supply the defects of our Canon. I have allowed them to celebrate with our use, which is carefully arranged, and they have practically all of them told me that it satisfies their aspirations, and that if they were to use that they would cease to wish for interpolations from the Roman Canon. I do not expect you to tell me that you could authorise such use of the First Prayer Book. Of course it would be irregular, and if you authorised it you would be open to all kinds of accusations. But if I knew in my heart that you would not regard such conduct on these men's part as disloyal, I think I could bring it about that the Romanising system I have referred to should be dropped in almost every parish where it is now usual, and that they would be satisfied with the other. . . .'

The Archbishop told Halifax that he had 'learned by experience the danger of allowing even apparently insignificant changes in exceptional cases because they are instantly taken advantage of as a starting point for something fresh, the contention being "This much we have now definitely gained for good. We start afresh for our further enterprise".' But he asked him why he and his friends desired the change:

> He [Halifax] said that they have now to use the Roman parts secretly not openly, and that the Service is very much spoiled by this process, the Prayer Book words being audible, the rest inaudible, to bring them into the category of private devotions, though they are not really private at all. I cordially agreed with him about this, and spoke of the intolerableness in my view of men adopting such use when they have solemnly declared as a condition of Institution or Ordination that they will 'use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other', etc. He had no answer to this and hardly attempted it. . . .

All that the Archbishop felt able to say in reply was that in Scotland he had used the Scottish Office and in the United States the American Office, both being based on the Order of 1549; that he 'had no kind of objection' to either Office, as he 'found nothing in that Office which jars upon me as unorthodox or wrong, but it is not the Office which I have said that I will

observe and enjoin upon others for use', and went on to say that

> personally if we were starting afresh in this whole matter and could legislate in the Church without the difficulties due to party conflict, I should personally prefer an enactment of a new Office compiled by the re-handling of our existing Prayer Book Office. But my personal preference for what would be desirable is one thing; my feeling of what is practicable or expedient is quite another; and he must not take it that I am giving him either tacitly or otherwise any other assurance beyond what I have stated, namely that personally I take no exception to the Scotch or American Office where it can be used in accordance with the due order of the Church.

III

It has already appeared that the problems connected with the Reservation of the Sacrament had occupied the thoughts of Churchmen long before the War. The increasing frequency of celebrations of Holy Communion during the past fifty years was itself a sign of the increase of reverence with which that Sacrament was regarded. 'Early celebrations of the Holy Communion were, I suppose, almost unknown in the first quarter of the nineteenth century.'[1] And when those who were well came more often to Holy Communion, it was not surprising either that the sick should desire more frequent opportunities of coming themselves, or that recognition should be given to the need of special arrangements for giving them their Communion privately after the celebration in church. The Book of Common Prayer provides a shortened form of the Order of Holy Communion for sick persons, in the sick person's chamber, with others receiving at the time. The practice of Reservation, which had ancient authority, though not mentioned in the Prayer Book, made it possible for the sick person to receive the Sacrament, reserved from the public service, without a fresh celebration. After a long period, some 300 years of almost unbroken desuetude since the first Reformation Prayer Book of 1549, where provision was made,[2]

[1] R. T. C before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 12855 A (b).

[2] The rubric in 'The Communion of the Sick' in the Prayer Book of 1549 ran thus: 'If the same day there be a celebration of the Holy Communion in the church, then shall the priest reserve (at the open Communion) so much of the sacrament of the Body and Blood, as shall serve the sick person, and so many as shall communi-

the practice was revived in the middle of the nineteenth century. It was at first exceedingly rare, but developed by degrees. And with the revival of the practice a problem was raised, viz. the proper treatment of the consecrated elements thus reserved, outside the actual communion. In the Eastern Church the Reserved Sacrament is put in a place apart, in or near the sanctuary, without a light, and receives no special reverence at all. But in the Roman Church—for a long time (though not in the first 1,000 years of the Church's history) the Reserved Sacrament was made the object of a *cultus*, the focus of a devotion. And the reason was doctrinal—the Roman dogma of Transubstantiation. Thus, to quote the concluding words of the standard book on the history of *The Sacrament Reserved* by W. H. Freestone, 'the original purpose of official Reservation (i.e. Reservation in Church) was purely practical (for communion). The development of any *cultus* of the Reserved Eucharist was the direct outcome of the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation as the orthodox belief.' The problems connected with Reservation in the Church of England arose from the perils of an extra-liturgical *cultus*.

The Archbishop, in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline in 1906, and in a very important speech in the Upper House of Convocation in February 1917, has given a summary history of the development from 1856 to 1917 of the problem in the Provinces of Canterbury and York. In 1856, following a lawsuit, a Memorial on Eucharistic Adoration had been drawn up by Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, Mr. Carter of Clewer, and Dr. Neale—in language very different from that of those who claimed to be the inheritors of their opinions. In 1866, Bishop Thirlwall declared:[1]

> But this ritual movement has by no means reached its term. It is still in the full vigour of its early years. It appears to be advancing both extensively, in the work of proselytism, and intensively, in doctrinal innovation, not always distinctly enunciated but clearly intimated. Its partisans seem to vie with one another in the introduction of more and more startling novelties, both of theory and practice. The adoration of the consecrated wafer, reserved for that purpose, which is one of the most characteristic Roman rites, and a legitimate consequence of the Romish Eucharistic

cate with him (if there be any). And so soon as he conveniently may, after the open Communion ended in the church, shall go and minister the same.'

[1] Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 12885.

doctrine, is contemplated, if it has not been already adopted, in some of our churches, and the Romish festival of the *Corpus Christi* instituted for the more conspicuous exercise of that adoration, has, it appears, actually begun to be observed by clergymen of our church.

In 1868 and 1876, the subject of Reservation was very briefly discussed in Convocation, as the result of memorials or petitions put before the Upper House, the request being markedly limited to making provision for the sick. There was a fuller discussion in 1885, when the Bishops unanimously declined to sanction Reservation as a law or usage: but the speeches showed that there might be possible exceptions, especially in hospitals, and in times of epidemics, and even in the particularly difficult circumstances of some parishes. Discussion continued in the Church, but without any special notice of an official character until 1899–1900, when Archbishops Temple and Maclagan, in the Lambeth Hearing, forbade Reservation absolutely. In 1905–6 came the Royal Commission. In the evidence it was clear that the Reserved Sacrament was in several churches made the centre of a *cultus*. Exposition, Benediction, Processions of the Reserved Sacrament, and Devotions with Adoration of the Sacrament were in use, in some London churches and in a few churches outside London. At the same time, in his own evidence, the Bishop of London thought, 'that a perfectly clear distinction could be drawn between Reservation for the purposes of the sick alone, and Reservation under conditions which rendered it possible that it should be used for purposes of devotion', though he subsequently saw reason to change his view of the possibilities, in some of the instances he then adduced.

IV

To summarize the general result of this slow but steady movement in a portion of the Church: (1) it was coming to be seen that some relaxation of the ordinarily accepted law forbidding Reservation was desirable for the Communion of the sick, subject to the Bishop's regulation; (2) there was no sort of claim or request on the part of those pressing the need of Reservation that sanction should be given for the use of the Reserved Sacrament for any other purpose whatever; (3) in a few churches a use of the

Reserved Sacrament for purposes of adoration was practised. Accordingly, when, in the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, the Order for the Communion of the Sick came up for consideration, the Bishops added a proviso allowing Reservation under certain limited conditions—which they recognized to be a departure from the usage allowed in the Prayer Book but to be a legitimate requirement of the circumstances of the time. The permission was contained in a Draft Rubric, which set out, not what was allowable but, what they hoped would be allowable if the revision of the Prayer Book received full canonical and legal sanction. It ran as follows, being drafted in this form by the Upper House of Convocation in 1911[1]:

THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK

When the Holy Communion may not by reason of grave difficulty be celebrated at the sick person's house, the Priest may (with the consent of the sick person) on any day when there is a celebration of the Holy Communion in the Church set apart at the open Communion so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as shall serve for the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any), and, the open Communion being ended, he shall, on the same day and with as little delay as may be, go and minister the same. And, except where extreme sickness shall otherwise require, before he administer the consecrated Bread and Wine, at least the parts of the appointed office here named shall be used, namely, the *General Confession*, the *Absolution*, and the *Prayer of Humble Access*, and after the delivery of the Bread and Wine the *Lord's Prayer* and the *Blessing*. And immediately thereafter any of the Bread and Wine that remains over shall reverently be consumed.

If the consecrated Bread and Wine be from any urgent cause not taken immediately to the sick person, they shall be kept in such place and after such manner as the Ordinary shall direct, so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever.

The consecrated Bread and Wine shall be taken to the sick person in such simple and reverent manner as the Ordinary may direct.

If any question arise as to the manner of doing anything that is here enjoined or allowed it shall be reported to the Ordinary for his decision.

[1] See *Report* No. 427 (1911), p. 17. The Draft Rubric remains unaltered in *Report* No. 481 (1914), p 32. Certain slight changes appear in the form given in *Report* No 504 (1917), p. 54.

The vital paragraph is the second—and the vital words in that paragraph, designed to limit the use of the Reserved Sacrament unconditionally to the Communion of the sick, are: 'so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever'.

By general agreement this Draft Rubric was accepted by the Bishops as giving them guidance in their administrative capacity for dealing with particular questions of Reservation. And it must be specially observed that it contemplated Reservation for a sick person or sick persons who desire to receive the Communion on the same day as the day of the particular celebration —and was not intended to allow anything like general, permanent, or continuous Reservation for such people.

Such was the rule which the Bishops bound themselves to administer to the best of their power, three years before the War. There were difficulties, and irregularities, especially in the dioceses of London, Chichester, and Birmingham—but these were not sufficient to make the rule impossibly hard for other Bishops, especially the Bishop of Oxford, to enforce. There were a few churches in London, particularly, where continuous Reservation was practised—on the strict condition that the Reserved Sacrament was there kept in a secluded chapel, inaccessible for purposes of worship.

V

With the War, however, the difficulty grew in acuteness. The emotions of the time—the tide of human grief and anxiety—made it very hard for some to observe the regulations of the Draft Rubric in all their strictness. It was a stern test of episcopal unity. The Bishop of Oxford had been foremost in insisting upon it. But as the months passed the strictness was little by little relaxed by the Bishop of London, and at last to such an extent that the Bishop of Oxford felt his own further insistence impossible. It was in the summer of 1915, when the war situation was grave, and the general tension already sufficiently severe, that the Bishop of Oxford announced his intention of abandoning his stand. He reminded the Archbishop of a Conference held at Lambeth attended by the Bishops of London and Winchester and himself at which, he said (8th June, 1915), 'I understood that there was a sort of informal agreement that where Permanent Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament was allowed, it should be allowed only

in a secluded chapel not accessible for worship.' He claimed that the crucial phrase in the draft rubric of 1911, 'so that they be not used for any other purpose whatsoever', meant Reservation only in a secluded chapel; and he added:

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Cuddesdon, Wheatley, Oxon. 8th June, 1915.

I have felt myself obliged to resist pressure of the strongest kind which has been put on me to allow Reservation in the open Church. I have only succeeded in maintaining this resistance by the strongest exercise of Episcopal Authority—first at Birmingham and now at Oxford—but it is constantly represented to me that no such requirement is made at Birmingham[1] since I left it, and in other dioceses, notably London and Chichester.[2] In these dioceses Reservation is allowed in the open Church, and the Blessed Sacrament so Reserved becomes at once an occasion and centre of worship.

The Archbishop sent a long letter in reply pointing out the far-reaching consequences of such a step on Gore's part. In particular he spoke thus of the general policy foreshadowed:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF OXFORD

Lambeth Palace, S E 10th June, 1915.

. . Then I should like to say a word about the policy generally which you foreshadow as now necessary. The argument I suppose would be this: Some Dioceses (exceptionally circumstanced) have not held to the rule repeatedly set forth that Reservation should be for the sick only, and if some Dioceses fail to enforce it the rest of us Bishops must give up what we have repeatedly said is the right principle. In other words we Bishops should be abandoning any attempt at discipline in this matter because the Episcopate has not succeeded in maintaining and enforcing a uniformity of Episcopal action I wonder myself how far there ever has been such complete uniformity of Episcopal action. Has it not been an ideal rather than a fact? And may not the difficulty or impossibility of attaining it be an example of those characteristics of the English Church upon which Dean Church so often dwelt?

On the other hand should you feel it to be possible to back up now the line which I and those who will go with me must certainly take, of adhering to what we have said and doing our very utmost to prevent the misuse for other purposes of Reservation allowed for the Sick, you would strengthen our hands more than any other men could, and would help immeasurably the Bishop of London

[1] Bishop Russell Wakefield. [2] Bishop C. J. Ridgeway.

and other Bishops, whose difficulties are exceptional, to maintain true principles. Such action on your part would be worthy of you and would in my judgment have an immense effect for good throughout the whole Church of England.

If the other line be taken and the use of Reservation for other purposes than the Communion of the Sick be encouraged, and indeed proclaimed, by the abandonment or proposed abandonment of the safeguarding words, it is to me quite obvious that we should have encouraged, perhaps even fostered, the growth of the usages we deplore—Monstrance, Exposition, Benediction. So far as I know my own mind, and I think I do, I could never under any pressure tolerate these things, believing them as I do to be perilous in the highest and deepest sense.

The matter is so sacred that I should like to have much time for thought before writing about it. But I have not got that time at the present moment, and this particular juncture in National life is quite extraordinarily unfortunate as a moment for our launching upon the Church what would probably be the gravest controversy of our generation. Must it be pressed forward now?

Further correspondence followed. Bishop Gore agreed to further talk before action. He said:

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Private. Cuddesdon, Wheatley, Oxon. June 12, 1915.

Yes indeed, I am more than ready for talk before action. I am still anxious to maintain the rule I have maintained that reservation should be in a secluded place. It is I think only this year that the Bishop of London has surrendered. What needs to be impressed on him is that it is not enough to secure or think he secures 'no public devotions before the Blessed Sacrament'. Nothing effective will be done unless he insists that reservation must be in a chapel to which there is no access.

He begged the Archbishop to press the Bishop of London not to commit himself at a conference which he was about to hold with certain Anglo-Catholic clergy. The Archbishop also got into communication with the Bishop of London explaining his perplexity:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF LONDON

16th June, 1915.

I remember well your own account to me of the care you had taken in some of the Churches—I think St. Mary's, Paddington,

was one—to go yourself over the building so as to secure that the Reservation should not be in a place accessible for devotional intent. I gather that by degrees this has been completely altered and that although you forbid Reservation in a tabernacle over the Altar it is quite well-known now that Reservation takes place in certain Chapels at or near side Altars, and that as a regular system people pray there in consequence; and this not incidentally but avowedly. This undoubtedly means a very marked change from what we planned a few years ago. . . .

You mentioned to me last night the suggestion that we might cease to allow Reservation at all, or rather might cease to avow that we are allowing it. I do not understand how this suggestion could be made effective. If we cut out what has been agreed upon by both Houses we shall seem to tell everyone that Reservation for the Sick is not after all to be sanctioned. But as a fact it will be just the other way. We shall be cutting it out because some of us find it necessary to sanction that which the suggested Rubric would forbid—i.e. the use of the Reserved Elements for Devotion. I do not understand that you would suggest that we could do this without explaining what we are doing, for if not we should mislead everybody. I am therefore simply bewildered as to what is intended. The mere fact that the men with whom you have been conferring are (1) prepared to repudiate the action of Mr. Kilburn, and (2) to state formally that they accept the Bishop's directions about how Reservation is to be arranged, does not seem to me to cover the ground, if in making this declaration they do it on the tacit understanding that the Bishop has so far modified his original direction as to sanction the use of the Reserved Elements for Devotion as a part of the arrangements of the Church. . . .

The Archbishop spoke again of his distress that the matter should be forced forward at such an hour:

I can hardly find words to say how sad I think it to be that men like those advanced skirmishers of yours should force this matter forward at the present moment when our thoughts and prayers are concentrated on other things. But the issues are so large and so grave, and for some of us perhaps so absolutely vital, that it is clearly impossible to let things drift until after the War.

In a note to the Archbishop, the Bishop of London said that there were eighteen churches (but 'the list has been drawn up rapidly and is not meant to be complete') in which he sanctioned Reservation—in a secluded place; that in three of these the Sacrament was reserved in a side chapel or other chapel, and

that in four others the devout were allowed to enter the chapel and say their private prayers, and might kneel *outside* the chapel in other churches for the same purpose (22 June 1915). The following is a Memorandum of an Interview on July 5:

Memorandum.

Interview at Lambeth on Monday, July 5th, 1915, with the Bishops of London, Winchester, Oxford, and Chichester, about Reservation and the use now sanctioned or tolerated in London. The Bishop of Oxford reiterated strongly his view that he could not be party to a declaration by Convocation that Reservation was for the Sick and no other purpose whatsoever, unless this was being reasonably observed by the Bishops generally, and he regarded the action of the Bishop of London in the tolerance he exercises as being sufficient to make his (Oxon's) support of the Convocation words impossible. As the matter was not coming up during the ensuing meeting of Convocation the discussion was rather academic, but both London and Chichester took the line that it was no longer possible for them strictly to follow the rules which Oxon and Winchester had followed, of forbidding Reservation within the Church in a place known, and therefore used for devotion. The Bishop of Oxford pressed strongly that more was being done in London than the Bishop of London realised, and the Bishop of Winchester made a great deal of the point that in the Roman Catholic Church Veneration of the Reserved Sacrament cannot be recognized if there be a wall between the person praying and the Reserved Sacrament—i.e. that the mere knowledge that there is the Sacrament reserved in a Chapel on the other side of a wall would not suffice to justify acts of veneration. I think the Bishop of London practically admitted, though he did not say so in terms, that he had now departed widely from what he laid down when he described his action to the Bishops a couple of years ago.

The Bishop of Chichester pressed the point that all we could rightly insist upon now is the absence of actual Services formally conducted under the direction of the Clergy in connexion with the Reserved Sacrament, but he said that the difficulty only arose in three or four churches at the most in his Diocese.

The Bishop of Oxford said that he adheres distinctly to what he has written on the subject in *The Body of Christ*, but he admitted that that writing was rather what he felt to be theologically true than what he found to accord with his private feelings, or, as Winton called them, temptations.

R. T. C.

VI

The Archbishop had thus got the subject postponed for that year. Bishop Gore, however, returned to the charge in May 1916 and desired to bring the matter before Convocation. The campaign for an extra-liturgical cultus had grown, and pamphlets were published by an Anglo-Catholic Society[1] strongly advocating both Exposition and Benediction. But after some talk with the Archbishop, Gore was persuaded to drop his request for an open discussion, on account of the National Mission then in progress under the leadership of the Bishop of London. Instead a special private meeting of the Bishops was held. There was a great and very grave division, and a clear recognition of the possibility of a schism from the Church, which yet might be preferable to disintegration within it. The Archbishop promised that, in the next group of Sessions, the whole subject should be publicly brought before the Church in Convocation. The Bishop of Oxford had by this time been persuaded, by the Archbishop's persistence, to maintain his original position and to give up his proposal to omit from the Draft Rubric the vital words 'and for no other purpose whatsoever'. He proposed the following Resolution in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation on February 9, 1917:

> In view of misunderstandings which appear to have arisen, the Bishops desire to call attention to the terms of the Rubric[2] in the Order for the Communion of the Sick proposed for adoption (see Report No. 481, p. 32) as part of the answer to be returned to the Royal Letters of Business, and to declare that they adhere to the Recommendations there made.

Seven bishops spoke, in addition to the Archbishop, in the debate, which lasted a whole day and attracted a great deal of public attention—all the more on account of a Memorial signed by nearly 1,000 priests opposing the policy expressed in the Draft Rubric and declaring that compliance with the restriction proposed, i.e. refusal of access to the place of Reservation, 'cannot rightly be demanded and will not be given'. The Bishop of Oxford spoke very strongly—emphatically reasserting his own whole-hearted belief in the ancient Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Sacrament, which he believed to

[1] The Society of St. Peter and St. Paul.

[2] See p. 805.

have been seriously impaired by the later Western doctrine of Transubstantiation, with all its consequences such as leading the faithful to seek 'nearness to Jesus' by an external visit to the Blessed Sacrament as reserved in the tabernacle, or monstrance, instead of finding Him spiritually present within themselves through the communion of His Body and Blood. And he asked that the Upper House should reaffirm their deliberate decision taken in 1911 to allow, when circumstances required it, Reservation for the purpose of communicating the sick and for no other purpose whatsoever.

Bishop Gore was followed by the Bishop of London, who was in charge of the diocese which was the storm centre of the dispute. He spoke very fully. He said that he had never allowed, and would never allow, unless convocation allowed, Benediction or Exposition. He admitted that it had proved impossible for him to refuse all access to the Blessed Sacrament, when and where it was reserved for the sick. He had succeeded when there were only about eighteen chapels in the diocese in which the Sacrament was reserved. But 'He frankly admitted now that the plan had broken down: it began to break down before the war, and the war had finished it; the tide of human grief and anxiety had been too great, the longing to get as near as possible to the Sacramental Presence of our Lord had been too urgent'. He therefore 'found it impossible to promise to-day that every one of the forty-two chapels where the Sacrament was at present reserved in London should be locked and barred'. Nor was he sure that such a policy was a desirable policy.

The Archbishop summed up at the end. He spoke of the danger lest older men should belittle the views of the younger.

> Those opinions of younger men are derived from premises different perhaps from the premises which were current in our youth, and upon which we learned long ago to base the conclusions we have reached to-day. We have to recollect, it is those younger men who will some day have to bear the burden of administration, in the Church or Realm, of that which issues from what we are doing or leaving undone just now. I try always and increasingly to be on my own guard against that peril, for I am certain it is often a real one, and this may possibly be an occasion in which we ought to be in an exceptional sense alert.

But at the same time there was the duty attaching to long experi-

ence; and the speaker gave an account, with arresting illustrations, of the development of the practice of Reservation during the past sixty years—and its dangers. Nor did he omit to answer certain of the points, both in diocesan administration and existing American and Scottish practice, which the Bishop of London had brought up. And he noted by the way that it was not always possible to share 'the characteristically sanguine and trustful view which the Bishop of London took'. Before he finished his speech, he referred in stern terms to the Memorial of the nearly 1,000 priests—an important document from the mere fact that it carried that number of signatures. To him the Memorial appeared simply deplorable—'alike as to the manner in which it must have been devised and framed, as to the policy which it appears to advocate, and, above all, perhaps, as to the unseemly threats which it contains'.

The Resolution was then put and carried *nem. con.* The meaning of the Resolution to adhere to the Draft Rubric was still far from clear. The Bishop of Oxford knew what he intended—but it was surely a very different intention from that of the Bishop of London, who voted for it on the distinct understanding that 'he did not commit himself to refusing to the faithful access to the Blessed Sacrament where it was reserved for the sick'.[1]

VII

In the following July, at a special meeting of the Bishops, a Memorandum was accepted which removed the main ambiguity, for it explicitly stated that Permanent Reservation was not covered by the terms of the Draft Rubric, and that, if any Bishop gave sanction for such, his action 'will be individual and exceptional, and will lie outside what the episcopate has assented to'. The Memorandum, which was simply a document for the guidance of the Bishops, and at first kept private, was published in 1918.

MEMORANDUM ACCEPTED BY THE BISHOPS' MEETING, *6th July*, 1917.

I

Under the present directions of the Book of Common Prayer we cannot admit any claim on the part of the parish priest or any

[1] See *Chronicle of Canterbury Convocation*, February 1917, pp. 81–126.

other minister of the Church to reserve the Blessed Sacrament, apart from the sanction of the Ordinary, for any purpose or in any manner.

II

We decline to go beyond the limitations with respect to Reservation to which the two Convocations in their Upper Houses have respectively agreed, and cannot recognise permanent Reservation as covered by the terms of either resolution.

III

If the Rubrics on the Reservation of the Sacrament for the Sick proposed by the Upper Houses of Convocation of Canterbury and York were duly authorised, they would lay down what would be permissible in all Churches in all circumstances, without the special consent of the Ordinary or reference to him, save as is expressly provided in those Rubrics.

IV

If a Bishop believes that owing to special conditions it is desirable that a parish priest or other minister should be allowed by him to go beyond what would, if the Rubrics became law, be set forth as the permissible rule or custom in the Church, his action in giving such sanction will be individual and exceptional, and will lie outside what the episcopate has assented to. Should a Bishop so exercise his administrative responsibility, any instruction that he gives either as to the place or manner of such Reservation should be in accordance with the principle that the Reserved Sacrament is to be used for the Communion of the Sick and for no other purpose whatsoever.

July 1917

R. T. C.
C. E.

VII

Some of the Bishops—and a great many others as well—would have been glad if the Archbishop himself could have given a definite lead in this and other questions of worship and ritual. An evangelical bishop, for example, before the Convocation debate, in discussing the issues with a friend, spoke of his own readiness to accept practices such as incense, or the use of the Scottish Office of Communion as a permissible alternative, if the Bishops would agree to act together. He also admitted the principle of perpetual Reservation in hospitals and similar places. But he longed for a lead from the Archbishop on some of the

vexed points, and he believed that the Bishops would thankfully accept it.

Why was such a lead not given? It is not easy to answer. Perhaps it was because the problem of Reservation as a theological problem did not in itself make a strong appeal to Randall Davidson. Indeed it was a perplexing problem—and he knew that it was the sort of issue which might lead to most divisive results. He wished to avoid such calamities; and he certainly would do his best to keep the ship steady. But, though he was not ignorant of the dogmatic implications, and had a genuine anxiety about the perils of a *cultus*, the issue did not stir his soul. Perhaps a note of a talk at this very time between the Archbishop and a friend may throw a little light on the temper of his mind. It was a few days after the Convocation debate on Reservation. A letter from Mr. Hanbury Tracey in the *Church Times*,[1] stating that the Bishops had originally intended to pass a Resolution forbidding access to the Blessed Sacrament but had quailed before the Memorial of the 1,000 priests, had made the Archbishop very indignant. And on Sunday, in the drawing-room at Lambeth at tea, the Dean of Wells's review of Sparrow Simpson's *Prayer of Consecration* was mentioned. This started the Archbishop on a very interesting statement as to the important and the unimportant things just then occupying religious minds. He said he could not bring himself to stress the points of liturgical reform and a change in the Canon of Holy Communion as comparable with the fight against evil.

[1] February 16, 1917.

CHAPTER LI

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS, REPRISALS, AND OTHER WAR QUESTIONS

Wise men patience never want,
Good men pity cannot hide,
Feeble spirits only vaunt
Of revenge, the poorest pride.
He alone forgive that can
Bears the true soul of a man.

THOMAS CAMPION.

THE work with which the third year of the war began was very varied in its character. On New Year's Day, the Bishop of Zanzibar's Commissary called about his Bishop's proposal to take over German Missions provisionally during the War. There was a talk on the telephone about the vacant Deanery of York, Lloyd George's first ecclesiastical appointment ('he mustn't act without consulting the Archbishop'). The same night the Archbishop of York came to stay, and conferred about National Mission Committees and other affairs. On January 4, the Chaplain-General came to discuss the needs of soldier Confirmation candidates in Mesopotamia. Another day, January 5, the Archbishop was busy supervising the starting of religious and social work amongst women and girls in munition factories. A telegram came on January 8 from the Holy Synod of Athens begging him to persuade the British Government to stop the blockade of Greece. On January 16, the Deputy Chaplain-General reported from the Front, with a plan for what he called a 'Bombing School for Chaplains'—that is, a school of instruction and prayer to help the chaplains in France to do their religious work more effectively, with the Rev. B. K. Cunningham in charge. Bishop Gore arrived on January 17 to discuss Reservation and other things, and when some one asked him at breakfast, apropos of the School for Chaplains, 'What would *you* do if you had charge of a school?' he replied, with a rueful shake of the head and twinkle of the eye, 'I should retire to my tomb.... I do not think I am cut out for a schoolmaster!'

I

A good deal of time in the first weeks of this year was taken up with the making of plans for additional national service for the clergy. Mr. Neville Chamberlain, the Director-General of National Service, came to see the Archbishop to discuss the question at large. It was, however, the Archbishop of York who took the main burden of this off the Archbishop of Canterbury's shoulders and worked out a careful scheme in conjunction with Mr. Neville Chamberlain, allowing for suitable branches of national service other than those which the clergy were already fulfilling through the ordinary duties of their calling. The plan gave some satisfaction to chaplains in France, for, as the Deputy Chaplain-General wrote:

BISHOP GWYNNE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

10 February, 1917.

. . . We are all more than pleased with the scheme of conscripting the Clergy for national service, and feel that we are now free from the carping criticism of those who shouted against us when the Clergy were exempted from the Conscription Bill.

It was varied enough in its range, but Archbishop Davidson warned the Archbishop of York against too great precision. 'It is', he said (February 5), 'a little dangerous to be too categorical, for the Clergy as well as other people might say "Why should the Bishops lock us up in this cupboard they have made? We are quite game to take an independent line of our own." ' At the same time when, at the request of Convocation, the Ecclesiastical Services (Omission on account of War) Act, 1917, received a Second Reading in the House of Lords on February 20, the Archbishop was able to give remarkable details as to the very varied special and general service which the clergy were in fact rendering to the nation.

II

A subject which caused the Archbishop keen anxiety, and came up this Spring, was the case of the Conscientious Objector. A large correspondence followed the passing of the Military Service Act, and letters from conscientious objectors, interviews with them or their friends, and representations to the Government on

their behalf, took up much of the Archbishop's time during 1916 and 1917 as well as later. He never disguised his own disagreement with their convictions, which he yet completely respected so far as the objection to actual military service was concerned. But he found it difficult to acquiesce in the refusal by the 'absolutists' of an exemption conditional on the applicant's undertaking work of national importance. 'One of the chief difficulties', so he stated to an intimate friend of several objectors (September 26, 1916), 'relates to the refusal of so many men to do any work whatever for the nation, however far removed from military service. It is this abnegation of the ordinary obligations of citizenship which renders reasonable treatment of these men so extraordinarily difficult.' To another correspondent, who reported that a young man whose plea was dismissed by the South Staffordshire Appeal Tribunal on the ground that, as he was a member of the Church of England, and that Church was praying for victory, it was hypocrisy for one of its members to claim a conscientious objection—the Archbishop caused the following letter to be sent by his Private Secretary:

A. SHEPPARD, ESQ., *to the* HON. G. COLLIER

4 April, 1916.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has received your letter of April 2nd with reference to a recent application made for exemption from Military Service on the plea of conscientious objection to such service. The Archbishop can express no opinion with regard to the merits of a particular application which has been considered by the duly appointed Tribunal. You ask as a general question whether conscientious objection to Military Service is in the Archbishop's judgement incompatible with membership in the Church of England. As to this the Archbishop directs me to say that, while he cannot himself regard as reasonable or consistent with Christian common-sense the position of those who claim for themselves and their property the protection of a civilised order of society while repudiating its corresponding claim upon their service, he has learned by experience that membership of a religious community is not found to be incompatible with even the extreme vagaries of individual opinion.

It was, however, not only the problem of the relation of the conscientious objector to the Church, but that of the relation of the Church to the conscientious objector, which found a

frequent place in the letters sent to Lambeth. And there was no criticism more likely to touch Archbishop Davidson than that of lack of consideration on his part for those who had a claim to expect it. Dr. Alfred Salter, of Bermondsey, a Friend and a Socialist, at the end of 1916 wrote a long letter on this very point to the Archbishop, in the course of which he said:

DR. ALFRED SALTER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Nov. 27, 1916

'. . . I cannot believe that Your Grace can approve of this set and deliberate persecution of men on account of their religious faith, and yet I cannot learn that you have used your powerful position to put an end to it. It is a fact that, at the present minute in England, there are more men in prison for the sake of their religious convictions than at any time for centuries past. Surely this is an extraordinary comment on the attitude of organised Christianity in this country! Cannot Your Grace take steps to impress on the Government the wickedness, and at the same time the uselessness, of attempting to force men to do that which they believe to be wrong?

The Archbishop did not send a long argumentative letter in reply. He sent for the writer, and they talked for an hour. In describing the interview the Archbishop wrote to a friend: 'I tried a little to corner him as to the length to which his opinions would carry him, but he practically shrunk from nothing. I wrote down the following and read it to him and he said it expressed his views—though of course he would add other things:

If the Government were acting properly now, according to my view it would allow any man who objects to enlistment for whatever reason to go freely on his way without restraint or internment. I say this even if such freedom involve (1) his effective efforts being used to dissuade other men who feel any qualms on the subject from taking their part in carrying out the Nation's purpose in this War; (2) his competing successfully if he can (like the men who are over military age) with the trade or occupation of those who are at a disadvantage because they have accepted service in the Army or munition works.'

At the same time, in spite of this 'cornering', the Archbishop was a good deal moved by a particularly bad story Dr. Salter told him of a young Bermondsey man who, after his plea as a

conscientious objector had failed, was arrested, taken to a depot, ordered to wear khaki—and on his refusal stripped, and had khaki put on him by force. The young man was at the moment awaiting court martial:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. W. H. LONG

1st December, 1916.

I am not sure whether you are the person to whom I ought to write about Conscientious Objectors. I am not proposing to raise a discussion on the whole question, but from the many interviews I have had with members of the Government, and from what was said in the House of Lords on two or three different occasions, I had thought that we had now done with the question of sending these hopelessly unreasonable people to a Camp to be put under military authorities and forced into khaki and so on. I have repeatedly stated this, and yesterday I was nonplussed by receiving at the hands of Dr. Salter, the well-known Socialist doctor in South London, a man of high character who is over military age and is a pacifist, a statement which I took down from him and which I enclose. Please observe that my point is not the imprisonment of these men but the placing of them under military rule. This seems to me to be as irrational as it is cruel

Memorandum.

The following statement was made to me on November 30th, 1916, by Dr. Salter, J.P., of 5 Storks Road, Bermondsey:

S. N., —— Street, Bermondsey, is the third son of a widow. His two elder brothers are in prison for refusal to serve. He is not a Quaker but he is a Pacifist. He was brought before a Tribunal and raised on religious grounds objection to serve. His plea was rejected. He appealed to the Higher Tribunal which also rejected it. No offer of alternative service was made to him, though Dr. Salter thinks that if it had been made he would have rejected it. He was arrested and taken to a depot on Monday, November 27th. He was there ordered to wear khaki; he refused; he was stripped and the clothing forced upon him; he is now awaiting court martial.

Mr. Long in reply wrote a general statement of the position under the Military Service Acts, not very sympathetic—and the conclusion of his letter is a sufficient indication of ordinary public opinion at the time:

The Rt. Hon. W. H. Long *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

Local Government Board, Whitehall. 4th December, 1916.

. . . If the matter had to be discussed again, I do not think the House of Commons, or the Country, would regard as tolerable the degree of latitude which we have allowed to all who allege a conscientious objection to military service. I am pretty sure that public opinion would demand much more drastic treatment of these people than the Government have been willing to mete out to them, and that in their own interest it is not desirable to disturb the present practice.

The Archbishop wrote a few months later to Lord Milner, asking more for arbitrarily exercised common sense than for a change of the law:

The Archbishop of Canterbury *to* Viscount Milner

21 May, 1917.

I understand (rightly or wrongly) that you are grappling with the question of the conscientious objector—one of the most difficult of present problems—and that some official discussion on the whole matter is imminent in Government circles.

I hope you will not deem me intrusive if I write to you to say that my view, often expressed in the House of Lords in favour of a large commonsense attitude towards these men, as being politic and desirable, has been greatly strengthened of late by what I have been learning about the men in question.

Stephen Hobhouse is of course the most conspicuous instance of a really fine fellow, who is, or has been, suffering in mind and body on account of 'crankiness' which is in no sense mischievous in itself. But there are a good many more, who could not be ranked alongside of him with respect to their nobility of service in days gone by, but who are really as conscientious as he is and are certainly not to be 'tamed' or converted by mere severity. I do honestly think that the matter is one for the exercise of a rather arbitrary discretion in favour of men whose supposed 'persecution' is doing far more mischief than would be done by the relaxation of logical, and technically defensible, sternness, and the granting of release on condition that it is not used for promoting anti-war policy.

No mere insistence on a logical application of military law will, so far as I can judge, *ever* meet these cases, and I have now a rather extensive knowledge of them.

Of course this is only my own opinion, and I have no right to speak as a representative of others, but I am constantly surprised to find how many 'stiffish' men are being led to the same conclusion.

I hold no brief for the men in question. I regard them as utterly misguided and unreasonable in the riding of their hobby. But sometimes a little arbitrarily exercised commonsense will solve a problem insoluble by either law or logic.

III

The Archbishop's 'common-sense' way of looking at things was also called into play this year on the Sunday question. Early in 1917 a considerable anxiety arose as to the food supply of the country.

There was a late frost, and it was urged by agriculturalists that Sundays as well as week-days should be used for tilling. Mr. Bonar Law came to see the Archbishop on February 26. The Prime Minister had, it appeared, promised Mr. Prothero, the Minister of Agriculture, to make a speech in the House of Commons urging the necessity of sowing during the coming season with the greatest possible zeal both on week-days and Sundays. But Bonar Law was asked to find out from Dr. J. H. Shakespeare, the President of the Free Church Council, whether Nonconformists would resent Sunday sowing. He said that he ought also in that case to ask the Archbishop. Dr. Shakespeare had replied that many Nonconformists would resent Sunday sowing. Bonar Law asked the Archbishop what he thought, and whether he would be inclined to stimulate Sunday sowing himself. He replied that it was outside his sphere to do this, but, if he were asked for his opinion on the subject, he would gladly give it, and that he certainly approved of Sunday sowing in this emergency. Bonar Law thereupon said that he would get a question asked in the House of Commons, the form of the question being agreed with the Archbishop, and went away happy. It may be added that the Archbishop's advice had already been asked by various Bishops, as Sunday labour on the farm had become an immediate practical problem. After further communication with Mr. Prothero, the following correspondence appeared in the Press:

The RT. HON. R. PROTHERO *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

14th March, 1917.

The delay which has been caused by the frost in ploughing land for the harvest of 1917 makes every day of the utmost importance to the food supply of the country. In these circumstances of great urgency and national necessity, I should be very much obliged if you would give me your opinion on the question of tilling soil for food on Sundays.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. R. PROTHERO

14th March, 1917.

I thank you for your letter about Sunday labour in the fields during these vitally important weeks. Our inheritance of the English Sunday, with its privilege of abstention from all ordinary work, is a God-given boon of inestimable value, and I desire to maintain and safeguard it in every reasonable way; but occasions may arise when, for the well-being of the people of our land, exceptional obligations are laid upon us. As Minister of Agriculture, you assure us that such an emergency has now arisen, and that the security of the nation's food supply may largely depend upon the labour which can be devoted to the land in the next few weeks. This being so, we are, I think, following the guidance given in the Gospel if, in such a case, we make a temporary departure from our rule. I have no hesitation in saying that, in the need which these weeks present, men and women may with a clear conscience do field work on Sundays Care would of course, be taken to safeguard from compulsion those who would feel such action on their part to be wrong, or whose health would be seriously endangered by the extra strain.

The incident is worthy of notice, as showing the strength of the public opinion in favour of Sunday rest, and the need which the civil power felt for assistance from the highest ecclesiastical authority in countenancing a departure even for a season from its observance.[1]

The Archbishop's attitude was approved by the main body of Christian opinion, but there were some notable protests and a very large number of letters and resolutions found their way

[1] The Roman Catholic Church through Cardinal Bourne, in *The Times* on March 22, advised 'That all the while the present national emergency lasts Catholics may lawfully engage in necessary agricultural work on Sundays provided they do not on this account neglect their essential religious duties'.

to Lambeth, while some very strange comments were made on both sides of the controversy by the Press. Thus the *Evening Standard and St. James' Gazette*[1] said:

> The Archbishop of Canterbury has taken the first definite step to put the Church in line with the people as regards the practical side of the war. He expresses the view that with a clear conscience Church people, men and women, can do field work on Sundays.
>
> We welcome this decision, not only because it has both common sense and Christianity on its side, but because it goes some way towards breaking down the aloofness of the Church on the great question of the day.

The Archbishop did not publicly notice the various remonstrances and complaints, except in one instance when a letter appeared in *The Times* of April 20 from Dr. R. F. Horton, an eminent Nonconformist minister in Hampstead, who had co-operated with the Archbishop in many departments of social service.

The REV. DR. R. F. HORTON, *to the* EDITOR *of* '*The Times*'

20 April, 1917.

May I through your columns address a question to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. When and how is the suspended Fourth Commandment to come again into operation? It was wonderful to see how swiftly and effectively his Grace's dispensation worked. At once the churches were half-emptied and the fields were filled with toilers on the day of rest. But when and how will the old sanction be restored? It is easier to shatter than to restore those 'unwritten and unfailing ordinances of the Gods', as Sophocles called them, which men cherish by an instinct and surrender only by the sophistication of an earthly authority.

The Bishop of my own district told Churchmen to 'do their religious duties' on Sunday morning and then go into the fields to dig and to sow for the rest of the day. Unfortunately, one of those religious duties is to receive the Holy Communion; and that service begins with the recitation of the Ten Commandments and the humble prayer after each for an inclination to keep it. The men, therefore, of my neighbourhood have been called on to listen to this Fourth Commandment: 'Six days shalt thou labour; the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God, in it thou shalt do no work.' Their attention may even have been called to the commandment in Ex. xxxiv. 21, that the law is to apply even in the

[1] March 15, 1917.

times of sowing and harvest. Then, having humbly asked God for mercy and an inclination to keep the commandment, they are to go out and—break it.

The Archbishop replied as follows in a letter to Dr. Horton (published in *The Times* on April 28):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. DR. R. F. HORTON

21 April, 1917.

I read with great interest, and, I confess, with some bewilderment, your letter in *The Times* of yesterday, noting especially what it leaves unsaid. You and I are ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Yet in your handling of a subject with which Our Lord dealt so often, I find no reference to His teaching or example. Our thoughts are directed by you, most rightly, to Sinai—they are even directed to Sophocles—but not to the Son of Man, Who, as Lord of the Sabbath, taught His disciples to use that day, should special need require, for acts of beneficent service.

Your letter refers to the Sabbath, which I gather that you would bid us observe in literal and exact compliance with the directions of the Pentateuch With regard to the kindred, but not identical, subject of Sunday observance, I am surprised that anyone—least of all a friend like yourself, with whom I have worked in this matter—should suppose me to be among those who regard it lightly. For many years I have been strenuous—and perforce prominent—in the endeavour to safeguard the Lord's Day. I hope to be strenuous to the end.

The Archbishop then reproduced the correspondence which had taken place five weeks previously between himself and Mr. Prothero, as quoted above, and continued:

This counsel I believe to be in full accord with what Our Lord taught us by word and act. Does the 'withered hand' differ in principle from the field rendered useless for lack of vitalizing seed? I have tried, throughout my ministry, to teach what I believe my Divine Master would have me teach. Far back in the dawn of Israel's history the people were Divinely taught that, if the life was to be maintained at its best, there must be some part of it kept free from the dust and the toil of ordinary days; and Israel grew to a mighty tree, and to a place among the world's peoples, with Sabbath observance at the very heart of its corporate life. Sunday, it has been well said, 'is no mere revival of the Jewish Sabbath upon a different day. It commemorates a different fact. It is

permeated by a different idea.' Its primary and characteristic observance is worship. The privilege, the duty, of rest, vitally important at it is, came in separately. It is impossible to exaggerate the responsibility resting upon every man and woman in the Church of Christ for making right use of the Lord's Day, for safeguarding so inestimable a thing from being lightly tampered with, for cherishing and honouring it for everybody's good. The Lord's Day is no mere accidental observance, which might be dropped without interfering with the Christian system. It has been inwrought in the life of the Church of Christ from Apostolic days, and the principle which it enshrines, the principle of rest as well as worship, goes back and back into the very origins of God's revelation and God's word. And Our Lord trusts us to use it reverently as a possession majestical in its history, and practical in its effective power over the working days of our whole life—trusts us to use it unselfishly, as something which belongs equally to us all, as Christians, and must be so handled by us as to keep it safe for those who shall come after, and for those among us who, in our complex social life, may be least able, by independent action, to keep their treasure unharmed. That is how the Sunday, God's gift, presents itself to my mind.

The circumstances to-day are unique. By those who have a right to speak, we are assured that we are standing at an hour of tremendous emergency, and at such a time it may be right to sacrifice for a while a portion of our privilege, and to ask God's blessing on the sacrifice. Take it in this spirit, and I fear no ill result.

You tell us that the publication of my letter to Mr. Prothero had the result that 'at once the churches were half-emptied and the fields were filled with toilers'. It may be so in Hampstead. I have not heard of similar experience elsewhere. But I believe that, when, as a minister of Christ, I answered to the best of my power the question legitimately asked of me, I was helping to bring wholesome relief to some, perhaps to many, honest Christian people who were perplexed as to their duty in these weeks of stress and might welcome an expression of opinion from myself.

Dr. Horton, in thanking the Archbishop for his letter, in a private note said:

The Rev. Dr. R. F. Horton, *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

April 23, 1917.

What I wanted to elicit from you was the authoritative judgment that the Fourth Commandment holds, and that its suspension was only for a definite time, viz six weeks.

He had hoped that the Archbishop would have seen his way 'to doing something more decisive and effective'. But he said that he would send the Archbishop's letter to *The Times*, and added, 'as a personal vindication it is absolutely effective'.

IV

The demand made on previous occasions for a Day of National Humiliation and Prayer by Royal Proclamation, was pressed again with extraordinary emphasis in 1917 It was not enough, declared the World's Evangelical Alliance and its friends, that the Churches should call to prayer; the State itself must act. The Archbishop gave many interviews on the subject to Mr. H. M. Gooch, its Secretary, and others, and was at great pains to represent their views to the King and to the Prime Minister. He appreciated the earnestness of the wish, even while hardly himself convinced that the proposal was desirable; and he went out of his way to try to learn the views not only of religious leaders but of serious statesmen. In the end the Archbishop succeeded in buttonholing Lloyd George on June 20th, who gave his decision and refused to advise any intervention by the State:

> I had button-holed him firmly at the Luncheon to Balfour and insisted on an interview if possible to-day. Accordingly I went to Downing Street half an hour later, and he was perfectly friendly and gave a full hearing. He is evidently puzzled, but he has in his own mind resolved not to ask for a Day of Prayer by Royal Proclamation or to advise the King to ask for it. He is quite clear that it would be misunderstood both by our enemies and by our Allies. The anxieties are very great both in the East—Mesopotamia, Syria, etc.—and with regard to Submarines. Russia is collapsing, he thinks hopelessly, though, as he added, 'They are a very unexpected people, and something may occur, and I believe they are going to put up a fight next week'. In view of all these things he is distinctly of opinion that it would be unwise for the State to take the line suggested, and he is vehemently supported in this view by Bonar Law.
>
> 'What then', I asked, 'about the Deputation? Mr. Gooch wants me to head a Deputation to you and is awaiting my reply before asking you to receive it. The point of the Deputation will be this: We want you to bring about on State authority the observance, not of a new day, but of the first Sunday in August, the third anniversary of the War. Of course we shall observe it, but

what we want is that the observance shall be of a State initiative and of a State character. Whether it is the Government, or the King, or the Privy Council, is a small matter provided it is the State. But we should further regard it as essential that the authorities who thus permit it, should themselves play the game—i e. show that they care about it by themselves attending, etc., and making it really the act of the State or country as such. This is what I should say if I came on the Deputation.'

Lloyd George answered 'I earnestly hope you will not come. I do not think I could refuse to receive a Deputation from the Alliance, but I shall certainly not grant their request. In these circumstances, it would put me in an almost intolerable position if you came and pressed me to do it and I had to decline. You see my difficulties, and I hope you will help me. I do not ask you to promise that no Bishop would come (that would not be fair), but if you or the Archbishop of York came, my position would be extraordinarily difficult.' I replied to the effect 'That is all very well, but as I think that some "day" of the kind is desirable I do not want to be left under the imputation that the lack of it is due to my having failed the Deputation, and that had I been there it would have been granted'. He answered 'I will take care of that. I should tell the Deputation that I have been in communication with you, and that you have put the wish before me which they express, but that I have explained to you, as I will explain to them, that I think it undesirable'. He then repeated again his strong feeling about the certainty of misunderstanding, and his hope that the Day would be observed on the initiative of the Churches as in former years He added further 'It would be quite different if the State had asked for this each year from the beginning. Then there would be nothing exceptional about our doing it just now. But at a time when our anxieties are so grave, and when our enemies are trying to exaggerate them and make out that things are worse for us than they are, they would leap at the opportunity of saying "See the plight to which they are reduced. We told you so." For these reasons I am quite clear that we ought not to do it.'

V

This year the Forms of Prayer issued by authority for use, where the Ordinary permits, on August 4 and 5, contained for the first time a prayer for the Departed. It ran as follows:

Almighty and Everlasting God, unto whom no prayer is ever made without hope of thy compassion: We remember before thee

our brethren who have laid down their lives in the cause wherein their King and country sent them. Grant that they, who have readily obeyed the call of those to whom thou hast given authority on earth, may be accounted worthy of a place among thy faithful servants in the kingdom of heaven; and give both to them and to us forgiveness of all our sins, and an ever increasing understanding of thy will; for his sake who loved us and gave himself for us, thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

The following letters passed:

The BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL[1] *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Leighton Vicarage, Welshport.
July 17, 1917.

I have received, this morning, the Forms of Prayer for use on August 4 and 5. On page 11, at the foot, appears a Prayer for the Dead more definite and precise than any that has yet appeared

I know how pressed and harassed your Grace is, and I am exceedingly unwilling to add to your burden and worry at such a time as this But I think that your Grace can hardly be aware of the strong feeling of distress and resentment which the insertion of such Prayers is arousing in the minds of a large number of Church people, and those not the least loyal. May I venture to suggest that an alternative Form be issued by authority with a *Thanks*giving for the Dead, as in the Prayer for the Church Militant.

Your Grace is so just and reasonable that I am sure you will try to meet the need and anxiety of those who have always believed that the Church of England does not authorize the public use of Prayers for the Dead, and that there is no authority for their use in Holy Scriptures.

Forgive me, your Grace, for writing so frankly. We are drawing too near the rocks for me to keep silent.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL

18th July 1917.

I am grateful to you for writing to me frankly about the difficulty you feel respecting the Service authorized for use on August 5th 'where the Ordinary permits'. I was keenly awake to the point of the difficulty which you feel about the mention of those departed, and I took special pains that nothing which goes a hair's breadth beyond what is clearly furnished in the Prayer Book should appear in the Office for Holy Communion, which will presumably be used

[1] Dr. F. J. Chavasse.

in most churches. I did not feel that in all the circumstances a quite similar difficulty need be felt with regard to the Supplementary Prayers to be used, as is specially stated, 'at the discretion of the Minister' as well as being subject to the permission of the Ordinary. Even here I was very anxious not to go beyond what has, I think, become very usual in churches of all schools of thought, including very markedly some of the most Evangelical of our brethren. I do not think that the particular prayer to which you call attention ought to present difficulties to anybody. It might have been better had the comma after the word 'they', in the penultimate line of page 11, not been there, and I am a little inclined to doubt whether it would be found in the original manuscript. My own feeling was that we were really suggesting a prayer which would meet the wishes of almost everybody, for it must be remembered that there are hundreds of thousands who are eagerly anxious for some prayer which can to them, as they use it, convey the idea of intercession with Our Heavenly Father on behalf of those whose life is now going on beyond our sight. I have passionate appeals to that effect, and it goes to my heart not to be able to meet their wishes more fully, believing as I do that such prayers are not forbidden by any doctrine of the Church of England, although their use liturgically was for very obvious reasons practically abolished. Surely, with the Rubric which stands at the top of page 9,[1] we may leave it to the discretion of the Minister to use or not to use the particular prayer you mention Those who feel as you do about it would obviously not use it. Others, including as I know a great many men of marked Evangelical opinion, would thankfully use it; and of course if any Bishop feels that he would desire that it should not be used, it is easy for him to say that he authorises the use of the Form *with the exception of that prayer*, which he thinks undesirable. Have we not thus really done our best to meet the varying wishes of devout people? The criticisms which I receive are much more frequently directed against our Forms on account of the absence of the sort of Prayers for the Dead which I have declined to sanction for liturgical use. I greatly hope that what I have said may to some extent meet your wishes.

The Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Knox), alone of the Bishops, joined his brother of Liverpool in the protest. The Archbishop had already, at the end of 1914[2] stated his own views on the

[1] 'Here may be added, at the discretion of the Minister, any of the Prayers which follow, or any other of the special Prayers already issued by authority'

[2] The following is an extract from a sermon preached by the Archbishop at All

permissibility of Prayers for the Departed, but it was not till 1917 that the official forms included such prayer.

VI

In the spring of 1917 a new and more violent agitation for reprisals was started in the Press and continued till the end of the year. Public indignation had been stirred by a succession of attacks aimed, it was held, simply at the civilian population or those unable to protect themselves in the Channel or on the high seas. Thus, at the beginning of February, the Anchor liner *California* was torpedoed without warning, on a voyage from New York to Glasgow, with 43 lives lost; the White Star liner *Afric* a few days later, with 25 lives lost, and the Cunard liner *Laconia* at the end of the month. 'Bombs were also dropped from the air on the Kent coast towns and elsewhere, in March; but it was not till two British hospital ships were torpedoed without warning during the same month that a deliberate retaliation took place. On April 14, a large squadron of British and French aeroplanes bombarded Freiburg, and the attack was stated to be by way of reprisal for that outrage. The Archbishop's aid was at once invoked to protest. He made a speech in the House of Lords on May 2, asking His Majesty's Government whether it was possible, without detriment to public interests, to make any statement

Hallows, Barking by the Tower, November 2, 1914. It was much quoted at the time '. . . And surely we are right to be on our guard lest in one who thus reverently, trustfully, thinks and prays and wonders, we discourage the upraising of the devout soul in prayer for the loved one out of sight. We are not forgetful of the long and mischievous abuse of that devotion in the later mediaeval days until, as your first Warden-Vicar has written, "It might almost be said that the main object of religion in the fifteenth century had been to deliver souls out of the ever-heightening horrors of Purgatory and to ensure the living against incurring them". Nay, we have not forgotten or ignored the same abuses still alive, still in some fields prevalent—the dogmatism about things we cannot know, and the perils which such abuse involves . . But surely now there is place for a gentler recognition of the instinctive, the natural, the loyal craving of the bereaved, and the abuses of the chantry system and the extravagances of Tetzel need not now, nearly four centuries afterwards, thwart or hinder the reverent, the absolutely trustful prayer of a wounded spirit who feels it natural and helpful to pray for him whom we shall not greet on earth again, but who, in his Father's loving keeping, still lives, and, as we may surely believe, still grows from strength to strength in truer purity and in deepened reverence and love ' Few things of the kind were more remarkable than the great change effected during the first year of the war in popular opinion, and church practice, with regard to Prayer for the Dead In 1914 such Prayers were most uncommon by 1918 their use was widespread

respecting the adoption of a policy of reprisal, at Freiburg or elsewhere, in retaliation for the outrages perpetrated by the German fleet. He spoke of his personal interest, since 'no corner of England has suffered in its open towns and innocent populations so severely as the Isle of Thanet' in his own diocese. But he maintained:

> I do know that the Christian judgement of England—and I do not shrink from using that term in its fullest sense—is that when we come out of this war (scarred and wounded, yes; bereft of some of our best and noblest and most hopeful, yes), we mean to come out with clean hands and with the right to feel sure that in the coming years, whatever record leaps to light, we never shall be ashamed.

On the previous day the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation had reaffirmed the Resolution adopted on February 17, 1916; and the Archbishop was also able to quote the Free Church Council as opposed to any such measure of reprisal. The Archbishop was heard with respect by the Lords, and Lord Curzon in replying for the Government was more half-hearted than some of the supporters of retaliation approved. A long correspondence with all sorts of people followed. Letters reached him from a supporter of reprisals like Hall Caine, who argued that 'to justify war and to condemn its natural if tragical developments is to strain at the gnat and swallow the camel'; as well as from General Bramwell Booth, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. Horton, and very many besides. In addition he and his friends were the object of violent attack in the Press from the Duke of Argyll, who said: 'The war is not going to be won by going back to coracles and arrows', and bade 'the bishops stick to their belfries, and cobblers to their lasts'; from Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, who wrote a series of eloquent letters on 'The uses of hatred'; from Sir Henry T. Eve, Eden Philpotts, and a host of minor but impassioned antagonists. The following letters may be quoted as showing the Archbishop's own view:

SIR THOMAS BARLOW *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

20 June, 1917.

Comments in the Press and elsewhere show, I think, imperfect apprehension of your attitude towards 'reprisals'. Are you willing to tell me what is the fundamental principle which you maintain

ought to be considered? Such a statement, if published, would, I believe, help many people in the formation of a reasoned judgment on a very difficult question.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* SIR THOMAS BARLOW

Lambeth Palace, 21st June, 1917.

You are right, I think, in believing that what I have said and written in regard to Reprisals has been curiously and even persistently misunderstood. The question of our moral duty in the matter is admittedly a difficult one, and it has a margin line which may easily be blurred. The foundation principle, however, does not seem to me to be obscure. My own point is best expressed in the words of a Resolution[1] passed, on my motion, by the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury. We there, 'while fully recognising that it does not lie within the province of Bishops to express any opinion upon matters purely military', recorded our conviction 'that the principles of morality forbid a policy of reprisal which has, as a deliberate object, the killing and wounding of non-combatants, and [this House] believes that the adoption of such a mode of retaliation, even for barbarous outrages, would permanently lower the standard of honourable conduct between nation and nation'.

The key of the situation lies in the intention of the act—not an uncertain hope of ultimate consequence, but its immediate practical intention.

Of course in one sense 'reprisal' is of the essence of war. But what kind of reprisal? We bombard a fortified town. This must often involve risk to innocent non-combatants. But that is not its object. Its object is to harm the enemy's combatant forces. The incidental harming of non-combatants is lamentable, and it will, so far as military conditions permit, be avoided. But it is sometimes inevitable.

Quite different from this, is an attack the direct object of which is to harm or kill non-combatants, either for reasons of vengeance, or in order to promote terror, or in the hope of deterring the enemy from perpetrating outrages That is the kind of 'reprisal' in which some people wish us in England to indulge.

Its advocates speak sometimes in general terms which disguise or evade the ultimate meaning. Others are more explicit. In the natural, the inevitable, strain of these sorrows, sorrows whose depth baffles expression, men and women write excitedly. But it is well to try to realise what their words mean. I am urged, for

[1] February 17, 1916. See p. 777.

example, to see to it that we insist upon 'reprisals, swift, bloody and unrelenting. Let gutters run with German blood. Let us smash to pulp the German old men, women, and children', and so on. Do those who describe the terrible sight of little London children lying dead really want to see little German children lying slaughtered in like manner by us?

In my belief such action on our part, if we were so mistaken as to adopt it, would be altogether futile as a deterrent: the Germans would always out-distance us in ruthlessness. But my belief or conjecture on that question is valueless: nor can the opinion of anyone about it be more than surmise. Of this I am quite certain: many thousands of the best and most thoughtful people in this country are resolved that, so far as we civilians are allowed any say in the matter, we mean to support the prosecution of the war with every power we have and every sacrifice that we can make, but we mean to come out of it with untainted honour and with clean hands. We are determined to leave to the Germans the unenviable monopoly of an infamous disregard of what is honourable and decent in warfare. We absolutely decline to degrade ourselves to that level. Suppose we were to act otherwise; suppose our righteous wrath against these outrages were to provoke us to retaliating in kind either on prisoners or on the harmless inhabitants of unfortified towns and villages Two results would follow. In the first place, history would draw no difference between the nations which had acted thus alike and had placed themselves on one level. In the next place, if another war should come (God forbid it), it would doubtless begin by outrages of this sort, as the perpetration of them could no longer be regarded as outside the pale. The whole moral currency of international life would have been debased. I am persuaded that the Christian judgement and purpose of England is that when we come out of this appalling war we must come out of it unstained by these atrocities.

That is my position. I believe it to be the position of the best and most thoughtful of our fellow-countrymen—sailors, soldiers, and civilians alike.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* HALL CAINE, ESQ.

12th July 1917.

I thank you for your courtesy in sending me a copy of your appeal to German Mothers. I hope it may do great good, if it ever reaches them, but my fear would be that that is unlikely. I note with great interest what you say about Reprisals and about the opinion of most good and reasonable people. I am, I confess,

somewhat appalled by the letters which pour in upon me in quite extraordinary numbers, breathing blood and slaughter, not against combatants but against the people of Germany if only they can be got at, with a special wish for the destruction of women and children. Of course, as you know, I have never said a syllable against Reprisals in the sense of our retaliating upon combatants. Unhappily war consists, and necessarily consists, of such retaliation. I have chosen my words carefully throughout, deprecating simply such kind of reprisals as have for their deliberate object the killing of non-combatants, not incidentally but of set purpose. I trust that you will take any step that may be possible to get your appeal to German women made known in Germany.

HALL CAINE, ESQ., *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Heath Brow, Hampstead Heath, N.W. 3. July 16, 1917.

I thank you very warmly for your kind letter. The Foreign Office undertook the distribution of my letter to the Mothers of Germany, and it went out in about half a dozen languages (German among them) to all the neutral countries, and particularly the cantons of Switzerland, which are in closest touch with Germany, and have newpapers in the German language crossing the frontier. In addition to this they have adopted other measures for the distribution of the letter from the air, over nearly all the territory that lies within easy reach. Therefore, there is perhaps some reason to think that the letter will reach its destination. Whether the German mother is open to approach on the side of her purely human emotions, when they are opposed to what appears to be the political interests of her country, remains to be seen. I have, however, immense faith in the power of the human instincts, and the response which has already reached me from women of many nationalities seems to justify it.

I am interested, but not surprised, to gather that you have had a flood of correspondence on the subject of reprisals, and that much of this has taken the form of a passionate cry for revenge. I have, on my part, received a vast number of letters, some of them denunciatory of my own views, some intelligently appreciative, but many breathing evil passions which certainly never entered into my calculation as the natural sequel to my teaching. I confess to feeling a certain alarm at the spirit of revenge which has been awakened in our people, particularly among the women of the humbler and less educated classes.

If you could have gone down to the districts of Hoxton and Stoke Newington within a few hours of the last raid on London, you

would have been able to realise, as no letters, however vehement, could show, how intense is the desire on the part of the humbler mother to revenge herself for the loss of her children by these brutal methods of warfare. I would almost suggest to you, if I may, that in the event (which God forbid) of another such air raid occurring, you should drive down to the densely populated districts in which the worst slaughter has more than once occurred. I feel quite certain that you would be treated with the utmost respect. It is conceivable that some of the more passionate in the dense crowds of women might shriek and yell and curse, but they are, after all, a very simple-hearted and almost child-like race under their ugly outer cloak of blasphemy. I am sure it would interest and move you to realise how deep and true is the human feeling that lies beneath.

More than once I have felt the impulse to speak to the crowds down there, and I feel certain that if you were to do so, saying just the right word at the hot moment, it would have an immensely beneficial effect.

I trust you will not think it presumptuous if I say that again and again at such moments of great national emotion, I have told myself that the Head of a great Church is in the position of wielding power immeasurably greater than that of any statesman or other public person whatsoever. Perhaps you will remember what a tremendous effect was produced by Cardinal Manning when he went down to the Docks at a moment of great excitement and public danger.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* HALL CAINE, ESQ.

Private. 17th July 1917.

I thank you much for your full and courteous letter. It interests me, and indeed it is a satisfaction also to me, to learn that you share my feeling of alarm at the spirit of revenge which has been awakened in our people by the German outrages. I am certain that it is our duty to allay this so far as possible, even while we encourage to the utmost of our power the due use of military reprisal on military objectives. The more vigorously such reprisal, in the true sense of the word, can be carried on, the better ground we shall have for making appeal against what I at least think to be the wholly mischievous form of reprisal which has as its deliberate object the killing or maiming of non-combatants.

With regard to what you say about our acquainting ourselves on the spot with the feelings of those who are subjected to this suffering, I have made this from the first my endeavour. In each

raid with which I have had anything to do—e g. at Folkestone, at Ramsgate, at Croydon, and elsewhere—I have tried to get as quickly as possible into touch with the sufferers and with their homes. In some of these places I think I saw everyone who had been wounded, and a great proportion of those who had been bereaved, visiting their houses and cheering and encouraging them to the best of my power. I am not certain that it would clearly be best that I should do this in East London, far from my own house and outside the area of my own immediate jurisdiction, if (or I fear I must say when) another raid of a like sort occurs. My relation to South London is a little different, and it would be my hope that I might be on the spot as speedily as possible should such incidents occur in this part of London. I am of course very familiar with its poorest regions and with the homes of the people there.

To Dr. Horton, with whom he had engaged in an earlier correspondence on the Sunday question, he also wrote in October, in response to his appeal for an authoritative lead 'against this vindictive passion of our political leaders':

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* DR. R. F. HORTON

11th October 1917.

I am exceedingly glad to receive your letter of yesterday. I share to a great extent your feelings on the question of Reprisals. But it seems to me that it would be superfluous at this moment for me to speak again unless someone else raises a point calling for my answer in Parliament or elsewhere. I am regarded apparently as the representative mouthpiece of those who object to reprisals undertaken with the deliberate object of injuring non-combatants, and I am in consequence the recipient of a continuous shower of protests, denunciations, and often virulent abuse, from every part of England, especially from London. I am said to be the cause of the Air Raids, to be in league with the Germans, and to be responsible for the death of those who have suffered, and so on. Devout prayers are expressed that I (and occasionally my wife, to whom they sometimes write) may be the next person to be blown to pieces. It is all coupled, strangely enough, with my action in approving a certain amount of agricultural work on Sundays as an emergency measure. In short, it is now taken as a recognized fact, both by friends and opponents, that I represent in the fullest degree that school of protesters: indeed even Government authorities and other public men speak to me as the representative who has (as one of them put it to me) burned his boats upon this question. I think therefore that I have said my say and, so to speak,

nailed my colours both adequately and with sufficient publicity. Another protest by me would have no fresh weight at all: whatever I could say I have said, and everybody knows it. If independent testimony is now borne backing up what I have said it may be most valuable. My letter to Sir Thomas Barlow (in *The Times* of June 22nd) expresses my opinion exactly, and I have repeatedly referred my correspondents to that letter.

CHAPTER LII

THE RUSSIAN COLLAPSE

When a world, not yet doomed for death, is rushing down to ever-deeper Baseness and Confusion, it is a dire necessity of Nature's to bring in her ARISTOCRACIES, her BEST, even by forcible methods. When their descendants or representatives cease entirely to *be* the Best, Nature's poor world will very soon rush down again to Baseness, and it becomes a dire Necessity of Nature's to cast them out. Hence French Revolutions, Five-point Charters, Democracies, and a mournful list of *Etceteras*, in these our afflicted times. THOMAS CARLYLE, *Past and Present*, III. XIII.

IN preaching at Westminster Abbey on Sunday, August 5, 1917, the third anniversary of the War, in the presence of the King, the Prime Minister, and most members of the Government, the Archbishop spoke of the need of patience. His text was Hebrews xii. 1: 'Let us run with patience the race that is set before us.' After the service he had a long talk with Lloyd George, and was with him over an hour. Lloyd George spoke about many things: the vacant Bishopric of Hereford; the Archbishop's sermon; the situation in Russia; the dangerous discontent of the French army; the impossibility of effective American help before next year; and the possibility of years of war, a new Napoleonic war, with England as the only people who really were fighting consistently and bravely. He was especially full of Russia, and when the Archbishop asked him whether the warning in his speech the previous day meant that Russia might collapse altogether and leave the Allies without her aid—the Archbishop's note proceeds:

> He turned round in his walk about the room, and standing still and lifting up his hand said, 'If Russia collapses completely, the entire world situation is changed and we must make new arrangements altogether'. I think these were his words. I pressed, as to what these new arrangements might be, and he said, 'I think we should have to make peace forthwith with Austria and Turkey on any obtainable terms.'

What was the Archbishop's own attitude to the Russian Revolution, and to Peace during these months? For answer we can give one or two significant illustrations.

I

The Tsar was deposed on March 15, 1917. These two letters to Miss Blanche Sitwell, one of the Archbishop's oldest friends, show one side of the picture:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* MISS BLANCHE SITWELL

Tremans, Horsted Keynes, Sussex.
7 April 1917.

I wish I could feel quite as hopeful as you do about the doings in Russia. One can't help recalling the way in which the French Revolution—with which you contrast it—began, as people all pointed out, with an absence of bloodshed and an apparent sobriety of Liberal purpose. God grant that Russia may be enabled to escape, or that she has even now escaped, the blood-thirstiness which is apt to enthuse Revolutionaries. I feel a bit anxious about Fleet and Army, though one mustn't be led to look too *sombrely* at what ought clearly to be so glorious and glad an emancipation from archaic ways, and from *misrulers*. I am in fullest sympathy with the averred aims of those who have now risen, and I hope it may turn out that to those aims and that line of action they adhere.

I have read these *Nation* letters and I return them. Surely it is hardly necessary for Jack Hutchinson to bid us eschew the bad and foolish drivel of the few old ex-officers, etc., who look on the war as a sort of game played for our country's, and other countries' amusement

But there is much in these letters with which I agree very fully. We have certainly managed to *muddle* the question of the conscientious objector. But he does make our helping of him nearly impossible. When a man (one of those these letters mention) won't help to make bandages for the sick, or food for the hungry, or relief packets for the destitute, and then refuses to let the doctor examine him even superficially, and yet claims the rights and properties of a *citizen*, for whom the State is responsible, he puts despair into the hearts of those who want to help him, and have spent day after day trying to do it. But enough of that.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* MISS BLANCHE SITWELL

Old Palace, Canterbury.
May 28, 1917.

I entirely share the opinions expressed by (? Miss) Leigh if she has really been so unlucky in the Churches she has attended. It

is *monstrous* how stupid and unimaginative a good many of the clergy are, and how they are missing great opportunities of being helpful at this time. But surely, surely there are scores or hundreds of parishes everywhere where that is not so. I have any amount of abusive letters and critical letters about it all, and that is right, for I am fair game, and the right target for folk to shoot at. But I have the other side too in abundance. Of course it would be splendid if the clergy were all able to be pointed, suggestive, eloquent, up to date, kindly and profound; but how are we to expect to get that sort of man everywhere as a parson when 'we have only got the laity to draw upon'! I don't excuse it a bit. It is heart breaking. But it is only a very limited number of men, *of any sort of class or profession*, who would be fit at such a juncture to do all that is needed, and possibly what (Miss?) Leigh calls a 'pro German' service, which sends her out of the Church, would be regarded by *you* as the sort of fair-minded unbigoted thing you specially liked! Well, we must wrestle on and do our best. (I like Miss Leigh's letter very much indeed; it says what wants saying)

You ask about Smuts I have been seeing a good deal of him. He dined quietly with us one night, and another evening I had him and Page, and (whom do you think?) *Milner*, together at a very interesting quiet talk about it all for nearly three hours. Milner is less pessimistic about Russia than Smuts is. Smuts thinks Russia has simply gone to bits, not being equal (i e. the people's grasp and grit) for such a time, and he thinks the outlook in Russia is black. Milner, though he sees all the mischief of what is happening both in Army and Navy, takes a more (at least *rather* more) hopeful view The murder of Officers has been very bad, especially in the Navy where ALL the leading men have been killed. But he believes more than Smuts does in the coming forward of good men among the Revolutionaries. Only it will take time, and meanwhile mischief, and especially *desertion*, are rife. Probably the best line for your young friend to take, in her Russian advocacy, is just what you tell me she *does* take, namely to say it isn't true and that these murders and desertions etc. are lies concocted by the European Governments (and I suppose Lord Northcliffe!). Unhappily that won't do. Jellicoe has been giving me the very ghastly facts. The wretched part of it is that, unless we can somehow get Germany more beaten within the next few months, the Russian collapse will mean the going *on and on* of the War.

All this sounds rather 'grousy' but I don't mean it to be. We are going to get through these troubles, and better things will be the outgrowth.

Two other messages, the fruit of his anxiety, show his sympathy with the Russian Church. The first, an Easter greeting, April 15, being the Russian Easter Day, was published in the Russian press and received a cordial welcome:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* HOLY SYNOD OF RUSSIA

April 15, 1917.

On behalf of the Church of England, I exchange with you, at this sacred season, the fraternal greeting of thanksgiving and hope. Christos voskress.[1]

May the blessing of the risen Lord 'fill you with joy and peace in believing', even amidst the anxiety and strain of this eventful year.

May the strife and confusion issue in a righteous victory over the high-handed wrong of our enemy, and in abiding peace and freedom for the peoples of Europe

May the Russian people, in its newborn strength, be guided by the Holy Spirit of God to bear therein a worthy part. The Easter benediction rests to-day upon our great peoples, united under new conditions by bonds of ever-deepening sympathy and friendship.

Christos voskress.

The second was dated September 11, 1917, while the Russian Holy Synod was deliberating on church reforms:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* HOLY SYNOD OF RUSSIA

September 11, 1917.

I desire on behalf of the Church of England to convey to the Holy Synod of the Russian Church, and to its responsible authorities throughout the land, the assurance of our deep fraternal interest in the efforts which are now being made by the Bishops, Clergy, and laity of the Russian Church to use for the good of the whole people the new opportunities which—even in the present turmoil —have arisen: and to express our firm hope and the promise of our confident prayer that it may please God Almighty, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to grant to the whole Church in Russia the spirit of wisdom and strength at this time of crisis and difficulty and hope.

In December the Archbishop sent a further message, following the decision of the Russian Church to revive the Patriarchate of

[1] i.e. Christ is risen—the Russian Easter greeting.

Moscow (after a suppression of nearly 250 years, due to Peter the Great) and have one supreme spiritual leader in the Patriarch of All Russia. The man chosen for the great office was Tykhon,[1] who had been elected Metropolitan of Moscow by popular vote in June 1917:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* HIS HOLINESS TYKHON, PATRIARCH OF ALL RUSSIA

Lambeth Palace, December 17, 1917.

I desire in the name of the Church of England to send to your Holiness our respectful and fraternal greeting on your election to the ancient Patriarchate of Russia. It is to the Christian Church united throughout the world in the bonds of our Holy Faith that mankind must look in hours of darkness and confusion for light and healing. We assure your Holiness of our unfailing prayer that the hand of our living Lord may rest upon you in blessing, that the Holy Spirit may guide you in thought and word and act, and that you may be strengthened to discharge to the glory of God and to the good of His people the high and sacred duties in the Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to which in the revival of the Holy Patriarchate you have at a time of difficulty and anxiety been solemnly called.

This message was duly handed to His Holiness, at a special audience, by the British Representative at Moscow, with as much ceremony as the circumstances permitted. The Patriarch immediately sent the following reply, in English, written with his own hand, and with the signature in purple ink.

†

2 Cor. i. 3–5.

TO HIS GRACE RANDALL CANTUAR, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, ETC.

Your Grace,

We beg to acknowledge the receipt of your kind message with the greetings in the name of the Church of England on our election to the Patriarchate of Russia.

[1] The Patriarch was 52 years of age He was the son of a priest in the Diocese of Pskov. He had worked on the staff in the Ecclesiastical Academies of St Petersburg and Kazan. He then became Bishop, first of Liublin, and then for the Aleutian Islands, with his residence at San Francisco. After some years in America he returned to Russia, becoming Archbishop in 1905 and holding the sees of Yaroslev and Lithuania from 1913 to 1917. He was regarded as cordially interested in the Church of England.

Permit us to express our sincere gratitude for your fraternal feelings, and our profound wish that your prayers, which are of great value and moral comfort to us at this hour of general anti-Christian spirit in the world, may fulfil, and all Christians unite in strong fight for the glorious banner of our Faith—Holy Cross of our Saviour.

It makes us happy to know that the Church of England keeps the Russian Church close to her heart, and in the name of the Holy Orthodox Russian Church we ask you to accept our warm appreciation of your belief, which we here fully share, that 'it is to the Christian Church united throughout the world in the bonds of our Holy Faith that mankind must look in this hour of darkness and confusion for light and health.

Therefore, let us pray that the vial of wrath of God may yet spare humanity, and that 'for the elect's sake' these days of tribulation may be shortened, and general misfortunes of nowadays may teach all branches of Christianity to approach nearer one another in the Spirit of love and unity.

Our blessings to all. With the best wishes and cordiality, we are, Sir, faithfully yours,

† TYKHON, Patriarch of All Russia.

Moscow.

January 12/25, 1918.

The next communication to the Church of England from the Church of Russia was a bitter cry from Odessa in December, for help in the midst of cruel persecution.

II

An interesting plan for helping the Serbian Church took shape this year, after considerable discussion. It sprang out of the terrible needs of a stricken country from which multitudes had been driven by the invading troops. The Archbishop of Belgrade (Dimitri) was himself an exile, with large numbers of priests. One of these, Fr. Nicholai Velimirovic, a very remarkable man, proposed that the Church of England should help selected Serbian students, most of them young seminarists whose theological work had been interrupted by the war, to complete their training in certain English colleges under the supervision of Serbian priests.

The plan (which it was understood that the Archbishop of

Belgrade blessed) was put to the Archbishop. But it seemed to him that a good deal of caution was needed. On the one hand, he wished to know what exactly the plan involved. On the other hand, he saw the risk that in later days it might be said that the Church of England for its own purposes had been proselytizing young Serbs, and teaching them unorthodox Anglican ways! His Grace was therefore reluctant to give the plan his official sanction without a clear authorization from the Serbian Archbishop. Many piteous letters, with sad stories of his Church's sufferings, reached Lambeth Palace from Archbishop Dimitri, now a refugee at Corfu, but neither they, nor a telegram which followed, seemed to Archbishop Davidson to be precise enough to justify him in giving his official approval to the scheme. The following letter from Fr. Nicholai to his Grace's chaplain, indicates the difficulty sometimes felt by the more impetuous souls in understanding the Archbishop of Canterbury's caution:

FR. NICHOLAI VELIMIROVIC *to the* REV. G K. A. BELL

Serbian Information Bureau, 9, King Street, St. James'.

June 15, 1917.

Many thanks for your kind note. Nothing is so very precise in this time of the universal chaos. And I am afraid our poor Archbishop of Serbia is not speaking very clearly and precisely as to the Serbian theological students.

I think you have to deal with the Serbian students as with the refugees who ask your help, the material and spiritual. The letter of the Archbishop asking for the help of the Serbian church includes the spiritual help of the Serbian candidates for priesthood. The Roman Catholics would not ask for an absolute clearness and preciseness. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has enough ground to help Serbia in any way he wishes. As to the details I am here in London to explain. The general idea and apply is given already by the Archbishop of Serbia.

We have got now 11 Serbian students of theology. They are a very good material. All the responsibility for any action I will take myself. Don't be afraid of anything. Either the church will awake during this war or never. It is an exceptional time. The people of Serbia are asking for material and spiritual help. Just as you do not ask anybody in the world whether to help materially the Serbians, so why should you ask anybody to help them spiritually? Yet, our Archbishop agrees quite. But he can't tell it quite clearly, as His Grace can't tell everything quite clearly as he desires.

The letter of the Archbishop concerns a Committee in Serbia, of which he is the Chairman, with purpose to help the suffering people from war. Well, it suggests the idea that a Committee may be formed in the Church of England to help the Church of Serbia in her distress, i e.

(*a*) to help the Serbian clergy (700 are now been interned, starving in Austria and Bulgaria),

(*b*) to help the Serbian students of theology, who are asking for spiritual help (it is now impossible for them to go to Russia and study there),

(*c*) to publish a Prayer Book for the Serbian soldiers at the front, who are longing to have a spiritual book in Serbian language to read.

I think it is clear now. But if you think anything to be unclear still, I will explain to you *in extenso*. I will not be here during 3 next days, because I am going to Peterboro to preach there. But I would be glad to meet you on Thursday next to tell you the rest that you wish to know.

The Archbishop saw Fr. Nicholai,[1] who called himself 'Your Grace's minor brother in Christ', and accepted a clear written statement from him as the Archbishop of Belgrade's accredited representative. The scheme with his *imprimatur* was started, and Canon Carnegie, the Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster, became Chairman of a Serbian Church Students Aid Council. In a period of two years, some sixty Serbian students were trained in Cuddesdon and Oxford. The Archbishop's hesitations were shown to be not unjustified. There was great delay between his approval of the scheme and the arrival of the first students in April, 1918, for there were obstacles at home in the Serbian Church. There were also greater financial difficulties about continuing the scheme than were originally expected. More serious was the eventual leakage, to lay posts in the Serbian State, of men trained in England for ordination in the Serbian Church. But the real value of the step thus taken was beyond doubt. It lay in the precedent set for the coming of other theological students for study in England, from other Orthodox countries—and the understanding established between many individual clergy of the two Churches.

[1] Fr. Nicholai subsequently became Bishop of Ochrida.

III

The Archbishop's attitude to peace was tested by the publication of Lord Lansdowne's Peace Letter in the *Daily Telegraph* on November 29, 1917. There is an interesting note of the way in which it came to be composed:

> On Thursday, November 29th, Lansdowne's long letter appeared in the *Daily Telegraph*, having been, on public grounds, rejected by *The Times*. His argument is—we must go on fighting strenuously and win, but to do this intelligently we, and as many as possible of our people, must know definitely what we are fighting for. He dwells on two points—reparation and security, and deprecates the vague and rather windy shoutings which are taken advantage of by Germans as betokening a blind fury on our part which will be satisfied with nothing less than their virtual extinction as a nation. Of course no one has said that, but we do not adequately, he thinks, insist the contrary. His letter is a reasonable plea for a quiet re-statement, which he thinks would be useful, both to our home public, our American Allies, our French Allies, and, in its own way, to the reasonable folk in Germany. It has created a storm of abuse, most of it, as it seems to me, monstrously unfair, misrepresenting Lansdowne's position, and belittling his authority and experience. But many reasonable people are carried away by this abuse, and some of them, I am certain, have shouted against Lansdowne as a pacifist, and so on, without having read his letter—a letter which is about as anti-pacifist as it could be. The present popular theory is that Lansdowne evolved this out of his own mind and launched it on the public without regard to the harm he might do to the Government, and therefore to the country. As a matter of fact, I know privately that the facts were very different. I have talked to Lansdowne about it. He welcomed the opportunity of most confidentially telling me the true facts. He desired to raise the question of a fuller declaration of our policy, and told Arthur Balfour that he would like to do so in the Lords, if Balfour saw no objection. Balfour deprecated this as likely to do harm, but he considered Lansdowne's memorandum, and conferred with him on the points at issue. Lansdowne thereupon told Balfour that he would write to the newspapers instead, and to this Balfour took no exception. Two days before the letter was published, Lansdowne and Balfour met, I know not where, and Lansdowne asked him (Balfour) to read the letter he had drafted. Balfour felt he could not at the moment do this, basing his refusal on the fact that he was just starting for France, for the

> *Paris Conference.* Balfour and Lansdowne agreed, however, that Lansdowne should show the letter to Lord Hardinge, Balfour's second in command. 'He', said Balfour, 'knew his (Balfour's) opinions and would give the soundest possible counsel.' Lansdowne took the letter to Hardinge, discussed it with him in detail and Hardinge approved it highly, and even suggested the altering of one or two words. Thereupon Lansdowne sent it to *The Times*, and on its being there declined to the *Daily Telegraph*. How Balfour and Hardinge can now rest quiet, under the accusations brought against Lansdowne, amazes me. . . . I believe Balfour has made a memorandum for the Cabinet of what passed, so that they at least may know that Lansdowne did not act as supposed.

In the *Life of Lord Lansdowne*,[1] the Archbishop is counted by Lord Lansdowne as on his side—but no public sign was given. The Peace question was, however, to be raised again in the New Year in connexion with a fresh invitation from the Archbishop of Upsala.[2]

IV

A matter which caused the Archbishop much thought and anxiety at the end of 1917, was the provision of an adequate number of chaplains for the Front. The leakage in the B.E.F. area, from one cause or another, was in October nine per week, and for the supply of these places, and places in other stations at home and abroad, the Chaplain-General got a total call of not less than twelve each week.

The Chaplain-General's office had long been strengthened—and there was an Advisory Committee presided over by Lord Salisbury, as well as a most efficient Assistant Chaplain-General at Whitehall, in Canon E. H. Pearce. But unfortunately the records of applications and service according to dioceses—the crucial thing in such an organization—were incompletely kept. The Deputy Chaplain-General wrote home from France pressing that clergy (like doctors) should be conscripted for service as chaplains wherever required, by means of a short Bill passed through Parliament. The Archbishop did not think that such a drastic course was required, the failure in supply being due to gaps in the organization rather than to any unreadiness of the clergy to volunteer. With the Archbishop of York's help, he

[1] Lord Newton, *Lord Lansdowne A Biography*, p 472. [2] See p. 885.

simply set to work in December and January. The result was a system which met the need admirably, but really meant the taking over by Lambeth of the main responsibility for communicating with the Diocesan Bishops, and securing a steady flow of the right men into the Chaplains' Department. By this means not only were the vacancies filled as they occurred, but there were a large number of men whose names were kept at Lambeth waiting to be sent up to the Chaplain-General by relays as required. The following letter, written on the last day of 1917 to the Bishop of Winchester, shows something of the pressure upon the Archbishop, and the spirit with which he faced his duties:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF WINCHESTER

Old Palace, Canterbury.
December 31st, 1917.

I thank you for writing to me about Chaplains. Your letter arrived after I had spent most of the day in arranging with the Archbishop of York, who came here for the purpose, a long letter to all the Bishops, laying down a scheme for their sending to me from every diocese, North and South, a list of men whose names they submit for chaplaincies, and I will then send on the list to the Chaplain-General, and hold myself responsible for understanding why any of them are rejected It does not work the thing out quite as completely as your plan for your diocese does, but it makes what I think will be a workable arrangement for England as a whole. I have asked to have the replies before the Bishops' Meeting, so that we may then be able to deal with the thing afresh if the replies are inadequate, or the supply of men seems too small. It is all being most difficult, but I think we are on the right tack. I think your own plans very good, but I doubt whether they would be applicable in all dioceses. . .

We have had a heavy Christmas week, for my perplexities are rather numerous. I have troubles both in Canada and in India in regard to the consecration of Bishops, and they have involved much cabling and immense correspondence with Government offices. We want to get men consecrated over-seas, if possible, instead of bringing them back through all the perils to England, only to face them again a few weeks later after consecration. The Sees in question are Newfoundland and Mombasa.

The Henson business is also of necessity bringing much correspondence from Bishops and others.

I own to feeling the general situation as regards the war to be exceedingly anxious. Reading between the lines it seems to me clear that our leading men think so too. I suppose that if the Germans can bring literally overwhelming forces from the Eastern front, they may be able to do what would otherwise be impossible in the West. I find the officers, there are many, who are here, are all a bit grave about it.

Pardon brevity I am over-crowded to-night. The year closes rather cloudily, but I see no real signs of a deep-down failure of heart or spirit either in England or in the Army. I was preaching last night in the Cathedral, trying to say what is needed. Unfortunately I have to preach in the Abbey on Sunday at the National Service, and I seem to have no upspringing thoughts. But I must say my prayers.

NOTE

1. The total number of chaplains of all denominations on the pre-war establishment in 1914 was 113.

2. The total number serving with the Forces at the armistice, 1918, was 3,480.

3. The total number serving with the Forces in January 1919 was 3,463.

4. The total number of Church of England chaplains in January 1919 was 1,973.

5. The total number of clergy of the *Church of England* commissioned as chaplains during the war was 3,030; killed or died on service, 88.

CHAPTER LIII

THE HEREFORD BISHOPRIC

My Lord of Hereford and I be neighbours, and we often meet and confer by reason of council-matters here, and commissions directed unto us I have brotherly monished him of such things as I saw in him, or heard of him, he hath promised, when occasion shall serve, to do the like to me. 24th Oct 1560 *The* BISHOP OF WORCESTER (SANDYS) *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY (*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker*)

IN the summer of 1917, Dr. Percival announced his intention of resigning the see of Hereford on account of old age. Mr. Lloyd George was Prime Minister, and it so happened that this was the first episcopal vacancy which it fell to his lot to fill. That fact, in itself, gave an interest to the appointment. He very early got into communication with the Archbishop on the subject; and they had a long talk, as we have seen, after the Abbey Service of August 5. At this interview Mr. Lloyd George, after referring to the Diocese of Hereford as predominantly rural, discussed various names. Mr. Lloyd George was emphatic about the need of a good preacher:

> He pressed with a good deal of fervour, and even pathos, the need of having good preachers among the Bishops. He seemed to have a sound idea of the Archbishop of York as a preacher who deservedly carried weight, but he did not speak with equal respect of some other of our Episcopal brethren, though how far he had actually heard them, or how far he was speaking of popular rumour, I do not know.

At the moment Mr. Lloyd George seemed to contemplate an appointment to Hereford by translation:

> He seemed as he went along to make up his mind that Hereford had better be filled by translation from another see, where some young and fresh man is needed.

And he suggested that the vacancy thus created should be filled by a new man.

I

Three names were before him, Dr. Furse of Pretoria, Dr. David of Rugby, and 'very markedly Hensley Henson'. The third of these, Dr. Herbert Hensley Henson, had been Rector of St.

Margaret's and Canon of Westminster for twelve years; and Dean of Durham[1] since 1912. In April 1917, he was just under fifty-four years old, a remarkable orator, with a fine literary style—and a man of high intellectual ability. No one could deny that he was one of the half-dozen greatest preachers in the Church of England of the day. He was also a scholar—for he had been elected to a Fellowship of All Souls, in October 1881, before he was twenty-one, after matriculating as an unattached student while under eighteen. He had had great experience in the industrial parish of Barking, after a short tenure of the Headship of the Oxford House, Bethnal Green, in which he was succeeded by Dr. Winnington Ingram. And he was a brilliant controversialist both by speech and by pen. He had been a strong High Churchman—but had long since abandoned their ranks, and was liberal or broad, both in matters of Church Order and in matters of doctrine. He had great charm, though to some his brilliant wit and obvious delight in debate seemed to suggest over-confidence: and with not a few of those, like Dr. Charles Gore, whom he opposed and embarrassed by his ecclesiastical activities, he was yet on terms of the closest personal friendship. He had published books in defence of a liberal interpretation of the Creeds which had aroused a good deal of criticism—notably *The Creed in the Pulpit*, which contained a preface dealing with the liberty of the preacher, and criticizing, in the case of the Rev. J. M. Thompson, Fellow of Magdalen College, the actions of the Bishops of Winchester and Oxford, the former of whom had withdrawn his licence, as Visitor, and the latter of whom had refused him permission to officiate in the diocese of Oxford. In this preface he had said:

> One thing is unquestionable. In setting a ring-fence about the narratives of Christ's birth and resurrection, and exempting them from the operation of critical methods allowed to control the rest of the New Testament, Mr. Thompson's opponents have taken up a position which it is really impossible to justify on any other principles than those which direct the policy of the Vatican.[2]

[1] Mr. Asquith, who appointed Dr Henson to Durham, had a high opinion of his preaching powers, as well as his vitality Writing to the Archbishop (Aug 30, 1910) with reference to the Deanery of Lincoln, then vacant, he said. 'If, as you say, they need a preacher, one might try Henson It would be rather like sending a torpedo destroyer into a land locked pool, and his place at Westminster would be a difficult one to fill'

[2] *The Creed in the Pulpit*, p xvii.

The Archbishop told Mr. Lloyd George that he would greatly prefer Dr. David to either Dr. Henson or Dr. Furse, and Lloyd George took note of the preference, and said he would inquire further. The Archbishop noted after the interview:

> It is a curious experience handling these matters with a man who has so very little knowledge either of the conditions of Church life, the nature of different regions (ecclesiastically), or the men who might be appointed to them. He takes in good part all that I say, and I pressed with no uncertainty the difficulties and perhaps the public protests which would arise if he nominated Henson. I said this would be more so than after his nomination of Rashdall to the deanery of Carlisle. He replied with some vigour and amusement that I warned him of the difficulties which would arise in regard to Rashdall, but that he had had nothing but praise from all who had spoken to him about it, including Lord Robert Cecil. I told him he need have no anticipations of an equally smooth course if he nominated Henson to a bishopric.

II

There was no immediate action, but in the early autumn there were clear signs that the appointment of Dr. Henson to a Bishopric was very much in the Prime Minister's mind. Archdeacon Pearce, who had stepped into the position of unofficial ecclesiastical adviser to the Prime Minister, was very much in favour, while Bishop Burge and others also supported his claims. Suggestions of various translations came to nothing, and at the end of November the Prime Minister wrote to the Archbishop to suggest definitely that the see should be offered to the Dean of Durham. He said:

The Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

10 Downing Street, Whitehall, S.W. 1. 26 November, 1917.

You will readily understand that the complexities of public business have caused delay in communicating with you further about the vacant See of Hereford.

What I want now to suggest is that it should be offered to the Dean of Durham. It is true that I should have preferred to propose him for a more urban and industrial diocese; but I believe he has never yet failed to devote himself eagerly to whatever work lay before him.

Moreover, Hereford has this advantage that, as I understand, the ritual problems of the diocese are not serious, and so the Dean would be little troubled by internal controversies.

On the other hand, I deem it to be of great advantage that the opportunity should be given to him to utilise his power to express logically, opinions that are largely held outside, rather in the Councils of the Southern Episcopate than in the public press.

I have one or two other men in my mind,—Archdeacon Lisle Carr of Norfolk, Archdeacon Gresford Jones of Sheffield; and Prebendary Swayne. But, as you know, none of these is of equal calibre to the Dean either as preacher or as thinker. . . .

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE*

28th November 1917.

I have given much anxious thought to your letter. The Dean of Durham is a personal friend of mine, and I think it is natural and right that his friends (and they are legion) should desire him to hold Episcopal office. It is not therefore at all with the desire to prevent this (and I am anxious to make that point quite clear) that I ask you to consider afresh whether the sending of him to such a Diocese as Hereford is really best. A large rural Diocese, calling for the plodding work of a man who has experience of varied parochial life, does not seem to me quite the place for a preacher and speaker with the particular sort of popular gifts which Dr. Henson possesses. You may consider it so desirable to nominate him for Consecration to the Episcopate that these objections ought to be swept aside. Personally, however, I am persuaded that it would be much better to wait for some future opening more appropriate. There must be such before long. I do not consider that the absence of ritual difficulties in Hereford Diocese is an argument in favour of sending Dr. Henson there. On the contrary, I think that what he rather needs for the exercise of his powers is the steadying which responsibility gives when a man has to deal with the kind of problems, the management of which by others, he has been accustomed to criticise. I feel the less scruple in asking you to consider afresh the question, because you have named as the next possible man one who is eminently qualified for such a See as Hereford. Archdeacon Lisle Carr is universally acceptable, and is possessed of very many of the sort of gifts a Diocese like Hereford calls for. He is active, popular, liberal-minded, and an admirable preacher. I do not claim that

he possesses the same remarkable intellectual gifts as the Dean of Durham, but he is a man far above the average both intellectually and in practical experience and capacity.

I feel bound to put before you my view of the situation, since you have asked for my opinion. At the same time I am particularly anxious not to seem to be derogating from the merits and powers of Dr. Hensley Henson. That his appointment would cause something of a storm is undoubted, and this would have to be faced whenever and wherever he was nominated a Bishop. I confess that I should prefer in the interests of the Church of England that your own first nomination to the Episcopate should be of a less controversial kind. But this is a matter on which perhaps I have no right to express to you my opinion. It is not that which chiefly influences me in putting before you for consideration the points I have mentioned. I repeat that Dr. Henson is a personal friend of mine for whom, though differing from him on many points, I have the warmest affection and regard. His powers are of course beyond question.

The Prime Minister replied:

The Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd George *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

6th December, 1917.

I have very carefully weighed your valuable letter of November 28, about the See of Hereford.

I entirely agree with you that the Dean of Durham is in the end more suited to a large industrial sphere, and, as you know, I have tried so to arrange. But I believe he has powers of adaptability which will stand him in good stead at Hereford, and, if it turns out that I am right, I shall be only too glad to suggest his later transference to some more urban Diocese.

Meanwhile, he will be learning his job in what ought not to be a very hard school, and I am sure you will feel the advantage of his bringing a vigorous mind to bear on the many difficulties which beset a Bishop's office at this time.

I am therefore writing to him to this effect.

The Archbishop's own view of Henson's orthodoxy is given in a Memorandum on the situation which he made on Christmas Day 1917:

The knowledge that [Henson's nomination to a Bishopric] was in contemplation made me read again some of Henson's writings, or

rather utterances, and I confess to having found them far less heterodox than I had expected. It is true that he throws his shield over men like Thompson of Magdalen, and others who go very much further than he does, and, further, it is true that he avoids handling the precise points of acutest controversy, e.g. the articles in the Creed relating to the Virgin Birth and physical Resurrection of Our Lord. But he shows repeatedly in his sermons a firm, and even enthusiastic, belief in the Incarnation of Our Lord. When Lloyd George a few weeks ago intimated to me that he had offered the See of Hereford to Henson, I wrote to Henson and had from him a rather characteristic reply. He referred me to a sermon he had preached on leaving St. Margaret's. It is the first sermon in his little book *Notes of my Ministry*, and in it he summarises his doctrinal teaching. He certainly avoids the kind of controversial points I have alluded to, and he uses phrases like 'Mankind, stricken, distracted, and undone, finds in the Birth at Bethlehem the re-Birth of Humanity. Thus, it has seemed to me, the Christian belief in Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Creator compels an attitude of sympathy towards every expression of the religious instinct' etc.

III

The announcement of Dr. Henson's nomination appeared in the Press on December 11. Immediately the storm anticipated by Dr. Davidson broke out. Resolutions and protests came pouring into Lambeth, and a fierce controversy started in the Press. The *Church Times*, whose editor, the Rev. E. Hermitage Day, had lately come to live in Hereford, sharpened its weapons; and protagonists on one side or another declared their various views in the columns of *The Times*. The leader of the attack was the Bishop of Oxford. Three days after the announcement in *The Times*, he sent to all Bishops of the Province a private and confidential notice to the effect that he proposed to make a Formal Protest to the Archbishop of Canterbury against the consecration of Dr. Hensley Henson, and inviting them, if they saw fit, to join him. In this letter he called special attention to the books: *Sincerity and Subscription* (1903), *The Liberty of Prophesying* (1909), *The Creed in the Pulpit* (1912); and said that, failing a retractation by Dr. Henson, if the consecration was to proceed and his protest was unavailing, 'I see no course *practicable* but to resign from the episcopate'.

On December 17, Gore spent the night with the Archbishop at Lambeth:

> Gore admitted frankly that Henson is a firm believer in the Incarnation, but that Henson's belief in that great doctrine is accompanied by a disbelief in those miraculous events of the Human Ministry which Gore regards as essential to the Incarnation doctrine in its entirety. He was somewhat excited, though not to the degree I have often seen, but he passionately exclaimed—'it all turns, though you won't see it, on his disbelief in miracles as such. He believes Our Lord had a human father, and that His Body rotted in the tomb A man who believes that cannot, with my consent, be made a Bishop of the Province.' This he expanded in many ways. I argued quietly with him to the best of my power, on the lines familiar to him and me in the controversy between us a few years ago respecting the declaration in Convocation on which he makes so much to turn.

The Archbishop saw Dr. Henson on December 19, at Lambeth, and gave him the impression of being depressed and morose. Dr. Henson himself says in a Diary written at the time:

> He told me that he was receiving numerous letters calling upon him to see the King and insist upon this scandalous nomination being cancelled and that he should refuse to consecrate!

He adds:

> I came away from the Palace with an uncomfortable suspicion that the Archbishop would like to throw me over if he decently could.

Dr. Davidson's own note is

> On Wednesday, the 19th, Henson came to breakfast, and I had full talk with him He was pleasant and friendly, but he disappointed me by his self-satisfaction, and his rather venomous denunciation of those who were opposing his appointment.

The English Church Union was meantime engaged in marshalling all its forces to prevent Dr. Henson's consecration. Their reports were, perhaps, assisted by the fact that the late Bishop of Hereford (Dr. Percival) had not been popular in the Diocese, owing partly to his radicalism in politics, partly to his liberalism in doctrine; while the Cathedral Chapter, composed in the main

of learned scholars, had not been itself in close touch with the exceedingly rural County. As Dr. Henson wrote to the Archbishop on December 22 with regard to the pressure of the English Church Union on the local clergy:

The DEAN OF DURHAM *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

December 22, 1917.

The material on which these conspirators work is the great volume of discontent and resentment, more political than religious, which has undoubtedly accumulated against the late Bishop. The Dean and Canons do not appear to have much relation with the diocese, but formed a flatterous clique round the old Bishop, and brought him no popularity on their own behalf. Nevertheless, I doubt whether there is any genuine substance in the agitation: and, though it may carry as far as refusing to elect by influencing the Prebendaries, I doubt if it will survive save as a memory to blush for.

That the E.C.U. is a powerful organisation is unfortunately true: but we have hardly yet reached the point when the King's nominations must be approved by that body before they can count on being effective. For myself, I have to say this. As I was led by long and anxious thought to the conclusion that it was my plain *duty* to accept a place on the Episcopal Bench if it were offered me, so I am not likely to be deflected from my course by *clamour*. Nor will I yield one inch to a Society with the principles and methods of the E.C.U.

It grieves me deeply that you should have worry on my account, but in this matter I am absolutely guiltless. . . .

The agitation of the E.C.U., both in the town and in the diocese of Hereford, failed of its object. The Mayor of Hereford refused the use of the Town Hall for a meeting, and repudiated the agitation. Nor did the efforts of the propagandists in the Press to persuade the Hereford Chapter to risk the penalties which might fall on their heads by refusing to elect, meet with better success. The Chapter met on January 4. Nineteen Prebendaries (residentiary and non-residentiary) were present, and elected Dr. Henson with a dissentient minority of four. Meanwhile the Bishop of Oxford had sent his Formal Protest to the Archbishop with a personal note, 'I never wrote anything with such loathing as I have written this':

FORMAL PROTEST

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Cuddesdon, Wheatley, Oxon.
Jan. 3rd, 1918.

I am compelled, under an overwhelming sense of responsibility, to address to you a solemn protest against the nomination of Dr. Hensley Henson, Dean of Durham, to the Bishopric of Hereford.

I am not taking this action because of anything which he has said about the ministry of the Church, or any other matter of Church polity or policy, with regard to which he and I have publicly differed in the past, for in respect of these things his views are shared substantially by many Evangelical and other members of the Church, with whom I am quite conscientiously able to live in unity of fellowship. I am driven to act as I am doing solely because his expressed beliefs touching the fundamental matters of faith seem to me incompatible with the sincere profession of the Creeds.

In more than one book he has argued that, though a man has been led to believe that our Lord was not born of a virgin mother, he should still be free to exercise his ministry in the Church and to recite the services of the Church in which the miracle is unmistakably and repeatedly affirmed: and even if he believe that 'no miracles accompanied His entrance into, or presence in, or departure from the world' he should still hold this 'freedom' to make public profession to the contrary.* But may I think that the Dean is simply pleading for freedom for others? I am led reluctantly to conclude that I cannot. His treatment of the Virgin Birth seems to me incompatible with personal belief in its occurrence.† Again, he expressly repudiates belief in the 'nature-miracles'‡ recorded in the Gospels as wrought by our Lord. He writes explicitly, 'From the standpoint of historical science they must be held to be incredible.'§ But the birth of a virgin mother, and the bodily resurrection of our Lord—that His body did not 'see corruption' but was raised again the third day to a new and wonderful life—are similar 'nature-miracles' ascribed in the Gospels to the same power and Spirit of the Father as the miracles upon

* *The Creed in the Pulpit* (Hodder and Stoughton), pp. xiv ff

† See *Sincerity and Subscription* (Macmillan), pp. 43 ff *The Creed*, &c., p xxiv, pp. 18–22, 49.

‡ Physical miracles which the 'normal' order of nature cannot account for, Dr. Henson distinguished such 'nature-miracles' from the miracles of healing which he thinks may 'be fairly called normal'.

§ *The Creed*, &c., pp. 88–9

nature worked by our Lord during His ministry. I can conceive no rational ground for repudiating the latter as incredible and believing the former. The Dean himself seems incidentally to include both classes of miracles in the same category.‖ He does indeed confidently and constantly affirm the truth of the Resurrection of Christ; but he seems to me by 'resurrection' to mean no more than personal survival.** He repudiates again and again any insistence upon the 'empty tomb', and declares it to have no significance.†† But the empty tomb was an absolutely necessary condition of any such resurrection as the New Testament postulates. If the tomb was not empty, Christ was not, in the New Testament sense, risen again. On the whole I am led irresistibly to the conclusion that, though he nowhere explicitly expresses in so many words his personal disbelief in the physical miracles affirmed in the Creeds, he does in fact regard them as incredible.

I am amazed by what seems to me the one-sidedness and unsatisfactoriness of the Dean of Durham's presentation of the evidence. But that is not my point at present. Again, I am amazed at the naive satisfactoriness of the Dean of Durham's presentation of the evidence. But that is not my point at present. Again, I am amazed at the naïve confidence with which he assumes that the theological ideas of the Creed and the New Testament, to which he gives noble expression, can survive unimpaired when the miraculous facts have been repudiated—an assumption which the history of recent criticism in Europe generally seems to me to negative. But that again is not my point at present. I am now concerned only with the conditions on which a man can sincerely profess the Creeds and exercise his ministry in the Church of England. And here I will recall the terms of a solemn declaration which the Bishops of our Province recently affirmed.

> 'Inasmuch as there is reason to believe that the minds of many members of the Church of England are perplexed and disquieted at the present time in regard to certain questions of Faith [and of Church order], the Bishops of the Upper House of the Province of Canterbury feel it to be their duty to put forth the following resolutions:
>
> 1. We call attention to the resolution which was passed in this House on May 10, 1905, as follows:—
>
> "That this House is resolved to maintain unimpaired the

‖ *The Creed*, &c., pp. 90–1 (at the bottom).

** e.g. he speaks of Christ returning to the Church in 'the fullness' or 'plenitude of personal life' (p. 211). But he speaks also of all the dead as 'persisting' in the plenitude of individual being'. †† *The Creed*, &c., pp. 199, 208, 211.

Catholic Faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation as contained in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and in the Quicunque Vult, and regards the Faith there presented, both in statements of doctrine and in statements of fact, as the necessary basis on which the teaching of the Church reposes."

We further desire to direct attention afresh to the following resolution which was unanimously agreed to by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion attending the Lambeth Conference of 1908:—

"The Conference, in view of tendencies widely shown in the writings of the present day, hereby places on record its conviction that the historical facts stated in the Creeds are an essential part of the Faith of the Church."

2. These resolutions we desire solemnly to re-affirm, and in accordance therewith we express our deliberate judgement that the denial of any of the historical facts stated in the Creeds goes beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation, and gravely imperils that sincerity of profession which is plainly incumbent on the ministers of the Word and Sacraments. At the same time, recognizing that our generation is called to face new problems raised by historical criticism, we are anxious not to lay unnecessary burdens upon consciences, nor unduly to limit freedom of thought and enquiry whether among clergy or among laity. We desire, therefore, to lay stress on the need of considerateness in dealing with that which is tentative and provisional in the thought and work of earnest and reverent students.'

Of course if, in order to be affected by this declaration, a man must explicitly and in so many words have denied the particular miraculous facts recorded in the Creeds, the Dean of Durham is not affected by it. But then I think the declaration is nugatory. A man can express a negative intention without any such express verbal denial. I think the declaration must be supposed to take into account the whole effect of a man's language. And taking this into account, apart from any fresh declaration of his belief which he may think fit to make, I can only draw the conclusion that the Dean's language falls outside the limits of 'legitimate interpretation' of the statements of the Creeds which according to our declaration must be observed by the clergy and, most of all I suppose, by the bishops. As things stand, that is judging only from his published writings, if Dr. Henson were to take his place among the bishops, I think three results would follow:

1. It would be impossible to deny that the Bishops—not all of

them individually, but the bishops as a body—are prepared to admit to the episcopate, and therefore to the other orders of the ministry, one who does not believe in the miracles of the Creed, supposing he unfeignedly believes (as Dr. Henson does) in the doctrine of the person of Christ. And this, it appears to me, is to abandon the standing ground of the Catholic Church from the beginning, which has insisted on holding together the ideas and the miraculous facts. I do not mean that the action of the bishops would commit the Church of England. I think the mind of the Church of England would be opposed to their action. But I think it would commit the bishops corporately.

2. An atmosphere of suspicion will increasingly attach itself in the mind of the nation to the most solemn public assertions of the clergy, in the matter of religion, just at the time when we are constantly hearing that the awful experiences of the war have forced us back upon realities.

3. An effective (though not, I think, a legitimate) excuse will be afforded to all officers of the Church to treat their solemn declarations on other subjects as 'scraps of paper'. Any discipline on the basis of official declarations will become more and more difficult; and the authority of the episcopate will be quite undermined.

In order that such disastrous consequences may be avoided, I feel myself constrained to intreat your Grace and my brother bishops, in the event of the Dean of Durham being elected to the see of Hereford by the chapter, to refuse him consecration.

I need not say with what profound sorrow I have written this protest and appeal. Dr. Henson and I have always been friends, and, though we have often differed in public, I believe no angry word has ever passed between us or marred our friendship: and I believe him to be personally among the most honourable and courageous of men. Nevertheless I have been obliged to write it.

With the humble prayer that God will cleanse and defend the distracted part of the Church to which we belong and will guide your Grace and the Bishops with the spirit of wisdom.

The Protest was published in *The Times* on January 10 But meanwhile, the gravity of the doctrinal conflict was emphasized by a letter to *The Times* from Dr. Darwell Stone, on January 1, giving a catena of quotations from Dr. Henson's books, by way of specific accusations against the Bishop-designate's orthodoxy:

The REV. DR. STONE *to the Editor of 'The Times'*[1]

Pusey House, Oxford. December 29.

The Dean of Canterbury writes with reference to the appointment of Dr. Henson to the Bishopric of Hereford:—'If the opponents could allege any definite disqualification, either in doctrine or life against a nominee of the Crown, they would be within their rights or perhaps their duty in urging it.' The definite disqualification in doctrine in the case of Dr. Henson is his attitude in regard to miracles, and especially to the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of our Lord. In his *Creed in the Pulpit*, page 89, he wrote of the 'nature miracles' recorded in the Gospels that 'from the standpoint of historical science, they must be held to be incredible'. In the same book, on pages xxiv, 18, 37, he spoke of 'Biblical Sciences' 'disallowing the belief in an incarnation effected by miracles', of our Lord's nature as being 'a severely normal humanity', of the narratives of our Lord's birth being 'generally assumed by the learned to belong less to history than to poetry', of the Incarnation being 'effected in the normal working of the Divine Providence'; and on page 211 he says that the doctrine of the Resurrection taught by S. Paul 'definitely disallows the theory on which alone "the empty tomb" can have any vital relation to Christian faith'. Many similar statements may be found in Dr. Henson's writings, notably, for instance, in *Sincerity and Subscription* pages 43–46, and *The Liberty of Prophesying* pages 86–89. The opinions thus expressed in regard to truths affirmed in the Creeds are the cause of the present grave anxiety. And I, for one, had hoped that the doctrines involved were as clear to the Dean of Canterbury as they are to myself.'

On the other side, a long letter from Dr. Sanday, defending Dr. Henson, had the formidable effect of uniting Dean Wace and Darwell Stone against Dr. Henson. Dr. Sanday's letter in *The Times* on January 5 stated:

The REV. DR. SANDAY *to the Editor of 'The Times'*

My own general position is so similar to Dr. Henson's that I believe he will accept me as an advocate.

And he went on to quote the following sentences from his own contributions to a recent book, *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition* (pp. xii–xiii):

The Virgin Birth, the physical Resurrection, and physical Ascension,

[1] January 1, 1918

are all realistic expressions adapted to the thought of the time, of ineffable truths which the thought of the time could not express in any other way. To conceive of them realistically was natural and right in the age in which they took shape. Speaking for myself and for those who agree with me, I should say that it was no longer natural and therefore no longer to be enforced as right—to be taken if we please as a human symbol for *x* but not to be identified in any hard and fast manner with it.

He then added:

By every word of this statement I am prepared to stand and I believe that Dr. Henson would take his stand with me.

Dr. Henson was very far from desiring such an advocate. It was no wonder that Dean Wace should write to *The Times* of January 9·

The DEAN OF CANTERBURY *to the Editor of 'The Times'*

I feel bound to acknowledge that the letters of Dr. Darwell Stone and Dr. Sanday, especially the latter, afford abundant justification for opposition to Dr. Henson's appointment, and I feel reluctantly obliged to join in the appeal which is being made to the Archbishop and the Bishops not to proceed to this consecration.

It was not surprising that the Archbishop should thus express his own disquiet:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* DEAN OF CANTERBURY

9 January, 1918.

I am a little disquieted on reading your letter in *The Times* to-day. The letter you showed me last week seemed so very much more like yourself and your calm judgment than the letter which appears to-day. What occurred to that first letter I do not know. As you had kindly shown it to me and told me that it was going an hour later to *The Times* by rail, I ventured (of course quite privately) to mention to more than one friend that you had written such a letter characterised by your robust commonsense as to the misuse of isolated extracts. It is fair to you that I should say that I had done this (of course confidentially) with no idea at all that you had changed your mind.

With regard to Dr. Sanday's letter it is a case of 'save me from my friends', for the position of Sanday and Henson are very widely apart. About this I have no doubt at all. Henson is taking the

line taken by Temple those many years ago that to make a public statement or apologia now would be out of place and open to grave misunderstanding. This may be right or wrong, but he seems clear about it.

I need not descant upon the position that would be created if I were now to say 'I decline to obey the King's Mandate and to proceed to Confirmation and Consecration'. We talked it over together so fully that you know my position and what that decision on my part would apparently involve. I should not on that account be deterred if I felt the decision to be a right one

I send you this letter because of my having mentioned the fact of your having shown me at the moment of its departure the letter you were sending to *The Times*.

So, just as Lord Shaftesbury and Dr. Pusey made their famous alliance in their day against Old Testament criticism, the Principal of Pusey House and Dr. Wace stood up together in 1918 against the criticism of the New Testament in *The Creed and the Pulpit*.

IV

As the days wore on, the anxiety of the Archbishop deepened. Letters continued to pour in, and not a few of them were from Bishops. He decided to ask Henson to come and see him. Henson came on January 7 (two days before Dean Wace's letter in *The Times*) from Durham, and the Archbishop notes as follows:

I was with him from six to eight in close converse. I found him entirely pleasant to deal with, though self-conscious and cocksure in a way that is always to me a little trying. He is also strangely sensitive to criticism, while he proclaims his complete indifference to it. He told me that he was determined to make no declaration which could be regarded as an admission to the rights of others other than the legal authorities acting in Court to question him as to his beliefs. If he were questioned, say in connexion with his Confirmation, or otherwise, he would simply present in reply a copy of his books, and say that the answer lay there. At the same time he would declare his perfect readiness to be tried in an Ecclesiastical Court for heresy, if anyone chose to indict him. He would neither resent such indictment, nor rebel against its decision, or sentence, whatever it might be. 'What I will not stand is that this party, led by Gore and his friends, should first repudiate all existing Courts and then try to set up another Court which they

manipulate for trying heresy.' He then went on to say that to me, as an individual, he, as an individual and a friend, was quite ready to state his credal position, provided I would regard his statement as wholly confidential. It must not be quoted in any way, nor the fact made public that he had made any such statement to me. I replied that I had no wish to draw a statement from him, but that if he had anything to say, that he would like to say, for the relief of his mind, in view of the present controversy, it was of course open to him to say it, and I should make no public use of the fact that he had so spoken to me. He then proceeded to tell me under this confidential bond that I am absolutely right in regarding his position with respect to the Virgin Birth as practically the same as that of Armitage Robinson, in his preface to the little book *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation.* He in no sense denies the truth of that narrative, as traditionally interpreted, or of the narrative of the Resurrection. But with regard to the details, he adopts a position of what he calls Christian Agnosticism, considering it to be true to say that progress of human knowledge forces us to state historic facts in a different way at different epochs. The facts remain throughout what they were at first. We should not nowadays narrate what occurred in Gospel days as the same facts were narrated by the original writers. Science, criticism, historical knowledge, and general mental advance, with a wider outlook on life as a whole, necessitates our being ready to admit a restatement to-day of what was stated in quite different words long ago. I referred him to his note in the little book '*Sincerity and Subscription* written in 1903, pp. 43–46. He said emphatically that note is to justify us in not regarding the opinions of men who go much further than I go as placing them outside the Church's pale. I asked him whether it is not true to say that a reader of these pages would rise from them with the feeling, if not the evidence, that the writer does, as a matter of fact, think that Our Lord had a human father? He said emphatically that he had no such intention; that it would not fairly present his position, and that he had entirely declined to formulate with certainty a judgment upon what had happened. He must, I think, have seen that I regarded his answer as not very satisfactory. He went on to press the point that it had somehow fallen to him to be the champion of the principle that wide toleration of modernism is now the duty of honest men within the Church, and so on. Our talk was long, and it left me with the impression that, while his ideas are not very clear and definite, he quite distinctly and definitely does not deny the truths of the Creed as traditionally interpreted. We discussed what might happen as to the position which would be reached if

I were to decline to consecrate him and to resign my office. He said that if I declined to consecrate him he would have no course open to him but to retire from the Ministry of the Church, as he could not possibly return e.g. to the Deanery of Durham as a man unfit for consecration as a Bishop. But he foresaw what distraction that would cause, and practically foretold schism. With regard to my own possible resignation, he thought that would be equally, or rather much more disastrous, and would place him in exactly the same position as if I retained office while refusing to consecrate him.

The Bishop of Ely (Dr. Chase) had begged the Archbishop to summon the Bishops of the Province to take counsel together. The Archbishop's Memorandum continues:

On receiving the letter yesterday morning (January 7) I telegraphed to him to come at once to London. He came, while Henson was with me, and, after dinner, he and I had a very long talk. I think I convinced him that the summoning of the Bishops of the Province, in the way he suggested, would be unworkable, misleading, and ineffective. Should they discuss matters and vote, what would their vote mean? If it was in favour of consecration, it would mean an imprimatur of a certain sort given provincially to opinions like Henson's. If it were against consecration, it would rather add to my difficulties than remove them, for the refusal to consecrate would not be less grave in its character and results than it would be if I decided upon it of my own accord. We then discussed Henson's writings and opinions as gathered therefrom. He was, as always, reasonable, tolerant, and yet somewhat rigidly orthodox. We went over the whole ground afresh, and, though we did not attempt a formal decision as to what is right, I think he was of opinion when he left me that I should do rightly if I proceeded to the consecration in the ordinary way.

The next day was a very heavy one. It included taking a marriage in Chelsea in the morning, followed by a meeting with the War Cabinet in Downing Street about the proposal that the British Museum should be taken over to house the Air Board:

After the briefest peep at the house gathering of the Bride's friends in Tite Street, I had to go off to Downing Street for the War Cabinet, picking up Sir Frederic Kenyon at the Athenaeum on the way, to talk over the Museum position with him. He and I were shown into the Cabinet Room, where those present consisted of Lloyd George, Curzon, Milner, Carson, Bonar Law, Barnes, Smuts, and, outside the Cabinet, Sir Alfred Mond, Sir Lionel

Earle, Sir Maurice Hankey, and one or two others whom I did not know. Before the discussion was over, Lord Derby, and Lord Robert Cecil, and one or two others arrived for the meeting which was to follow the Museum discussion. I said my say, and was rather examined as a hostile witness by the Prime Minister. Sir Frederic Kenyon gave a clear statement in support of my deprecation of taking over the Museum, and during the discussion I felt the position changing. When we began, Carson, Bonar Law, and Barnes, and to some extent Milner, were evidently strongly against the Trustees' opinion. They wanted the Museum, and meant to have it. Curzon was vehemently the other way, and had prepared a memorandum which he began to read, but Lloyd George stopped him and requested that it should be not read while outsiders were present. Rather an absurd position, as we had already seen it! Curzon behaved very well. We left with the sense that we had made a good case and had impressed the Cabinet with the untenableness of the position they had taken up. I may add that in the evening I saw Curzon and learned from him that he would the next day make a public statement that the matter had been reconsidered—so our arguments had prevailed.

The day also included a visit to Rosebery, whom the Archbishop had not seen since Neil Primrose's death. The conversation was a most interesting personal one about Neil, and religion. Then it turned to political matters:

We talked a good deal about Asquith. He thinks Asquith the greatest Parliamentarian that ever lived. Much greater than Gladstone or Dizzy, or Palmerston, or Peel. A cultured scholar of amazing power of Parliamentary speech; never a word wrong, and never a word too much; wholly unlike Gladstone whose exuberance of oratory marred its effectiveness. He thought Asquith had never been so great as since Lloyd George came into power.

The Archbishop's own comment on Rosebery, at the end of the talk, must be added:

He was much keener and livelier than I have generally seen him of late, and less cynically morose. But I could not help feeling all the while the strangeness of his isolated position at such a time of crisis as the present. A man who has been Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister; intimate with Gladstone; a friend of Bismarck; friend of successive sovereigns, the darling of the public in his oratory; the foremost figure in the House of Lords; the first Chair-

man of the London County Council; and so on: that such a man, with such a record, should, while still amply fit for a great deal of work, be a complete outsider in national affairs, and apparently doing hardly anything for anybody, and living in his own shell, is both mysterious, and deeply disappointing. He knows what I feel about this, and I only hinted at it again to-day. It is not very easy to say what he could do to get back into public affairs, as I sometimes think he would half like to do, if he could do it with dignity. He and I walked from his house to Lambeth together, or at least to Lambeth Bridge, where his brougham met him and took him back, for he is not fit for long walks.

There was still more work to be done that day before turning again to Henson:

I was back at Lambeth soon after three, and had an hour there before going to the House of Lords During it I had business with Hugh Lee about the consecration of the Bishop of Mombasa in India, and the consecration of the Bishop of Newfoundland in Nova Scotia, both new problems which nobody quite understands except, I think, myself.

Then the House of Lords, where the Representation of the People Bill, the biggest Reform Bill in our history, came up for discussion in Committee. . . .

After the Reform Bill debate, I got through the Committee stage of the Bill for the Bishoprics of Coventry and Bradford—the time occupied being perhaps three and a half minutes! Then back to Lambeth with Edith, who had been in the House of Lords, to find the Bishop of Gloucester—Gibson—who was dining quietly with us to talk over the Henson difficulty.

Such were the events of a single day—the background against which the Archbishop had to determine the battle of the Creed and the Pulpit.

V

Dr. Henson himself was pressed by some of his comrades to withdraw his acceptance of the bishopric, and by others to make some sort of an explanation or apology. He refused to do either, justly claiming that his books and writings were well known and had been before the public for a long while, and that if he was to be accused as a heretic the charge should be made in the regular Courts. Sunday, January 13, was spent by the Archbishop at Tremans, Horsted Keynes, where he drafted a long letter to

Bishop Gore. He left on the Monday, in deep snow, and had further talks with Sir Lewis Dibdin and Professor Jenkins. There were some who wished to persuade him to use the Confirmation of the Bishop-elect for the purpose of examining Dr. Henson's orthodoxy. The Vicar-General, Lord Parmoor, was clear that such a course was out of the question, nor was the Archbishop likely to take it. If he believed that there was a case for accusing Dr. Henson of heresy, his remedy was to resign rather than issue the fiat. At the same time the Archbishop knew well that if he resigned rather than consecrate Dr. Henson, it would be impossible for the latter himself to retain office in the Church of England, and a schism was probable.

The Archbishop went to the House of Lords at 3.30 on the Monday, January 14:

> Found Halifax awaiting me, excited and eager; beseeching me to refuse consecration to a man who will, whatever his own beliefs, ordain unbelievers. He saw, however, the difficulty of the situation. Then a very full talk with Parmoor, as Vicar-General. He is evidently very uneasy about the Confirmation, and, after much talk, advised me to see Gore and Henson with a view to more fully satisfying my own mind prior to signing the *fiat* for Confirmation, which ends my personal discretion, the subsequent stage being Ministerial. He is clear that I have some discretion as to issuing the *fiat*; if no discretion in law, certainly some in conscience, when the sacredness of the issue is remembered. Then a full talk for another hour with the Lord Chancellor, Finlay, in his room. He had forgotten the particulars in these matters, though he appeared for the Crown in the Gore case. He was very anxious, and was terrified at the thought of my possibly resigning. He did not disapprove absolutely of my seeing either Gore or Henson privately, provided it was wholly private, and not so conducted as to have in any way the character of a Court of Inquiry, or capable of being represented as such. Specially he deprecated my getting into the position that I was refusing consecration because Henson refused to answer questions asked by me. He thought I should have no case, and could not allege such silence as ground for refusing consecration. He realised, however, (for I pressed it upon him) the sacred and solemn character of my responsibilities in their religious aspect.

He had further talks with Archdeacon Holmes about a draft letter from the Bishop of London, on which he refused to comment

beyond saying that he thought a short letter better than a long one. He saw the Bishop of Peterborough, Woods, who also had drafted a letter; then Lord Selborne, who poured out earnestly his grave fears and personal horror; and he was immediately followed by Lord Salisbury, who took the same view but much more calmly. He then returned to Lambeth to find Sir Lewis Dibdin who had come by appointment to dine and sleep and talk afresh over the situation:

> I settled with him that I should not be wrong in summoning Henson and asking him quite definitely the simple question whether, or not, he believed that Our Lord had a human father. He thought this quite different from a general inquiry into his opinions. This last he would strongly deprecate, supporting Henson's contention that he, Henson, could only be so questioned in a duly constituted Court.

The situation was extraordinarily difficult—and Dr. Davidson's ability to keep both parties abiding in the ship of the Church was seldom more sharply tested. He had no doubt that Dr. Henson's beliefs were fundamentally orthodox, and were compatible with his being a Bishop in the English Church; and yet he could perfectly understand the alarm which Dr. Henson's combination of a championship for liberty with a delight in strong and unguarded statements aroused in multitudes of Churchmen. After much thought he decided to summon Dr. Henson from Durham to Lambeth for a long and private conversation on January 15. Dr. Henson came; and after making it plain that the conversation was that of friend with friend, and not an examination, the Archbishop showed him a portion of the Reply he was preparing for Bishop Gore, and especially the paragraph where he said he had found nothing 'which, when it is fairly weighed in its true setting, I can regard as inconsistent with the belief which he firmly asserts in the facts and doctrines of the faith as set forth in the Creeds'. The Archbishop notes as follows:

> Henson arrived from Durham in time for dinner in response to a telegram from me. From nine p.m. to midnight I was steadily at talk with him. We went into matters unreservedly. I read him part of my draft letter to Gore, in order to reassure him as to my wish to defend him from unjust criticism. And I called upon him to facilitate my task by letting me understand clearly what his true attitude to credal questions is. We referred, of course, specially

to the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection. He talked at great length, and I took down bits of what he said, and then wove these into a memorandum, expressive of his position and belief, and read it over to him more than once. He agreed that it correctly stated his position. This was a great relief to my mind, and made me feel justified in arranging to let the Confirmation and Consecration go forward unless new pitfalls should open. He behaved well, having been, I think, helped by finding that I was endeavouring to treat him with scrupulous fairness. I do not think at first he realised the difficulty of my own position, but he came to do so, hence the memorandum and assent to it. I told him that I should not make any use of it in a public way unless I obtained his leave hereafter for doing so. But I reserved the right to make such statement as to my belief about him as might be necessary in my intercourse with responsible counsellors. The memorandum was as follows:—

> I repeat and accept the words of the Creed *ex animo*. I use them without any sense of incongruity, and with no desire to change them. With me it is a question of emphasis. I desire that the emphasis of the Apostolic teaching should be preserved in the teaching of the Church. No man who believes in the Incarnation could postulate for Our Saviour an ordinary Birth. I believe that in the Birth of Jesus Christ, Whom I worship, as in the fullest sense Divine, there was special action of the Holy Spirit. But when in the Creed I affirm, as I readily do, the traditional belief of the Church in the Birth of Jesus Christ without a human father, I am bound to add that the belief in the Incarnation may be consistent now, as it was consistent in Apostolic days, with other notions or explanations of the mode of what happened therein. I have never seen any satisfying alternative to the dogma of the Virgin Birth.

There can be little doubt that Dr. Henson disliked making such informal special statement of his belief. And he made it, as he recorded it at the time, simply because 'the Archbishop appealed to me for the relief of his own conscience in performing a very difficult act'.

VI

The next crucial stage must be described in the Archbishop's own words:

> During the evening of Wednesday (Jan. 16th), I felt rather overweighted with the perplexities arising from the situation. It was

clear that Henson's complete silence gave a handle to those who declared that he was obviously unable to express a definite belief in the credal articles on which he is unsound. On the other hand, one felt the difficulty of his seeming to be trimming a statement of belief in order to enter the port of Episcopacy, and his vehement and rather irritable spirit would lead him to listen greedily to those who urge him to leave the onus on his opponents, and to preserve a dignified silence. While this might be well enough for him, it did not go far to relieve me of the charge that I was carelessly ordaining an unbelieving man because the Crown bade me do so. Past midnight, just when going to bed, it occurred to me that possibly I might write something to which he might assent. I scribbled down a draft letter, abbreviating it to the narrowest compass, and a yet briefer draft reply. I slept over these, so far as I did sleep, and in the morning showed them to Dibdin, who had come to breakfast at my request. He was very much against my asking Henson to fall in with such a plan. He was sure to refuse, and then I should be in a most undignified position, having apparently gone begging to him to get us out of a morass, and having failed in the attempt. While Dibdin and I were talking, the servant announced that the Dean of Durham was in the next room. I bundled Dibdin into another room, and brought Henson in. He showed me a telephone message which had come to him through the porter of his hotel, saying 'The Archbishop of Westminster wishes to see you at once'. He was amused at the suggestion that he had been summoned by Cardinal Bourne, but had interpreted it as meaning me, and had at once obeyed what he thought was my call. I explained that I had not sent any message, and we agreed that it must mean the Archdeacon of Westminster, Henson's friend, Pearce However, he was glad to have a few minutes' talk, as he wished to tell me that he had, at my request, decided to stay away from the City Temple meeting, at which he had been announced to speak that Thursday evening. I thanked him cordially for this, and we went on to a little general talk. I tentatively suggested the possibility of some such letter as I had drafted, but said I was by no means certain that it would be best, and was merely thinking aloud. I showed him the rough draft I had made, and he at once replied 'I should have no objection at all to write you such a note of reply to an enquiry, but I should wish to add another sentence'. I took down the sentence as he said it. I append the letter here, with Henson's additional words so marked. He signed the rough paper. I have preserved it, and then I asked him to let me decide whether to send the two letters to the press, or not. He gladly left it in my hands, and went away.

Then I saw Dibdin again, and he, Dibdin, at once withdrew the objections he had raised, and thought that, since Henson welcomed the opportunity, the whole position was changed, and the two letters might usefully be published.

The following are the letters:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* DEAN OF DURHAM

Lambeth Palace, 16th January 1918.

I am receiving communications from many earnest men of different schools who are disquieted by what they have been led to suppose to be your disbelief in the Apostles' Creed, and especially in the clauses relating to Our Lord's Birth and Resurrection. I reply to them that they are misinformed, and that I am persuaded that when you repeat the words of the Creed you do so *ex animo* and without any desire to change them. I think I understand your reluctance to make at this moment a statement the motives of which might be misconstrued, and it is only because you would relieve many good people from real distress that I ask you to let me publish this letter with a word of reassurance from yourself.

The DEAN OF DURHAM *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

17th January 1918.

I do not like to leave any letter of yours unanswered. It is strange that it should be thought by anyone to be necessary that I should give such an assurance as you mention, but of course what you say is absolutely true. I am indeed astonished that any candid reader of my published books, or anyone acquainted with my public Ministry of thirty years, could entertain a suggestion so dishonourable to me as a man and as a clergyman.

The last sentence of the letter just printed ('I am indeed astonished . . .') gives the additional words which the Archbishop took down at Dr. Henson's dictation. His Grace's personal appeal to Dr. Henson for some means of reassuring the panic-stricken, was very strong. Dr. Henson responded. But, in giving such response, Dr. Henson desired to make it plain that, if he answered such a letter as the Archbishop wrote, the essential thing was explicitly to stand to his ministry, written and spoken.

On January 18 the two letters quoted above were published in *The Times*, together with the Archbishop's full answer to Bishop Gore:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF OXFORD

Lambeth Palace. 16th January 1918.

You need no assurance from me as to the grave and sedulous care with which I have weighed all that you say in your published letter of Protest respecting the Crown's nomination of Dr. Hensley Henson to the See of Hereford.

I have, as you know, always maintained that in the last resort a large measure of responsibility must belong to the Ecclesiastical authorities, and especially to the Archbishop of the Province, in regard to the filling of a vacant See by the consecration thereto of a priest duly nominated by the Crown. It is therefore appropriate that you should write to me as you have written on a matter about which you feel so strongly. No constitutional rule or usage can force the Archbishop to the solemn act of Consecration, if he be prepared, by resignation or otherwise, to abide the consequences of declaring himself *in foro conscientiae* unable to proceed. I should be deliberately prepared to take that course if I found myself called upon at any time to consecrate to the Episcopate a man who, in my judgment, is clearly unworthy of that Office or false to the Christian Faith as taught by the Church of England.

Dr. Hensley Henson has now, on the nomination of the Crown, been duly elected by the Chapter of Hereford. I have personal knowledge of the care taken by some at least of the prebendaries who voted for him to satisfy themselves as to his teaching, and I am informed that of the nineteen members of the Chapter who took part in the proceedings, all but four voted in his favour. I do not say that the fact of his formal election finally disposes of all question as to his consecration: I mention it because it is an important step in the procedure. I have now, by the help of GOD, to exercise my own responsibility to the best of my power.

You call upon me to refuse consecration to Dr. Henson. You rest your protest simply on his published writings. These extend over many years, during which he has held positions of considerable importance in the Church of England, and has there been liable to formal proceedings in case of heresy or false teaching. To the best of my belief, no such accusation has ever been formulated against him in such manner as to enable it to be authoritatively tested.

During the last few weeks I have read with care most of Dr. Henson's published books, and since receiving your Protest I have re-read with close attention all the passages to which your Protest refers. Taking them, as in fairness they must be taken, with their full context, I find opinions expressed with which I definitely

disagree: I find in some pages a want of balance, and a crudity of abrupt statement, which may give satisfaction or even help to certain minds or temperaments, but must inevitably be painful and possibly even dangerous to others: I find what seem to me to be almost irreconcilable inconsistencies: I find much that seems to me to need explanation, qualification or re-statement. But the result of my consideration of the whole matter—and it has not been slight or hurried—is that, neither in Dr. Henson's books nor in the careful communications which have taken place between him and myself on the subject, have I found anything which, when it is fairly weighed in its true setting, I can regard as inconsistent with the belief which he firmly asserts in the facts and doctrines of the Faith as set forth in the Creeds. Some of the collections of isolated extracts from his writings, as sent to me by correspondents, are even more than usually unfair. And, as you say in your letter, 'he gives noble expression' to what you have called 'the Theological ideas of the Creed and the New Testament'.

We are familiar with the danger, common in ecclesiastical controversy, that a critic, taking his opponent's premisses, may base on them what seems to him to be an obvious conclusion, and then describe, or perhaps denounce, that conclusion as the opinion of the man whom he is criticising, when, as a matter of fact, whether logically or illogically, the writer commits himself to no such opinion. This danger is very real in the case of a writer so exuberant as Dr. Henson. It is a satisfaction to me to note your explicit statement that the 'denial' which you attribute to him, is your inference from what he has written and is not found in the words themselves.

I am bold to say that no fair-minded man can read consecutively a series of Dr. Henson's sermons without feeling that we have in him a brilliant and powerful teacher of the Christian faith, who regards the Incarnation of the Son of God as the central fact of human history, who accepts without qualification the Divinity of our Blessed Lord, and who brings these supreme realities to bear with persuasive force upon the daily problems and perplexities of human life. That he has also a singular power of effectively presenting the Gospel message to the hearts of a congregation of quite ordinary and untheological people, is a fact of which I have personal knowledge and experience.

You have legitimately directed attention to a Resolution which was adopted *nemine contradicente* by the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury on April 30, 1914, in reply to certain Memorials which had been presented to us. I do not myself find in that Resolution, interpreted either literally as it stands, or in the light of the ample

and weighty debate which introduced it, anything which leads me, as one of those who voted for it, to feel that I should be acting inconsistently in proceeding in due course to the consecration of Dr. Henson.

I am acting, in a difficult matter, with a sense of high and sacred responsibility towards God and man, after giving weight to the theological, the ecclesiastical, the constitutional, the practical, and the personal issues involved.

I think it right to add that, while my conclusion is, in all the circumstances, clear, I do not regard without appreciation and even sympathy the anxieties to which expression has been given by yourself, and by others who have, in a less formal and responsible way, addressed me. Yet I believe that, under the good Hand of God, the outcome of these anxious days will be to His glory, and to the well being of the Church of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

Every controversy must be decided on its own merits, and, in such a connection, precedents and analogies are dangerous, but it cannot be quite out of place that I should add a brief reference to some historical precedents within our own life-time. You are familiar with the remarkable Chapter written by Dean Church at the very close of his life, in which he looks back upon the Hampden controversies of half a century before, and in language of characteristic force and moderation shows how easily in such controversies unfairness may be shown and serious misunderstandings may arise 'A manifold and varied experience', he says, 'has taught most of us some lessons against impatience and violent measures.'[1]

Not dissimilarly, in the course of a Debate in which I was myself concerned, in the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation on February 4th 1891, Archdeacon Denison, the protagonist in the denunciation of *Essays and Reviews* thirty years before, and in the subsequent and consequent opposition to Dr. Temple's consecration to the See of Exeter, confessed that he would not, after the lapse of years, endorse the protest which he had himself drawn up and presented to Convocation in 1861.[2]

That incident occurred in the Convocation Debate upon the volume called *Lux Mundi* It is my unhesitating belief that, if the life of the great teacher and divine, Henry Parry Liddon, had been, to our great gain, prolonged for twenty or even for ten years, his view of that volume would have been very different from what it was when he wrote of it, in the last year of his life,

[1] *The Oxford Movement, 1833–1845*, by Dean Church, chapter IX.

[2] *Chronicle of Convocation*, February 4, 1891, p. 60. See p. 109, *supra*

as a book with 'a materialistic and Pelagianising tone, the writers (of which) seem to think it a gain when they can prune away or economise the supernatural'.[1] To myself, as one who owes much to that volume, those words seem almost incredibly unfair.

I thank you, as an old and tried friend, for having written to me so frankly in this grave matter. May God the Holy Spirit guide us both in discharging to the best of our power the great trust which He has laid upon us.

VII

The effect was remarkable. The Bishop of Oxford at once wrote privately to the Archbishop that his idea was to take Dr. Henson's reply at its full value and withdraw his protest—but that he would write formally after consulting Dr. Stone and other friends. He wrote shortly after as follows:

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Cuddesdon, Wheatley, Oxon. 22nd January, 1918.

In the protest which I thought it my duty to address to you against the consecration of the Dean of Durham to the see of Hereford, I wrote that I was 'judging only from his published writings', and 'apart from any fresh declaration of his belief which he may think fit to make'.

In your letter to him of Jan. 16th, your Grace expressed your conviction that those who had been led to suppose that he disbelieved 'in the Apostles' Creed, and especially in the clauses relating to Our Lord's Birth and Resurrection', were misinformed. You added—'I am persuaded that when you repeat the words of the Creed, you do so *ex animo* and without any desire to change them'.

To this the Dean replied on Jan. 17th, 'What you say is absolutely true'. I observe that your Grace's question is explicit, and that Dr. Henson's reply is given without reservation. I own that I am still profoundly surprised that he should profess astonishment at the fact that opposite conclusions about his personal beliefs should have been drawn from his published writings. But I joyfully accept his present assurance.

I consider myself now entitled to declare that Dr. Henson believes what I thought he disbelieved, and affirms *ex animo* what I thought he did not affirm. I am also entitled to declare that the declaration of the bishops in Convocation would stand unim-

[1] *Life of Liddon*, Johnston, p. 372.

paired by Dr. Henson's consecration: and with this twofold assurance I beg respectfully to withdraw my protest against his consecration.

Just before getting this formal letter the Archbishop had seen the Bishop of Winchester, and noted as follows (January 22):

> After luncheon I saw the Bishop of Winchester, in Lollards Tower, as he was passing through London, and he was rejoiced to hear of Gore's change of attitude, though he apparently felt that it somewhat stultified something he had himself written for publication. 'At all events', he said most earnestly, 'we shall not now have Gore resigning.' I joined with him in thankfulness that that was so.

Other objectors were not so ready to accept Dr. Henson's statement. The E.C.U. continued its opposition. Its Secretary (H. W. Hill) declared that the words in Dr. Henson's letter to the Archbishop, to have been of any value, should have been accompanied by a retractation of what he had published in his books. If the words had been accompanied by such a retractation, they might be sufficient. And Lord Halifax, writing on behalf of the Council of the E.C.U., felt compelled to inform his Grace that they were 'constrained to reconsider our whole position in regard to the conditions under which the Church of England is now governed'.

The confirmation took place in Bow Church on January 23. Two objections, one from Dr. Hermitage Day, and another from a layman in the Hereford diocese, alleged Dr. Henson's heresy and general unfitness for episcopal office. They were ruled out as inadmissible, and the Bishop-elect was duly confirmed. The Archbishop invited Dr. Henson to stay at Lambeth for the day of consecration and the following week. The future Bishop's feelings of grief and injustice are clear from the following letter:

The DEAN OF DURHAM *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Deanery, Durham. January 30th, 1918.

You are very good, and your kind letter is welcome. My wife and I will be pleased to accept your invitation to stay at Lambeth from Monday till Friday next week. There can be no question that I shall stand in great need of counsel on many matters, and I am grateful for the assurance that I can draw on your Grace's resources.

The behaviour of the Bishops has certainly made a deep and painful impression on my mind. Obsessed with the ambition of securing a 'clean bill of orthodoxy' from the English Church Union, they seem never to have given a thought to the inevitable, or probable, consequences of their action. My personal relation with the Bishops who have announced to the world that they cannot assist in my Consecration, must needs be very difficult. To forgive an injury of that kind is a duty which I shall endeavour to fulfil, but to forget is hardly in my power. I shall, however, try to content myself with leaving their Lordships to the comfort of their consciences, and the lasting satisfaction of their memory.

Ordinarily some measure of devotional retirement is permitted to a man on the verge of so momentous a new departure. That has been denied to me, and I have instead to carry to my Consecration a mind harassed and fatigued, and a wounded heart. Were it not that Consecration carries me into a Presence where a Higher Equity and a more Generous Charity than that of the Bishops may be counted upon, I could hardly stand it all.

The Archbishop wrote a long and tender letter after the consecration:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF HEREFORD

Private. Lambeth Palace. Feb 10, 1918.

I value very much your letter, and the assurance of your affection gives me real pleasure. It has meant a great deal to us having you here this last week, and I have been and am remembering you steadily when I say my prayers and think of your difficulties and obstacles and of the strain which these weeks of controversy have involved both for you and me. On Tuesday when you are being enthroned we shall have you in special remembrance.

I confess to being a little taken aback by what you told me as we walked through Little Smith Street on Friday about your not preaching in the Diocese just yet, and taking very few Confirmations during the Spring. I will tell you how it strikes me as I think it over. You have at this moment an opportunity the like of which may never come to you again—an opportunity of shewing what are and what are not to you the great realities, and what is the *proportion* of things in our Faith and Life. I rejoice in the glowing accounts I have had of your sermon in the Temple Church this morning—where you shewed the truest wisdom in dwelling upon the eternal realities in Christ which illuminate and steady our life, and in eschewing the perhaps expected reference to these controversial weeks of misunderstanding and criticism.

What I long for beyond easy expression, is that in the immediately coming weeks you should stand before and among your new folk as the shepherd conscious of his trust and his message, and bent on being the *friend* and *warden* and *father* both of clergy and people. Few men could do this so effectively as you, and it may make all the difference to the coming years, for the fruit will abide. No such opportunity may ever be so decisively yours again of shewing by living example as well as spoken word (if I may quote the Consecration Service) 'how ye be minded to behave yourself in the Church of God'.

I think I should, if I were in your place, take quick opportunity of some quiet, simple confirmation, and should try my best to give the *simplest* message in the Master's name. And I am very sure that I should watch eagerly for any who among clergy or laity are in sorrow or sickness and go quietly and unobtrusively to see them—say parents whose son has been killed—or clergy who are ill, and if they happen to be among those whose criticism of your appointment, or whose protest against it, is known to you I should be doubly anxious—in absolute simplicity and privacy and without fuss—to tell them now of Christian comfort. I believe that to do this would be in accord with the dictates of your own heart, even though the 'natural man' in any of us might give a pull the other way! It is an hour when the 'natural man' has to be pushed behind us, and the servant of Christ to do his true part. A few simple, straight sermons, translating into elementary words, the sort of teaching you gave in the Temple to-day, may lead more who have been in trouble and fear, to see their mistake and to become your yokefellows in the work—and it is big—which lies ahead for exploring the waste places and making Christ's message tell. I write unreservedly, not for any eye but yours, but I do feel sure of my ground. Believe me, my dear friend, silence 'even from good words' at this critical time may be not only misunderstood—that is a small matter—but may be harmful. I don't want to bore you by referring again to Temple's advent into Exeter Diocese. But I happen to know the facts intimately (Courtenay, one of his chief opponents, was my valued friend at Windsor and spoke of it often). He simply killed the opposition by words of quiet, steady, Christian messages spoken in and around Exeter *during his first few weeks*, without even a reference to the organised opposition which had been aglow among the clergy. (It was far more intense than in your case. Every Rural Deanery had its spokesman, and Lord Shaftesbury and Dr. Pusey were organisers at Headquarters.) The cases are not identical, but they are similar. He was a strong man—but so are you—and I believe that our prayers for you are

going to be answered, and that you are going to be the truest of Bishops to those rather hungry souls in Herefordshire. Pardon me for writing all this with a full heart.

Dr. Henson took his advice; and an episcopate began which, though destined to last only two years before his translation to Durham, was very happy, truly pastoral, and was rewarded with the affection and trust of the clergy and laity of the diocese alike.

For the Archbishop himself, these weeks had been, as he told the Bishops at the private meeting just prior to the consecration, the most anxious and harassing in the whole of his life.

CHAPTER LIV

THE CLERGY AND CONSCRIPTION

'How came priests and Bishops, an please your Honour, to trouble their heads about *gunpowder*?'

'God knows, said my uncle Toby—his providence brings good out of everything.'

LAURENCE STERNE, *Tristram Shandy*, VIII. xix.

FOR a few days towards the end of the Hereford crisis, the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson were able to escape for a brief rest at Tremans, the home of Mrs. Benson and Miss Tait. But when he returned to Lambeth just before Dr. Henson's consecration, he had his hands 'singularly overfull' of other matters of quite first-rate importance.

I

In 1917 he had been appointed a member of the Speaker's Conference on the Reform of the Second Chamber. Hitherto, though a regular attendant at the meetings, he had spoken little. But, by the end of January 1918, the Conference had come to the voting stage upon the preliminary draft report. Accordingly on January 29 he spoke rather fully on the question of the retention of Bishops in the House of Lords. In his speech he proposed that six Bishops should remain members, but expressed a readiness to accept any mode of choosing the six that the Conference should recommend. On January 31, when the discussion was resumed, there was some rather excited opposition, on the part of a few liberals, to any inclusion of Bishops.

> But the real heat was imparted by Sir Thomas Whittaker, who denounced the proposal in a violent way as perfectly monstrous and intolerable, and altogether made an exhibition of sectarian heat for which I was quite unprepared.

After others had spoken, a motion by Lord Burnham was carried: that it be a definite direction that five Bishops should be chosen, together with the hereditary peers chosen by the Standing Joint Committee of the two Houses.

> Thereupon Whittaker rose in white heat, and moved that the Conference adjourn immediately. 'Such a decision made the continuance of discussion impossible', and so on. Different members

who had voted with him appealed one after another to him to withdraw such a proposal, Chamberlain, Crewe, Hudson, and, I think, Sir Charles Hobhouse. Finally he did so, but with very bad grace, and it was obvious that the matter would come up again, and I think it may turn out in the end a point of controversy so acute as to imperil the unanimity, if that be attainable, of the Report.

II

There were, of course, in addition a good many war questions causing, Dr. Davidson anxiety, and involving a good deal of trouble throughout this time. The problems likely to arise both before and after demobilization, had been much in his mind, and with the Archbishop of York he had decided to appoint a Church Council on War Problems, under their joint presidency, of over a hundred members, naval, military, and ecclesiastical. He had besides been considering the method of dealing with candidates for Ordination from the Navy and Army, and he told Convocation on February 8 of his official assurance through the Chaplain-General to 'all really suitable and qualified men who desire to be candidates for Orders, and who are chosen as suitable for it, that the financial difficulties shall not be allowed to stand in the way'. There was also the moral and spiritual welfare of women workers: both those working in munition factories, to deal with which the Archbishops had set up an Archbishops' Committee, with an office at Lambeth Palace, from which, under the guidance of the Bishop of Dover, over fifty paid and unpaid workers had been sent to different centres by the beginning of February; and the members of the Women's Auxiliary Corps, in which the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson interested themselves deeply. And there were moral problems which will claim our full attention a little later.

There was, however, another question, affecting not so much the continuance of the War as the means of bringing it to an end, which troubled the Archbishop's thoughts a good deal at this time. We have already seen how, on the outbreak of the War, the Archbishop of Upsala begged Davidson, with other Church leaders in the combatant and neutral countries, to issue a general appeal in the interests of peace. In December 1917, Dr. Soderblom had called together an important conference of neutral Churchmen at Upsala, to deal with questions of practical Chris-

tian unity, and the Church's task in the settlement of international controversies and the support of international justice. It issued a statement, over the signature of the Primates of the Churches of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. In February 1918, the Archbishop of Canterbury received from Soderblom an official invitation to send representatives to an Oecumenical Conference of all the Churches at Upsala. The object of the Conference was to proclaim to mankind the uniting power of the Cross, and to call the Churches themselves to labour together in the application of Christian principles in the relation of the nations to one another, and the regeneration of society. The Archbishop saw both the importance, and even more clearly the difficulties, of the Upsala proposal. And it is very interesting to observe the way in which the receiving of such an invitation at this critical stage in the World War set his mind to work. He was concerned not only with the answer which he should give to the immediate proposal, but also with the deeper question whether the Church, in England, was doing enough in the direction of peace. One of the first of those whom he consulted was Lord Lansdowne, who was himself at that very moment taking his own peace movement a step farther. Lord Lansdowne agreed that the acceptance or non-acceptance of the Upsala invitation was one that the Church ought to consider on its own merits. But (the Archbishop writes) 'I pointed out at the same time the difficulty I felt about the Conference from its almost platitudinous character if it did not talk about actual terms of peace, and its very dangerous character if it did, without having the Government and country behind it.' He also saw Arthur Balfour and Robert Cecil together. The former:

> took a characteristically philosophical line about the whole situation—Christian spokesmen have always weighted themselves with the thought that they were not adequately asserting the Christian position in the World's life, they have tried to remedy the mischief in different ways; the Papacy . . . by making itself political; Puritans . . . in another way, and so on. All this is a blunder. The men deceive themselves. They think they are following Christ, and they are not; they are trying to be politicans rather than Christians, whereas they ought to be making people everywhere Christian, and then the political lines will be automatically sound.

Robert Cecil disagreed, and maintained that 'as Christians we

want to affect politics by making Christianity permeate the whole body' (January 30). On February 8 the Archbishop had a talk with Asquith of which he made the following note:

> I spoke first of the Upsala Conference, and found him entirely in accord with me in the reply we are making, namely that we could only send delegates to such a conference if the other great organised Churches, the Roman and the Eastern, were doing the like.
>
> Then we passed to a larger question. I asked him, did he think that the Church, using that word in its widest sense, was fairly chargeable with having failed to find and use its opportunities during the war. He replied that, on the whole, he did think so, though it was difficult to speak positively, and he admitted that everyone is apt to criticise everyone else at such a time. I asked him to put his finger, if he could, on any special lack of duty on our part, or to name any time during the war when it had been specific and definite. He could not do so, and I pressed him as to whether the dissatisfaction in the matter, which undoubtedly exists, is not the rather fretful criticism of other people which is the outcome of general dissatisfaction with the condition of things. It would be different if he could name anything specific, but he certainly could not.
>
> Then, leaving the past, I asked him about the present. Is there opening now for an utterance on the part of the representatives of the Christian Church on behalf of the fundamental principles of peace and goodwill for which Christianity exists? If so, on what lines ought a wise Christian teacher to proceed? What kind of appeal can he effectively make in England or Europe just now, and, so far as England is concerned, from what platform? Sermons are constant, but produce small effect, and yet, so far as our foremost teachers go, I did, and do think, that men in posts of responsibility had done their best. I named my own case, and the utterances I had tried to make on the different anniversaries in St. Paul's, the Abbey, and elsewhere. He said he had no exception to take to my own part which had seemed to him useful and appropriate, and if the effect was small he did not think it was my fault. He did not feel the same about ***, who preached what he regarded as sheer jingoism of the shallowest kind. He thought his utterances deplorable. 'Well, if that be so, is there anything more', I asked, 'just now open to us? I am in favour of the position taken by e.g. Lansdowne, and I think by yourself in these later months—namely that peace by sheer victory is unobtainable; peace due to revolutions in the different countries is uncertain, and certainly not what I would advocate; and there seems to

remain only the peace by some sort of negotiation. Shall we be better able thus to negotiate a year hence than we are now, supposing things to go on in their stalemate condition?' He replied decidedly that he did not think they could go on. He thought a break-up must come on one side or the other from popular discontent and war weariness. No chance of a smashing victory. No satisfaction from a prolongation of an indecisive trench warfare to which we have become used. 'If so', I answered, 'what then? Is there anything that either you or I can do? If you see anything I ought to do, or any direction in which I should be moving, tell me frankly.' He confessed himself unable to make any suggestion.

Such consultations certainly show some of the thoughts then stirring in the Archbishop's mind: but so far as the immediate question went of sending representatives to Upsala, a temporizing answer was sent, leaving room for the further soundings which took place later on in the year.

III

On February 12, he was taken ill—with a recurrence of his old trouble, and spent some time in bed. But he was not idle. The memoranda which are preserved show the deep interest he took in Lloyd George's difficulties with the military chiefs or vice versa: and most other public affairs, including the sad outlook in Ireland.

On April 7 Dr. Davidson kept his seventieth birthday. He was at Canterbury at the time, and a large number of letters reached him, but there was little time for birthday festivities at so grave a crisis in the War. It came only a few days before Haig's famous order to the troops: 'With our backs to the wall, and believing in the justice of our cause, each one of us must fight on to the end' (April 13). The immediate task to be grappled was the position of the Clergy under the new Man Power Bill which raised the military age for compulsory service from 41 to 50 and in some cases 55. In the form in which it was introduced to the House of Commons the clergy were no longer exempted from compulsory military service. Their inclusion was approved by the Archbishop. The new Bill was introduced on April 9, but six days later the decision was reversed. The Archbishop reported the change, in the following letter to the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Southwark:

The Archbishop of Canterbury *to the* Bishops of London, Winchester, *and* Southwark

April 15th, 1918.

The situation is changed about the clergy exemptions. I have been with Cave[1] this afternoon, and find that the Government, frightened by Ireland's refusal to let the priests serve in the Army, and the impossibility of doing in England what cannot be done in Ireland, are likely to withdraw the clause conscripting the clergy. I do not think the House of Lords will take this peaceably, and I myself should feel bound, I think, to make it very clear that it was not being done by our wish, and possibly should feel bound to say that we ought to bid the clergy, who are willing to do so, volunteer for service, preferably non-combatant, but not exclusively so. Further, it may pass the Commons under the guillotine, and, therefore, without any discussion or explanation at all. This would reserve the discussion for the House of Lords. If that happens in the Commons to-morrow, Wednesday and Thursday may be important in the Lords. This is private, but you may be glad to have it.

When the Second Reading of the Military Service Bill was moved in the House of Lords on April 17, 1918, the Archbishop made his own position plain. He said that the exemption of the clergy in the original Military Service Act of 1916 had not been asked for by the Bishops and clergy of the Church of England; though he had approved of it as wiser 'as things then stood', and Lord Kitchener had emphatically assured him of his own agreement with his view. And he gave an account of the way in which the clergy and ministers of religion in their parishes, and as chaplains, and in war work of all kinds, had risen to the occasion and met needs which perhaps they alone could adequately fill. He went on:

Now came the change. A few weeks ago a new emergency arose. . . . The call took a new and more vibrant sound, and we all felt that it concerned not those who were fighting only, but ourselves who were at home. In those circumstances, before the Prime Minister made his speech in the House of Commons, I took upon myself to write a letter to him with regard to the particular point that I am dwelling upon. I was obliged to write on my own responsibility; the matter was sudden, and it was impossible to take counsel with my brother Bishops or others. . . . I wrote to him

[1] Home Secretary.

'My dear Prime Minister,

In confronting your task of summoning the manhood of England even more urgently than before to rally to the conflict on behalf of righteousness and freedom, you may possibly be uncertain as to how your appeal will be met.

I should like, so far as I am entitled to do so without formal consultation, to reassure you with regard at least to one section of the people. We clergy, in face of an emergency so great, are ready, I firmly believe, to answer with whole-hearted loyalty to any new call that the nation through its responsible spokesmen makes upon us. The hour is too grave for any reply but one, and the very sacredness of our distinctive trust deepens our sense of responsibility for seeing that no detriment or lack accrue by any default on our part, or on the part of those whom we can influence' . . .

It is not for me to say why the change was made. The noble Viscount (Lord Peel) . . . stated that it was due merely to the fact that the numbers who would be available in any circumstances from the ranks of the clergy and ministers would at best be small. I agree that it would be far smaller than people suppose. . But there would have been a considerable number still remaining. . It is not for me to say what reasons may have induced the Government to come to the conclusion at which they have arrived. But I wish to make one thing clear—namely, that it was in no sense at our request . . let no man say hereafter that the clergy of the Church of England have asked for exemption at this hour. . . In my judgment the very contrary is the case.

The Archbishop ended his speech by a promise 'to see what we can do voluntarily under conditions so different—and this is the real point—from those of 1915–16 as to justify a different attitude on our part from that which we took up at that time'.

Five days later, a special meeting of Diocesan Bishops was held at Lambeth. The seventeen Bishops present agreed unanimously that they would endeavour by diocesan arrangement to give to the clergy, under a voluntary system, facilities for putting themselves in the same position as that which would have been theirs under conscription. Effective provision was made for non-combatant service, but combatant service was allowed. Some Bishops found it more difficult than others to distinguish between the facilitating of what was really voluntary action, and the maintenance of an atmosphere which ceased to make it voluntary. The Bishop of

London, in a summons to his diocese dated 'St. George's Day', offered 'special dispensations' to clergy undertaking combatant service, 'now that the lives and honour of women and children depend upon the courage and skill of their menfolk'. Tribunals were appointed in the different dioceses to decide whether offers should be accepted or refused; and the working out of the system was everywhere helped by the Ministry of National Service. In some dioceses, a number of clergy were in fact released, but it was found on the whole that, so far as the younger men were concerned, allowing for chaplaincy needs, the combing had already been fairly complete.[1] In reporting to the Upper House of Convocation, July 9, 1918, the Archbishop said of the general outcome of the diocesan efforts: 'What, I think, is coming out, as far as I can judge, is that the demand for men for quite inevitable and indispensable work in our parishes has been, by the public outside, though not by us, underrated.'

[1] The Bishop of Bristol, May 11, 1918, sent the Archbishop the following summary. Total number of clergy in Bristol Diocese, August 4, 1914, 310. Of these 71 had been commissioned as Chaplains in the Navy or Army, 4 were serving as combatants, 4 working in Church Army Huts Of the 124 of military age (May 1918), 41 alone were immediately available, and of these 19 would become Army Chaplains, 10 have volunteered for non-combatant service, 4 for combatant, 8 for work in Church Army Huts abroad.

CHAPTER LV

THE CRISIS OF THE WAR

For what is war? what is it, Yorick, when fought as ours has been, upon principles of *liberty*, and upon principles of *honour*? what is it, but the getting together of quiet and harmless people, with their swords in their hands, to keep the ambitious and the turbulent within bounds? LAURENCE STERNE, *Tristram Shandy*, VII XXXII.

IN the last ten months of the war, there were many other cares which pressed upon the Archbishop. Some were cares for promoting peace. Thus, in February 1918, the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation passed a Resolution welcoming the proposal of a League of Nations:

> That this House notes with especial satisfaction the prominent place recently given by prominent statesmen among the Allies to the proposal of a League of Nations. We desire to welcome in the name of the Prince of Peace the idea of such a League as shall promote the brotherhood of man, and shall have power at the last resort to constrain by economic pressure or armed force any nation which should refuse to submit to an international tribunal any dispute with another nation Further, we desire that such a League of Nations should not merely be regarded as a more or less remote consequence of peace, but that provision for its organisation should be included in the conditions of a settlement. (February 7th, 1918.)

The Archbishop, in a full speech, gave it strong support, and took pains to indicate that there had been brave men before Agamemnon; successive British Prime Ministers, for example, and General Smuts, having spoken up for the principle of a League earlier than Woodrow Wilson. Later in the month, he headed a manifesto by the leaders of many Churches, including the Church of Scotland, the Free Churches, and the Roman Catholic Church, to a similar effect, urging again that the League 'should be put in the very forefront of the peace terms as their presupposition and guarantee'.

I

The spring of 1918 was the most critical period of the War; and the Archbishop's anxiety was great. One particular trouble, which caused him special concern in these months, was the

question of morals and health among soldiers of the Expeditionary Force in France. From the beginning of the War, he had kept a watch on the subject, not least in connexion with the troops quartered in Folkestone, in his own Diocese; and he had remained in close touch both with the chaplains to the Forces, and social workers, and with the Home Office and the military authorities. In February 1918, a good deal of public indignation was stirred at what seemed the *nonchalance* of the responsible people both in France and at home, with regard to some particularly bad cases of *maisons tolerées* in Havre and Cayeux, and also to the considerable prevalence of disease. With the arrival of the American troops, Bishop Brent, acting as their unofficial Chaplain-General, pressed hard for joint action between the British and American armies, and also between chaplains, doctors, and officers. The Archbishop went thoroughly into the whole question with Bishop Gwynne, the Deputy Chaplain-General of the British Expeditionary Force; and had many communications with Lord Derby, the Secretary of State for War. Various Resolutions were passed by the Bishops in Convocation, and a good deal of indignation was expressed all over the country. The Archbishop told Lord Derby that he was not surprised at the agitation, 'for the reputation of the Army is supposed to be distinctly lowered by such incidents' (February 9, 1918). A fortnight later he asked Lord Derby for a further interview, and, after saying that he was laid up in bed at the time, added:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EARL OF DERBY

25th February 1918.

I have however had full conversation with Bishop Gwynne, the Deputy Chaplain-General who is now in England, and have arranged with him that he should send me a report from the Chaplains' standpoint with regard to the problem both at Cayeux and at other like places.

The idea of a report from the Chaplains' standpoint caused something of a stir in high military circles; and the Chaplain-General sent the Archbishop a copy of a letter from the Adjutant-General (Sir Nevil Macready) to Bishop Gwynne as follows:

The ADJUTANT-GENERAL *to the* DEPUTY CHAPLAIN-GENERAL

27th February 1918.

Lord Derby has received a letter from the Archbishop of Canter-

bury to the effect that he has arranged with you to send a report from the Chaplains' standpoint, in regard to the problem of venereal disease and French brothels.

You will no doubt appreciate that any report you may send, or, indeed, conversation you may have with an official unconnected with the Army, must be rendered through and with the consent of your immediate superior, who of course is the Adjutant-General in France.

I do not, of course, refer to the purely spiritual side of the position you hold, nor would I suggest that this should not be a matter of discussion with the high authorities of your Church, although even here it may be questionable whether reference before doing so should not be made to the Chaplain-General.

This roused the Archbishop:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* CHAPLAIN-GENERAL

1 March, 1918.

I return the letter which the Adjutant-General has written to Bishop Gwynne. I cannot conceive that the Adjutant-General would contend that men in the position of yourself and the Deputy Chaplain-General cannot talk over with me the moral problems of the Army with a view to the removal and resistance of temptation. If he were to say so, the country would not support him in demanding it Nor, I am sure, would the Secretary of State support him in endeavouring to restrict intercourse among us Bishops upon the moral question which is stirring the hearts of the whole people Of course formal letters prescribing policy to be followed by the Army authorities in connexion with Brothels and the like are not in contemplation between us, and neither you nor I would think of acting in such a matter formally and publicly without communicating with the highest military authorities But our whole *raison d'être* is that we should try to promote the moral and spiritual well-being of the manhood of England now serving in the Army; and to say that we must not take counsel on this subject with a view to ascertaining the facts, or that what the Adjutant-General calls 'purely spiritual' questions can be separated off from moral questions, is surely out of the question. I am quite prepared to face the public on that subject if necessary, and I am ready at any moment to see the Secretary of State on the subject. The immediate occasion of my letter to Lord Derby was a request from him that we should give him counsel and information about these very questions Nothing could have been more frank and encouraging than his wish that we should help him if possible to get

to the roots of a problem of intense difficulty. He knew and desired that we should try to put before him all the information available.

Pray show this letter to Bishop Gwynne. I am certain that you are yourself whole-heartedly with me in the determination to know all that we need to know about the morality and the temptations of our men and to consider in what way we can best help them.

It also roused Bishop Gwynne, who said in a letter to the Archbishop's Chaplain (March 4): 'Macready's letter to me is rather an insult to my chief—the Archbishop—which I ought not to take sitting down. I do not mean to answer the A. G. until I have seen his Grace.' The Archbishop saw Lord Derby on March 7 at the House of Lords, and notes: 'He entirely agreed in scouting the idea that there was anything inappropriate in my communicating as fully as possible with the Chaplain-General, or with the Deputy Chaplain-General, upon all that belongs to our relation with soldiers on moral as well as on spiritual questions. He thought the Adjutant-General had pictured to himself some kind of formal report. . . .'

A few days later, the Archbishop gave notice of his intention to raise the general question in the House of Lords, putting a motion on the paper in the following form:

To call attention to conditions affecting morals and health among soldiers of the Expeditionary Force in France.

The Archbishop had already acquired an immense amount of information, and, between the sending in of his motion in the middle of March and the actual debate, he gained still more from both British and American sources.

The expected debate took place on April 11. The Archbishop was well aware of the delicate character of his task; and he discharged it with no less consideration than courage. He reminded the House that this was not a new question. He spoke of his own experience 'for more than three years now', during which he had been in constant touch, especially on the conditions of camps on the south coast, with military, medical, magisterial, and municipal authorities, and testified that alike from them and from the Home Office under successive Home Secretaries, and other Government departments, he had received much more than courtesy. He paid a great tribute to the young men serving in the British Army. Then he went on: 'We owe everything to these

men. Are we doing everything for them that we can possibly do?' He spoke of his own very close touch with men on leave, officers, intimate friends, medical men of the highest knowledge and character and experience, and not least with the chaplains:

> And from all these we learn a very great deal which cheers and inspires, a very great deal which evokes our admiration, our gratitude, and our sympathy, and we learn something, too, that gives us disquiet. To take an example. There are special hospitals on a huge scale—I need not name them or their character—where groups of lads can be seen by any one of us who will go to see them, lads who a little time ago were, many of them, clean and healthy, and who are not clean and healthy now. And we older men, we men who are perforce stay-at-homes, ask ourselves, 'Have we, as representatives of British citizenship and British affairs at home, done all that in the country lies to prevent, or to render unlikely, the kind of charge which object-lessons like that present to us?

There were, he suggested, always three groups of men who had a responsibility for action and administration in these matters—the military authorities, the medical authorities, and 'a body of men whose business lies with moral questions, religious questions, and with keeping up . . . the spirit and the tone', the padres and their fellows. Were they co-ordinated, or were they even acting in rivalry with one another? 'We are told that that co-ordination is found, but it does not always seem so to the young officer who talks to us about these things, who speaks about France and its temptations, about the Paris leave, about the streets of the great base cities—perhaps above all about the condition of England itself, and of London itself, to those who are on leave.'

Then he referred to the American forces, and the great difference their incoming made; the methods they had adopted, with the greatest possible encouragement from their highest naval and military authorities; and he begged for an adequate co-ordination of the work the Americans were taking in hand with the work of the English. And he spoke of the home region, for which civilians had a special responsibility, as affording a very large part of the source of the moral mischief affecting the tone and health of the Army. There were branches of this question which he and his friends were bound to leave to the military authorities —such as the penal consequence of a soldier's wrongdoing, or the

rules and methods of early treatment, and medical inspection. But on one department in particular he did claim a right to speak as a matter of principle—the whole system of *maisons tolerées*. This he attacked root and branch. The Archbishop, at the close of his speech, pleaded once again for the co-ordination of English and American efforts, and ended thus:

> . . . if the Government can give us encouragement we believe that by such co-ordination of effort and unity of action by ourselves and our brothers from other lands, we can produce something more effective than we have at present on the preventive, educative, and recreative side, we shall not merely bring strength to a great many of those to whom we owe everything for what they are doing in the field, but comfort and encouragement to thousands of English homes.

The speech made a great impression. Lord Derby, after speaking of his own difficulties, and appreciating the Archbishop's clear recognition of some of the brutal facts in the whole matter, said from his own different standpoint he was 'in entire agreement with what the Archbishop of Canterbury had said', and would do his best to help him. One point he had already anticipated. He had seen Bishop Brent, whose presence in France had made so great a difference, and had taken steps to arrange a conference between the American and British representatives, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the whole question.

A month after the debate, on May 10, the first conference was held under the chairmanship of Mr. Ian Macpherson, the Under-Secretary. The Archbishop was present, and representatives of the Army, Navy, New Zealand, Canada, and the American Army (including Bishop Brent), the Chaplains' Department, and the Medical Services, as well as Lord Sydenham, the Chairman of the Royal Commission on Venereal Diseases. One result of the Conference was the issue of a revised official War Office circular on early treatment in which, at the Archbishop's special request, in addition to the medical remedies, words[1] were included to emphasize the authorities' desire that the men 'should keep themselves in all respects fit and clean'. A second conference was held

[1] The words (they did not go as far as the Archbishop wished) were as follows [24/Gen. No./6398 (AMD2) 25 May 1918]: 'The first duty of a soldier is to keep himself fit and to avoid any risk of incapacitating himself from the performance of his duty One of the greatest risks is that of venereal disease against which continence and self-control prove the only real safeguard.'

on July 11—when a distinguished French doctor attended (Dr. Gougenot), as well as the other representatives. The difficulties were not small. On August 4, 1918, when the Archbishop dictated his reflections on some of the points which had been most in his mind during the past few months, he wrote as follows:

> There have been other things connected especially with the Army's morals and health, both physical and other, which have been a ceaseless cause of anxious consultations, cross-currents of half-informed enthusiasms and wrath. On the whole, I think we have perhaps done as much as was practicable, but it is disappointing. Bishop Brent, whose presence in France at the head of the Chaplains, is an immense boon, has discussed it with me time after time, and we are working well together. It is a miserable subject, and one which inflames people almost beyond any other. . . .

II.

There were other anxieties to which the Archbishop had to attend, concerning the special duties of the Church in the reconstruction of social life when hostilities were over. And there were some, most urgent of all, which arose out of the gravity of the military situation. He followed the fortunes of Navy and Army alike with the closest attention. After the fall of Zeebrugge, he wrote to Admiral Roger Keyes, whose reply shows how much his sympathy was appreciated by brave men on a dangerous venture:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* VICE-ADMIRAL KEYES

Lambeth Palace. S.E.
S. George's Day. Apr. 23, 1918.

The news which tonight's paper gives us is of the sort which makes a man 'hold his breath' in admiration of the magnificent courage and skill involved in such an enterprise.

As one to whom our Kentish shores mean much—for they lie within Canterbury Diocese—I should like (on St. George's Day) to say to you and to your brave men how intensely we appreciate the heroism of such deeds, and how proud we are of those who are thus adding lustre to the long and varied records of English seamanship and naval prowess.

We know nothing yet, save the brief news in tonight's papers, but I am sure you will not mind my sending you this appreciative word.

VICE-ADMIRAL KEYES *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Admiral's Office, Dover. 25th April /18.

It was a very kind thought of yours to write to me and to send such an inspiriting message to the gallant force I am so very proud to have commanded on St. George's Day. It will interest you to know that, just before we went into action, I signalled 'St. George for England'! I felt we had at last struck the right day—after two great disappointments, in one of which we—108 vessels of sorts, having come over 100 miles, were within gun range of our objective when the wind changed to a direction which would have brought disaster had we not turned back before we were committed—horribly afraid that we might be discovered by aircraft at dawn before we could get back to our hiding places. The disappointments were most trying to the men cooped up in ships for 17 days almost out of sight of land, but their cheery patience and confidence that they would be 'put there' in time thrilled me with admiration and pride—and later, the way in which they took their heavy losses, at a moment when I was feeling desperately sad, touched me more than I can say.

Thank you, Sir, on their behalf and mine, for writing.

Two days later the Archbishop had lunch with the Asquiths. The following extract is from a memorandum made at the time:

Lunched with the Asquiths Saturday April 27th. After luncheon I had a full talk with him in his study. The loss of Mont Kemmel had been announced the night before, and I naturally tried to draw from him his view of the whole situation resultant therefrom. He was naturally cautious from lack of detailed personal knowledge, but his acquaintance with the war problems generally, and with the locality, and with the leading Generals, gives weight, of course, to what he thinks and says at such an hour. The situation, he says, is the gravest we have yet had to face; matters are darker than they have been at any time during the war. Nobody is to blame, on a great scale, at least. It is due to the collapse of Russia. The pity is that the public are allowed by Lloyd George to suppose that we are secure against German attacks by the numbers of our men and the solidity of our positions. . . . I reminded Asquith of his original Guildhall speech, 'Never sheathing the sword until German militarism was destroyed', etc. 'I suppose you would say that the conditions have so completely changed that those words could no longer be expected to hold good?' He answered 'Certainly. No one at the moment I spoke had the vestige of an idea

of the collapse of Russia, which really governs the whole situation. I should be quite ready to say so. . . .'

His friendliness to myself was very warm. He gave me a copy of his book *Occasional Addresses*, and said warm words about our friendship. I thought him at his best—healthy-looking, not excited, large minded, full of knowledge, and expressing himself with the force and weight which are always his in such talks.

III

The summer of 1918 was unusually strenuous, even for the Archbishop. He was plunged, as ever, into all manner of public affairs. He took the deepest interest in the affairs of General Maurice, whom he saw on several occasions after his famous letter to *The Times*,[1] and admired his great dignity and courage. The diocese, Convocation, Parliament all had their absorbing claims. In Convocation, echoes of the Hereford controversy made themselves heard. It was not to be wondered that Dr. Henson should have resented the agitation opened by Gore with regard to Crown Nominations to ecclesiastical offices 'in view of the anxiety widely felt in many quarters with regard to the present method'—and a speech made at a Life and Liberty Meeting by the same Bishop, containing the words 'Another appointment like that to Hereford would bring the whole system tumbling to the ground'. Nor can we be surprised that Dr. Henson should object to a petition, presented to the Upper House by another Bishop of the Province, with regard to the maintenance of the Christian faith, as part of 'the long tissue of insult which had misrepresented everything that he accepted'.

In Parliament the Archbishop renewed appeals he had made in 1915, 1916, and 1917 in the House of Lords on behalf of prisoners of war. He asked on March 7, 1918, for an *en bloc* exchange of prisoners. Again on July 24, he protested about the difficulty of obtaining any direct answers from the Government, and on October 16, spoke of the widespread indignation at their slowness. At the same time he gave his full support to the Education Act which Mr. Fisher piloted through the Commons. There was no religious controversy; and when the Act took its place on the

[1] *The Times*, May 7, 1918 Major-General Sir Frederick Maurice, Director of Military Operations, Imperial General Staff (1915–18), charged Ministers with a series of misstatements on the military situation.

Statute Book in August the following letter reached him from its author:

RT. HON. H. A. L. FISHER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Board of Education, Whitehall, London, S W. 8.8.18.

Now that the Education Bill has been placed on the Statute Book, will you allow me to tender you my most sincere and heartfelt thanks for the invaluable help which you have given me at every stage of the Bill, and more especially during its passage through the House of Lords.

I feel that I should also like to tell you how very much I appreciate the wise and broad-minded attitude which Mr. Holland of the National Society has adopted throughout. He has kept us in touch with the body of opinion which he represents, but has always stood for moderate and sensible counsels, and I feel that we have indeed been fortunate in finding in the Secretary of the National Society a man of so balanced and generous a temper.

I hope that the Act will be found to be as fair in its working as it is in its intention. That it will be a means of raising the education of our people on to an altogether higher level, I have no doubt whatever.

The Archbishop's own summary of these months, as he looked back upon them (Aug. 4) was as follows:

I think I have written nothing since the first week in May, and yet these three months have been in some respects the most important months of our common life, as regards the things which have been happening. One wonders intensely what people will think who, with competent knowledge and pains, are fifty years hence discussing what we have now been doing, saying, or leaving unsaid. I have been in pretty close touch with prominent actors and thinkers who have been handling English affairs and policy. Abundant talks with men like Curzon, Bryce, Crewe, sometimes Asquith, occasionally Arthur Balfour, and occasionally Lloyd George. Also with men of a different group or grade, Sanderson, Newton, Kenyon of the British Museum, the Speaker, the Lord Chancellor, and military men like Maurice, occasionally Robertson, and the War Office administrators, and so on. Besides this, I have been in close and constant touch with Stamfordham, who has kept me abreast of many things, and prevented my ever being quite out of touch with any important things which were happening, or under debate. I have also had my ears open in the House of Lords, where I have attended with great regularity, and in the House of Commons when important things were under debate.

All this results in my finding myself abreast of conversations among public men, when I am present at such, and on a good many points I think I have perhaps a wider knowledge than many with whom I converse, even though they be officials with access to Government information. And yet there is no outstanding controversial matter in which I find myself brimming or effervescing with thought, or controverting vehemently a current view. Perhaps the most outstanding is what people are learning to call the 'Lansdowne' controversy. . . . A few days ago appeared his second letter to the press. Whether its publication was wisely handled by him or his friends, I doubt. I think he allowed himself to be exploited by men whose pacifist views he entirely repudiates. . . . Our distinct view is that whether Lansdowne's wording is well chosen, or his modes of making his views public fortunate, he is to this extent right—no defeat we have at present inflicted on the Germans in France, or Africa, goes far enough to ensure German anti-militarism in finding a voice, and backward and forward battlings on the Western Front might apparently go on interminably, unless there be economic or food questions forcing an issue, and this seems exceedingly doubtful. In these circumstances, we do need, as Lansdowne says, to be feeling our way, not towards peace terms, but towards the bringing about a discussion as to whether peace terms are obtainable. Lansdowne's quotation from Smuts' speech in Glasgow, May 17th, is to my mind of supreme importance, and that speech goes quite as far as anything Lansdowne has said. . . .

Another matter, in which Lord Lansdowne and the Archbishop were both interested, was the question of a Tombola. A proposal was made that a Tombola should be promoted for the funds of the Red Cross, with a prize of a magnificent pearl necklace made up of single pearls; it being calculated that the result of such a Tombola or Lottery would realize well over one million pounds. The Archbishop had some correspondence and interviews with Mr. Geoffrey Dawson, editor of *The Times*, and Lord Lansdowne on the subject, especially with the former, who had been sent to him by the Prime Minister to ask him what line he would take if the Government were to promote the Tombola. His view was stated in the following letter to Mr. Geoffrey Dawson:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* GEOFFREY DAWSON, ESQ.

2nd July, 1918.

I have given careful consideration to what you told me about

the plan of raising money for the Red Cross by means of a Lottery or Tombola of the Pearls collected for Necklaces. I have taken counsel with one or two friends interested in social life and progress, and experienced in the conditions which confronted us before the War, as regards the mischievous growth of a gambling spirit among the lads. I was necessarily in constant touch with these difficulties, which were I think almost universally felt to be very grave. The War has of necessity operated to check the opportunities, and therefore the temptations, and our hope is that in after-War conditions we shall be able to grapple more effectively with what was a growing danger. I am not I think a fanatic on that subject: many of my friends use more vehement language than I do: but the man must be blind indeed who is unaware of what was, and will again be, the rampant peril among both boys and girls, including specially the factory workers of both sexes. In these circumstances I have no doubt at all that an imprimatur given by the Government, for the first time in recent years, to a general Lottery on a huge scale, would be intensely harmful to any efforts which we may hereafter have to renew for combating the mischief. I have no right to press on you other considerations such as the pain which would undoubtedly be given to many donors of Pearls, sometimes given in memory of those who have fallen, were their gifts to be thus utilised for what they would believe to be a mischievous mode of raising money. And you are as well able to judge as I whether the Red Cross cause would be permanently helped by such action. You asked me whether I should feel bound to denounce this lottery plan if it be undertaken under Government authority. I do not know exactly what kind of denunciation you were forecasting. I have no wish to threaten a public outcry, but an outcry is I think inevitable, whether I speak or hold my tongue; and if people were to be ranged on two sides as regards the expediency and rightness of such procedure, I should have no doubt on which side I should be bound to stand. Nor can I suppose for a moment that appeal would not be made to me for some utterance on the subject.

I do not like saying all this, for it may seem discouraging to the splendid effort which has been and is being made for the Red Cross. There is no worthier object for our gifts.

A Bill was nevertheless promoted in the House of Lords:

Lansdowne was somehow got to be the spokesman of this measure in the House of Lords, and his advocacy had the result of silencing what would have been the hostile voices of many of his friends and long admirers. More than one Peer told me that he thought there

was a great deal in what I said, but he could not vote against Lansdowne (*Memorandum, 4 Aug. 1918*).

The Bill was carried in the Lords on August 2—in spite of the Archbishop's opposition—but it failed to pass the Commons.

IV

A change of a different kind, in the temper of the people, was shown in the renewal of the agitation against enemy aliens, and a demand was made for a drastic review of all cases in which exemption from internment had been given. There can be little doubt that this, as well as other questions more political in colour, were in Dr. Davidson's mind when he preached at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on the fourth anniversary of the Declaration of War, Sunday, August 4, 1918, in the presence of the King and Queen and the two Houses of Parliament. His text was 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain' (Exod. xx. 7). He spoke of the loftiness of the nation's trust, and the three special perils which may mar its nobility at a crisis hour: that its pure ideal may be weakened, or may be coarsened by selfishness and greed of gain, or crossed with temper of another kind:

> And again: the high ideals and aims to which we proclaimed our fealty at the start may, in the dust and distraction of the long-drawn strife, with its confusions and perplexities, its passions and its devilries, come to be crossed and seamed and transfused with temper of another kind. There is a righteous wrath, which is not only compatible with the noblest of God-given impulses, but may even be of their essence. Yes, but there is also a form of wrath which may degenerate into a poisonous hatred, running right counter to the principles of a Christian's creed, right counter to what was taught us by the Lord Christ, and which, once its roots get a firm place in our lives, may do worse than weaken, worse than coarsen and lower our high aims: it may corrupt and defile them with a horrid miasma, transforming what was a righteous—yes, a wholesome—wrath against wrong into a sour and envenomed hatred of whole sections of our fellow-men. That peril is no mere vague possibility. It exists. Such a spirit has, here and there, found voice among the sons of men in these years of strain and sorrow. As pledged disciples of a living Lord and Master who died upon the Cross for those who hated Him, we have to see to it that the spirit of hate find no nurture in our hearts.

His own account written immediately after the sermon was:

> This morning I had to preach at the unique service of the fourth anniversary of the war, when the King and the two Houses attended St. Margaret's. I felt the occasion to be an important one, but it would have been, I think, an abuse of the pulpit had one tried to outline questions of policy, even in the largest way. It was not an easy sermon to preach, for the very reason that political questions in the controversial sense had to be avoided, and, on the other hand, one wished to avoid, and I think I did avoid, the comparatively easy and certainly popular course of beating the big drum, and simply belauding ourselves and our cause. I tried to say some things which are not politically controversial, but which cut at the root of our religious attitude and temptations. I was listened to with unbroken attention. It remains to be seen whether I have so trodden on susceptible toes as to produce protest or attack. Whether my words do so or not, I am at present sure that I was right in saying them.

V

The summer holiday was spent as usual in Scotland, and almost entirely in the neighbourhood of Perth, Crieff and Gask, Aberuchill and Cloan. Everywhere he and Mrs. Davidson stayed with friends. At Gask, Bryce was a fellow visitor:

> He was rather eager that the Church as such should put out something which should smooth the road to peace—only he is vehemently hostile to negotiations being opened with the Germans at present. He thinks Lansdowne had gone too far in that direction.

The Archbishop was laid up at Gask for a few days with his old illness, but not seriously, and talked a good deal, as well as reading, amongst other literature, a very interesting memorandum which the Colonial Office had sent him on African questions, by Dr. Norman Leys, the future author of *Kenya*.

> At Aberuchill I revived the memories of boyhood at Dunira and elsewhere, and revelled in the glory of the hills. I still think it the most beautiful part of Scotland, and our hosts were kindness itself. I hope to be allowed future visits there. I preached in Comrie.
>
> Then we had a week with Haldane at Cloan. I preached at Auchterarder on the Sunday. Every day I had abundant walking and talking with Haldane. I had one adventure with him. He took me for a walk along a ravine where he had not been for a long time. The path disappeared, the sides were precipitous, loose

earth, and many of the little trees, which were abundant, were decayed and gave no hold, and the earth slithered away. Haldane, who is most inagile, would not go further, and I think he was right, but when we tried to get up the bank on our return, he stuck, and for some minutes I was seriously alarmed that he would slip into the ravine below—a really serious matter. However, I got above him and hauled him up with my stick. He is not a good climbing companion. He recognised it to the full and even exaggerated the perils in which he had been. We felt it would have been an odd incident if the Archbishop and a Lord Chancellor had together tumbled down a valley into a burn and been killed! But the thing was really not impossible.

On our walks we had abundant confidential talk. I still think he makes good his contention that he was after all in the right as regards his endeavours to establish friendship between England and Germany in 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914. . . . It is an extraordinary fact that he should be regarded as pro-German in policy. He is one of the most determined patriots in regard to the war policy etc. that England possesses. He does believe in the greatness of German intellect, the thoroughness of German work, and the usefulness of German education in the world's life, and he believes, as I do, that any attempt to rule Germany outside the pale of civilised nations after the war, is as impolitic as it is unworkable.

He had many interesting walks and talks with Haldane while at Cloan—dwelling on the future more than on the past—on subjects as varied as the question of producing centres of electric power for English industries, Haldane's friendship with the first Mrs. Asquith, contemporary politicians, the need of preparing people's minds about peace terms, and Haldane's own educational theories:

I think that he believes that England cares much more than England does about his opinion on educational subjects. He does really know a great deal, but it is of a very academic and unattractive sort, a complete contrast e.g. to Fisher. He intends, however, to make speeches about it, and he gave me notes to read which I have not yet opened.

I greatly enjoyed my walks and talks with him, and I was touched by his unstinted confidence, and I think genuine caring for my opinion.

In the evenings he read and recited Browning and some of the Bronte poems, which he has at his fingers' ends.

VI

On his return to England, on September 9, the Archbishop found himself immersed in work, and had to grapple with the accumulation of arrears:

> I have written a long letter about this to the Bishop of Winchester, which is preserved with this memorandum, as it gives a good specimen of the duties devolving upon the Archbishop of Canterbury of the 20th Century.

Here is the letter Certainly it would be hard to provide a better picture of the amount and variety of the work in which a modern Primate, with Dr. Davidson's range of interests as well as responsibilities, was absorbed:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF WINCHESTER

September 15th, 1918.

This is going to be rather a long letter, but I shall relieve my mind by writing it, and you will think it over, and we can talk about it when the opportunity comes.

Each time that I return, as I am now returning, to my work after a little holiday, the thought comes over me that it may be the last time one is grappling with these problems in the sort of way one does when they have accumulated for a fortnight or so, and I want to face up to them and to look at the whole wood, and not only at the trees, and to view the position and its responsibilities in the sort of way in which one would like to commend it and describe it in handing it on to a successor

The real difficulty is to keep a reasonable proportion between the great things of first rate importance, and the small things, quite necessary and important, but apt to multiply to the obscuring of the bigger. I suppose my 'make' has always been to look at things in the concrete, and not abstractively Part of the glamour and mystery and inspiration to me of a teacher like Westcott, was that he looked at everything with a certain abstractness, seeing the principles rather than worrying about the practical details, when he was writing, though in action he was pretty good in details also.

I myself see few things clearly except in the concrete—that is what makes me a bad metaphysician, and perhaps a bad, and certainly an indifferent, Archbishop. Therefore let me come to the concrete. I this week have had to face a pile of things most of which belong to the last six or seven days only, for I attended to a good many while I was absent. When I look at this mass of sub-

jects and feel, as one must, how much really depends on what I, individually, do and say about each, I am faced by the thought that we are trying to do an impossibility in leaving on the Archbishop's shoulders the responsibility for so many things which seem to be nobody else's business, except his; and yet when we consider how to contrive conciliar aid one is baffled as to how it can be done, or what sort of council would be workable and reasonably permanent and tolerably acceptable to Bishops at home and abroad, and to Church folk generally.

This is Sunday afternoon—let me give you a list of the questions I have been trying to deal with since Friday morning—two days and a half

1. The Bishop of Zanzibar's repudiation of Canterbury, and the duty of Canterbury in relation thereto, remembering our general organisation of Lambeth Conferences etc.

2. The Charge of the Bishop of Korea, dealing with the same kind of questions—the relation of Bishops on the circumference and in missionary fields to us at the centre.

3. A very practical question pressing for attention as to the Australian dioceses and their relation to the home Church. Ought they to be doing without home aid; or is such aid still as necessary as the Colonial and Continental Church Society, which is organising a big campaign on the matter, thinks?

4. The strange diocese of Polynesia, and the qualifications, or disqualifications, needed in its Bishop.

5. The varied and far reaching problems raised by Bishop Cecil of South Tokyo, about the Japanese Episcopate, and Nippon Sei Kokwai.

6. The North China dioceses, with a corresponding problem to that of Japan, and the subsidiary question whether a Church officer in England can do certain work consistently with the principle of a native Chinese Church.

7. Bishop MacInnes of Cairo and Jerusalem, and the questions about his diocese which are made burning by the war, but are really permanent.

8. The Mission to Western Canada, and the winding up of it. Ought we to endow the Mission we have founded, or ought Canada to do it? A most delicate matter.

9. The Bishops needed for the troops in Mesopotamia. Are they to go from England, or from India, and, if the former, how am I to furnish them?

10. The proposed visit of Swedish clergy to England, and the relation of their Church to our own, especially in connexion with the recently proposed Upsala Conference.

11. The visit of clergy from the United States to England—is it now desirable or inexpedient, in regard both to war policy and ecclesiastical questions?

12. The fearful needs of the Assyrian Christians in Persia, and the action of the Foreign Office in relation thereto.

13. The impending arrival of the Archbishop of Belgrade in England to deal with Serbian questions, and the alleged possible consecration in England of a Serbian Bishop—query, with or without Anglican co-operation.

14. The visit of the Greek Archbishop of Athens to England to organise what looks very like opposition to some portions of the Eastern Church, and to obtain England's support

15. The diocese of Bermuda and its proper relation to the Canadian Church or the home Church, the decision being thrown upon me.

The foregoing 15 subjects all need practical attention forthwith. Besides all these there come the questions like.

16. The League of Nations and the part we ought to take—a matter about which Bryce and others are very anxious, and Dickinson and Co. very eager, while the critics are also hard at work.

17. The request made by Chaplains at the Front, through the D C.G , that we should, forthwith, re-establish Minor Orders in England for ex-soldiers who want to be Ministers, but are unfit to be Priests. They seem to think it can be done almost offhand.

18. The problem of what is called 'International Insurance', as raised by Principal Jacks and others on moral and almost religious grounds, though really an international question.

On all these later heads, 16, 17, 18, I have no difficulty in getting home counsel, but the others are difficult. There is scarcely one of them that can adequately be handled without several Episcopal heads being put together over it, but whose heads are they to be? And we want different people's heads for the different numerals in my list.

You will see, I think, how very practical is the question I am giving you to think about, in view of the fact that the present Archbishop is past three score and ten, and a new one will soon be needed. Meantime the unhappy man who has to handle these subjects finds also a daily pile of the usual things about dilapidations and stable roofs, or the salary of a curate-in-charge, or a churchwarden's objection to a processional hymn, or the publication of Banns by laymen, and far smaller things than these. I have the best and most admirable of Suffragans to help me, but I do not see clearly what ought to be the policy of the future. I am

honestly anxious not to be fainthearted, or to croak lugubriously, but the outlook is to me a most difficult one for the Church.

You will, of course, realise that I have not picked out a special time of unique aggregation of problems. It is a normal condition of things, only I do not usually formulate lists of the subjects of each week's correspondence. I do not think that the list I have given above is markedly exceptional, though undoubtedly it is rather a high temperature of feverish work. I wonder what Moore or Manners Sutton would have said about it.

You have yourself recently raised to me several questions which are in your view looming ominously, and they lie outside the little list I have given above. Anyhow I have offered you some material for your meditations and your counsel, and, having dictated this, I must have some tea.

The letter was written from Canterbury where the Archbishop spent the best part of a month. His eager interest in all that went on was evident in all sorts of ways:

While there we went (Edith and I) for two nights to Sheerness, (Sept. 16–18) staying with Admiral and Mrs. Hyde Smith, delightful people. We visited Faversham, Friday Sept. 20th, and inspected the powder factories etc. On Thursday the 26th I spent a day with General Dallas in manœuvres of immense interest in the Canterbury, Ashford, Stone Street, Waltham region. On Friday the 27th Bell and I spent a day at Lympne, inspecting aerodromes and learning a great deal about flying.

All this was, of course, in addition to innumerable diocesan engagements and interviews, meetings with the Archdeacons and Rural Deans, sermons in the Cathedral (to the troops as well as to the evening congregation) and at Margate. Certainly here was a crowded life such as few men could manage in their prime—and the Archbishop was now past seventy.

CHAPTER LVI

THE COMING OF PEACE

Let it not disgrace me,
If I demand, before this royal view,
What rub or what impediment there is,
Why that the naked, poor, and mangled Peace,
Dear nurse of arts, plenties and joyful births,
Should not in this best garden of the world,
Our fertile France, put up her lovely visage?
Alas! she hath from France too long been chased

SHAKESPEARE, *King Henry V*, v. 2.

ON Sunday, September 29, 1918, there were Services of Thanksgiving all over England—for the delivery of Palestine: and the Archbishop made this the theme of his own two sermons in Canterbury Cathedral. The following day saw the publication of a letter from his pen in *The Times*, on the League of Nations. It was written at the express suggestion of Lord Robert Cecil, prompted by President Wilson's speech reported in the press on September 28.

LORD ROBERT CECIL *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Confidential. Foreign Office. 28 Sept. 1918.

I am venturing to send this note to you by the hands of Wolmer. President Wilson's speech last night is of the utmost importance as it seems to me. It lays down with vigour the true principles of peace and brings into proper perspective the League of Nations. You have probably noticed symptoms here of a cooling off in some important quarters of the feeling in favour of a League. That is inevitable. There are so many people who will never be really enthusiastic for it—the militarists, the bureaucrats and all the conservative forces who disapprove of change. As victory comes nearer, the conquerors will see less reason for it. It is therefore specially important that at this juncture the President should have spoken out so unmistakably, and should have directly challenged the opinion of the Allied Governments on his utterance. May I venture to say that it seems to me that this gives a special opportunity for the Church? If the President's words are allowed to fall flat and if in consequence this Government returns the ordinary kind of non-committal reply, a priceless opportunity will have

been lost. Now is the time for a real lead from the Church. If your Grace could see your way to write a stirring letter to appear in *The Times*, and/or other papers on Monday morning, warmly endorsing the President's utterance, the effect would be very great. It might make all the difference to the official attitude.

Wolmer will be able to tell you more in detail what I have tried to say in this hasty scrawl.

The Archbishop's response was instantaneous:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EDITOR *of* '*The Times*'

Canterbury, 28th September, 1918.

With the straightness and force which we have learned to expect from him, President Wilson, in his speech of yesterday, describes the character and the vastness of the issues which are at stake. He appeals to the Governments of the Allied Nations to say plainly whether or no, in the plan now being shaped for a League of Nations, their vision and their purpose correspond with his. I can speak for no Government, but I am convinced that the mass of thoughtful Christian folk in England feel with an earnestness beyond words the force of his contention that for reasons not of policy but of principle, not of national interest but of righteousness and justice and enduring peace, we want a League of Nations on the very lines which he has drawn. Details there may be in his description which need elucidation or development, but his outline has our unhesitating support. We are not afraid of such items of self-surrender as may here and there be involved for this nation or that. The issues are world-wide. Our vision and our purpose must be world-wide too. Let Mr. Wilson rest assured of the vivid and eager response which his appeal awakens in the minds of tens of thousands of the Christian men and women upon whose will, in the long run, the effective decision must turn. The Churches in our land have spoken with no uncertain voice. The responsible vote of our Bishops, given eight months ago, was deliberate and unanimous. We not merely welcomed in the Name of the Prince of Peace the idea of such a League, but we desired that provision for it should be included in the conditions of settlement when it comes. Other Churches agreed or followed suit. We have not spoken lightly or without assurance of the width and warmth of the support on which we count. We give no mere lip-adherence to a great ideal. We mean that the thing shall come to pass.

The letter met with very wide approval and comment. And a few days later the Archbishop attended the meeting addressed by Lord Grey in the Central Hall, Westminster, on the League

of Nations—and moved a vote of thanks to him. 'I think', notes the Archbishop, 'this committed the Church, so far as I by any means can, to the project, though I am painfully conscious of its somewhat general and even vague character.'

Peace was now coming in sight—but there were still some weeks before the end was quite decided. And much happened in between. A Conference of representatives of all four Houses of the two Convocations on the possibility of presenting an agreed reply to the Royal Letters of Business for Prayer Book Revision was held from October 8 to 15. At dinner on October 9, the Archbishop of York, who had come to the Conference, repeated a remarkable story about Professor Harnack which he had been told by President Haley during his visit to America:

> Haley and Delbruck (Harnack's brother-in-law) were great friends, and Haley asked him one day if he might ask him a personal question about Harnack which Delbruck need not answer: 'How is it that Harnack is such a blind follower and flatterer of the Kaiser?' 'I can tell you that,' said Delbruck. 'Harnack believes there are two sources of Divine Revelation, one in the Bible, the Old Testament and the New Testament, of spiritual truths; the other through great men of action like the Kaiser, of political truths. the Kaiser to Harnack is divinely inspired, his words are true.' 'But he doesn't really believe that?' 'Yes, he does· and I'm going to tell you another thing Two-thirds of me refuses to believe it, thinks it nonsense; but there's another third, the Prussian part, which thinks that after all it may be true!'

On October 12, the Archbishop dined as the guest of M. Paschitch, Prime Minister of Serbia, at Claridge's Hotel. It was a dinner to a group of Anglican clergy, in recognition of the help given by the Church of England to the Serbian Church during the War. At the end of dinner, to the Archbishop's infinite surprise, M. Paschitch rose by his side and publicly decorated the Archbishop with the sash and brooch of the 1st-class grade of the Serbian Order of St. Sava—all resplendent blue and white —on behalf of the King of Serbia. The rest of the guests were informed that they would be similarly decorated later on, with suitably lower grades, but might wear their rosettes at once!

On October 14, the King returned to London. The Archbishop notes.

On Monday last the King returned to London and I went to Buckingham Palace and there met Stamfordham, Lloyd George and Sir Henry Wilson. Wilson was furious with the American President[1], who had written his first letter of October 8, but not then his subsequent letter of October 14. He, Sir Henry Wilson, said: 'My cousin Woodrow (so he always calls the President) has simply bungled as a civilian would. He has mixed up armistice and peace. The making of an armistice is not his business at all, and he had no right to have alluded to it. It is a purely military matter. The making of ultimate peace is another question, which does belong to frock coats, not khaki tunics. But we in khaki mean to have a great deal to say before we leave the frock coats to go into council. We are not such fools as to fall into the trap into which Cousin Woodrow has nearly fallen, and telegrams have gone pretty stiffly from Versailles to Washington telling the President to hurry up with a second letter, getting himself out of the hole.' With all this, Lloyd George was in full agreement. What has exactly happened in these private circles since, I do not know, but I shall probably learn ere long.

On Tuesday I again saw Stamfordham at the House of Lords, and on Wednesday I dined at Grillions where we had abundant talk—Haldane, Sumner, Desart, Neville Lyttelton, Bryce, Sir G. Murray, with Selborne and Crewe in the background, though I had no talk with them. I have never known any occasion on which the front rank experts were so wildly contrary in expectation one with another as in this matter. Haldane thinks Germany is on the eve of collapse, and that fighting will be over in a week or two. He believes their home affairs to be in such a state as to make it impossible to have a coherent policy supported by public opinion. Some of the others, on the contrary, are convinced that Germany would resist to the last ditch the kind of humiliation which we should be obliged to impose as part of the terms of a peace, and that she must be much more soundly beaten before she will take the attitude rendering peace negotiations thinkable by us.

On October 16, the Archbishop attended the funeral of Sir Hubert Parry, the great composer, in St. Paul's Cathedral. There had been some hesitation on the part of the Dean and Chapter as to allowing him to be buried in the Cathedral, and

[1] On October 4, Germany addressed through Switzerland a Note to President Wilson inviting the opening of Peace negotiations and asking for the immediate conclusion of an armistice. On October 8, President Wilson replied to Germany requiring the Germans' retreat to their own territory before the question of an armistice could be considered.

the Archbishop's letter recommending it had decided in Parry's favour. The Archbishop told Canon Alexander that the immense congregation was itself a justification, not to mention the musical participation in the service of such eminent musicians as W. G. Alcock, Hugh Allen, Walford Davies, Walter Parratt, and H. G. Ley.

On Saturday, October 19, the Archbishop issued a message to the press, calling the whole nation to prayer for the nation's statesmen at this crisis. He also issued invitations to a large number of Church and Free Church leaders to a conference at Lambeth (duly held on October 29) to promote the Churches' co-operation on behalf of the League of Nations.

During the next few days we find Dr. Davidson preaching at Lambeth Parish Church, and at Sevenoaks (for the C.E.T.S.); discussing West Indies questions with Archbishop Parry; and consulting about the League of Nations and Germany, and the African colonies, with General Smuts. Two old friends passed away in Bishop Boyd Carpenter and Bishop Walsh of Dover, and the Archbishop ministered at their burial. He received a deputation of 'unredeemed Greeks'. He learned the latest news about T. E. Lawrence and the Arab situation:

> A man called Lawrence, an officer in the British Army, who has been living with the Arabs, an extremely intelligent man, has been with Bigge about it, and also with the Government. He thinks that we shall produce quite disastrous results if we do not cancel the French agreement and adhere to what we promised the Arabs.

Preparations were also on hand for the peace demonstrations —whenever they should be due. The two Archbishops also prepared an Address to the newly enfranchised Electors, to be issued simultaneously with the announcement of the Dissolution.

On November 6, the Archbishop visited Bristol and spoke to a great meeting of men under the Chairmanship of a Labour Lord Mayor (Sheppard). On November 7, he dined with the Asquiths—one of those mixed dinners, he said, where husbands are invited without their wives, and wives without their husbands. He fell a victim to lumbago on November 8—when he offered nevertheless to preach in the Abbey on Sunday, November 10; and thanks to massage by a sister from St. Thomas's, got steady relief. The rest must be told in the Archbishop's own words:

> The next day, Saturday, I was able to attend the British Museum

meeting in the morning, when we began the plans for bringing back from underground the buried treasures, and settled also some other questions. I drove Fisher back with me from the Museum, making a circuit to avoid the Lord Mayor's procession. At night, I attended the great Guildhall Banquet, driven thither by Bigge in a royal carriage. It was a memorable scene, and I was glad to have been there, though the proceedings were of interminable length. I thought the Prime Minister's speech excellent, and the reception which greeted him was without parallel in my experience. As he came up the Hall, and the whole company stood on chairs and shouted and waved, I was standing by Arthur Balfour, near the Lord Mayor, and I remarked with amusement on this demonstration to a man who, ten years before, was regarded in the City as unutterable, and Balfour's reply in the din was shouted into my ear, 'Well, the little beggar deserves it all'. As to the speech, he was, I thought, quite justified in scoring heavily against his opponents in reference to side-shows, and 'knock-out blow'—the two things for which he was always criticised. Where were the critics now? The speech exists on record, so I need not try to summarise it. The whole scene in the Banquet-Hall was extraordinary. There was a sense of elation and enthusiasm which burst out into shouts at some points in the speech, and was buoyant all through. Lloyd George announced the abdication of the Kaiser, which some of the audience had heard an hour or two before, but some had not, and there were shouts of joy. Cambon also spoke well. Arthur Balfour had plenty to say, but was as usual unprepared and very ineffective. Geddes had too much to say, but said it well; some of the others were most needlessly lengthy, and we did not rise from table till past 11.[1]

Sunday November 10th. The morning I spent in bed, working at my sermon for the Abbey in the evening, which, thanks to Mary in the morning, and Clements in the afternoon, was admirably ready in time, and was sent also to the press. The scene in the Abbey was to me intensely moving. The analogy was striking between my sermon on the Sunday before the declaration of war, and this Sunday before the peace armistice. It had been half

[1] On returning home that night, the Archbishop remarked that Lloyd George had told him that the signing of the Armistice was constantly expected—though the German envoy had been delayed en route for Spa, owing to the German barrage. Lloyd George told the Archbishop that the difficulty was due to the fact that the Germans were flying so fast that the envoy could not catch them up. The Archbishop said, 'You are not going to say that in your speech?' 'Do you think not?' 'Most certainly, keep a high tone.' 'You are right' The Archbishop said he saved him from that error of taste

hoped that the signing of the armistice might have taken place, but it had not. We supped with the Ryles; the Archbishop of York was with us.

On the next morning, the armistice was signed. Bigge telephoned to me soon after nine, and the public knew it by about ten-thirty or earlier. Maroons were exploded in the air, and London was in hubbub within half an hour. St. Paul's and the Abbey were crowded with people almost immediately, and a series of services were held throughout the day, and in some places far into the night. St. Martin's in the Fields was crowded at 11.30 p.m., services having been held on and off for about 12 hours. We had a service in Chapel at one, and in the evening I preached in the Parish Church to a congregation of Lambeth people, who were not merely attentive, but visibly moved. The attendance was remarkable.

But before that service, we had an eventful afternoon. I went to the House of Commons and heard Lloyd George announce the signing of the Armistice and recount the terms it contained. After reading them, he moved that the House should adjourn to St. Margaret's to pray. This Asquith seconded, and they went forth. They were joined on the way by the House of Lords walking in procession with the Lord Chancellor. I myself went across before them, and robed in St. Margaret's, and took part in the service—simple, solemn, and intensely moving To say it was managed well, is not at all the right way to put it. It managed itself because everybody was in earnest, and to tell the truth the least effective part of it was * * *'s reading of the prayers and thanksgiving. I do not suppose there has ever been in our history a more significant recognition of the Divine Presence and aid than in this sudden attendance of the Houses at Divine Service in lieu of a Commons debate. The House of Lords presented a curious and, some would say, a characteristic spectacle. Curzon was absent in Belgium with the King and Queen of the Belgians, and his place was taken by Crawford who read the Armistice terms with exceeding dullness and with difficulty from a badly written typed paper, which turned out afterwards to be an uncorrected draft, and not the paper which he ought to have read. After this most ineffective performance, not a word was spoken by anybody, but the House proceeded to some prosaic business, including a Tithe Bill, and a Teachers' Superannuation Bill, on both of which I had to speak—the debates being of the dullest and most prosaic, carried on by a mere handful of peers. For good or for ill, the House of Lords is a queer place!'

CHAPTER LXVII

THE ARCHBISHOP AND GERMAN CHURCHMEN

They stood aloof, the scars remaining,
Like cliffs which had been rent asunder;
A dreary sea now flows between;
But neither heat, nor frost, nor thunder
Shall wholly do away, I ween,
The marks of that which once hath been.

COLERIDGE, *Christabel.*

WE have already seen how, on the very eve of the War, Dr. Davidson was in correspondence with Dr. Ernst Dryander about the great Lutheran celebrations proposed for 1917.[1] We also observed the action which he took in reply to the Appeal of the Evangelical Churches in Germany to their Brethren abroad on the issues of the War. The severance of his relations with German Churchmen was no ordinary sorrow to the Archbishop. He had striven for friendship and mutual understanding, and he felt the ruin of his efforts and hopes most keenly. In war time, the severance was inevitably almost complete: but throughout the four long years he both maintained the hope of renewing his friendship and did what he could to keep alive the spirit of charity. Moreover, certain written communications, additional to those mentioned above, passed from Archbishop Davidson in England to Professor Adolf Deissmann in Germany, which are of high importance: and certain action was taken by the Archbishop (with Mr. J. H. Oldham and others) in relation to German Missions, which no just account of the attitude of the leaders of the Churches in war time could omit.

I

Direct communication of a personal character, it goes without saying, was impossible. Nevertheless, the Archbishop, from quite early days in the War, was able to learn, through American friends who had missionary or philanthropic errands both in England and Germany, something of the attitude of individual German Church people, as well as of the general atmosphere of the nation. His principal informants were Dr. John R. Mott,

[1] See p. 731.

without a doubt the most distinguished missionary statesman in the English-speaking world; and Dr. Battin, a Professor of German in an American University who was spending a year's holiday in Europe when the War broke out. Dr. Mott, after a long evening at Lambeth, took the following letter with him, from England to Berlin for a Missionary Conference in October:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* DR. J. R. MOTT

13th October, 1914.

Your visit yesterday was a great gain and solace to me. God grant you guidance, strength, judgement, and quietness of soul in your busy days in Europe at this time. In case you may be able to use the German version of the paper I gave you yesterday, some copies of that translation are being posted to you to-day. Of course in the present confusion of boats and mails you may never receive such letters or packets.

You will judge for yourself how far it is well that, in your conversations with German friends, you should make reference to myself or to what I have said to you. It is possible that in the present strain, and while the spirit which has found voice in Germany is prevalent, any reference to myself might be harmful to the cause of 'quiet understanding', rather than helpful. But if you feel otherwise and care, in conversation with my honoured friend, Dr. Spiecker, or others, to make reference to myself, pray let it be made clear to them that I, for my part, am resolved not to let these terrible international strifes impair a friendship and a community of thought and prayer which I have valued beyond words. That our German brothers and friends in the Faith of our Lord Jesus Christ desire simply to be loyal to the cause of Our Master and of truth, I do not doubt for an hour. The incomprehensible thing to me is how it can come about that our views of plain historic facts and of prevalent teaching can differ so widely. I literally have no notion at all, for example, of how Dr. Spiecker interprets Treitschke and his teaching.

But I retain, through thick and thin, my belief in the honesty of those German friends, and my trust that they will join their prayers with ours, that Our Father may find for us a way out of all this fearful strife, and bring us outwardly as well as inwardly to the peace which passeth understanding.

And on Dr. Mott's return to England, the Archbishop wrote again to Dr. Dryander who had told Dr. Mott, that he had not received the Archbishop's reply to his letter of July.[1] He sent

[1] *Supra*, p. 732.

him a copy of that reply through the American Ambassador, Mr. Walter Page. The Archbishop wrote:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* DR. DRYANDER

27th October, 1914.

. . . It would at all times be to me a matter of extreme regret were I to seem to treat discourteously or carelessly any communication from you. But above all should I feel this at a time like the present. It is my earnest hope and prayer that, notwithstanding differences and misunderstandings which are inevitably keeping us apart, or interfering with our usual freedom of communication and friendship, we shall allow nothing to interrupt the Christian fellowship of thought and hope and prayer which ought to be holding us together in spite of every difficulty. I am certain that you join your prayers with ours that it may please God to again make possible before long the relation of friendly brotherhood between Germany and England, which you and I, together with so many friends in both countries, have for years been earnestly striving to foster and maintain. If there are misunderstandings which I can help to remove, I shall be profoundly grateful if you will communicate with me on the subject, supposing that you can find means of doing so. . . .

During his visit, Dr. Mott saw Harnack, Spiecker, Siegmund-Schultze, and many others—reporting his experiences to Dr. Davidson on November 10, before going back to America. Dr. Battin, whom the Archbishop first saw at the end of 1914, was less intimate with religious leaders, and had a somewhat unusual access to politicians; but nevertheless made the acquaintance of certain Churchmen. At the end of 1916, he not only showed the Archbishop the whole series of Dr. Deissmann's printed Letters to American Protestants for the year, but brought from Harnack (hitherto the most bitter of anti-English spokesmen) 'courteous messages of friendship' to the Archbishop.

II

The first direct written communication from a German Churchman to Lambeth came from Dr. Adolf Deissmann in 1915:

DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Berlin-Wilmersdorf, Prinzregentenstr. 6. 26 April, 1915.

I have the honour to communicate most humbly the following information to Your Grace. I have learnt that a pamphlet is

being prepared on the fortunes of the German Evangelical Mission of 1914 in the Cameroons. In this pamphlet will be communicated, based on the testimony of witnesses, the methods practised by organs of the British government against German missionaries. Now from the personal knowledge of your Christian character which I have gained from frequent meetings and also from having been your guest at Lambeth in 1912, I have a confidence in Your Grace's unqualified *bona fides* and *bona voluntas* which remains undestroyed even in the present situation. I am, therefore, convinced that Your Grace, when you have been satisfied of the actuality of these incidents, will not approve them, but on the contrary will now and subsequently do everything to remedy them so far as possible. Although those concerned with publication of the work in Germany consider its appearance to be absolutely necessary, it seems to me desirable that Your Grace should not learn first of the work (*perhaps in a garbled form*) through discussion of it in the Press, but should be in possession of the documents even before publication. It will perhaps then be the more possible for Your Grace to do something to ensure that incidents of the kind are not repeated.

I have accordingly asked the Editor, Pastor W. Stark, to let me have, before printing, a copy of the final proof which I transmit herewith to Your Grace.

I gladly take the opportunity of thanking Your Grace most heartily for the successful efforts to mitigate the lot of the German prisoners in Great Britain. The care of prisoners is a common meeting ground, even in the present situation, for Christians of all countries, following in the steps of their common Master, Jesus Christ.

Accompanying the letter, was a pamphlet by a German, Pastor Stark, containing allegations of the ill-treatment of German missionaries in the Cameroons by British soldiers and native troops under British officials, on the surrender of Duala, the capital of the German Protectorate, September 27, 1914. The charges were curiously varied: that a price was set upon the head of every German, and the natives incited to murder; that a reward was given for severed hands; that they were robbed, starved, deprived of clean water, made to stand out in a blazing sun, insulted, maltreated, made to carry their own luggage, and so on. But the main grounds of complaint were that they were not allowed to take all their personal belongings away with them into captivity, that they were put under guard by native soldiers, and that they were in great discomfort on board the ships which

brought them to England. In particular, two white women were said to have died through lack of proper care and treatment. The Archbishop immediately communicated with the Colonial Office and other Government authorities. The charges were already known, and had been investigated. The evidence which he saw completely satisfied the Archbishop that they were unfounded. Later, in November 1915, both the accusations and the answers were published as a Blue Book.[1] The Archbishop, however, did not reply at once. And in September he received from Dr. Deissmann a bundle of typewritten copies of a series of Weekly Letters which he had circulated among American Protestants, and which dealt with the religious attitude of Germany in connexion with the War. The Archbishop regarded this action of his as constituting 'virtually a sort of challenge to me to send some comment'. He at once drafted an answer to Dr. Deissmann, which should also be an answer to his earlier letter about the alleged cruelties in the Cameroons. This letter was dispatched by the Foreign Office to Berlin via the Consul-General at Rotterdam:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 22nd September, 1915.

You may sometimes have wondered why I have not written in reply to a letter about the Kamaroons which I received from you in May, or, again, in reply to your kindness in sending to me last month by the hands of a friend a typewritten copy of your series of weekly letters (Dec. 6 to June 26) addressed to Protestant friends in the United States

Assuredly my silence has not been due to any unreadiness on my part to welcome and reciprocate your kindly words of Christian confidence with regard to myself personally. I thank God for the assurance which, among all this confusion, I hold without wavering, that behind and below the appalling international strife there still endures among men of goodwill in Germany and in England a bond of fellowship—strained but not severed—a bond which finds its meaning in the loyalty which we unite in cherishing towards the Divine Lord and Saviour whom you and I alike adore. God speed the return of days when we may again be able to strive unitedly to give effect to the words of brotherly fellowship which have been spoken in successive years by the German and the

[1] *Correspondence relative to the alleged ill-treatment of German subjects captured in the Cameroons*, 1915, Cd. 7974

English representatives in the memorable gatherings of the Associated Councils of the Churches of the British and German Empires for fostering friendly relations between the two peoples.

But, my dear Doctor Deissmann, it would be vain to deny that the path towards the active renewal of that Christian fellowship is at present so darkened and broken as to be almost impassable. If we seek, as I have honestly sought, to believe that the words of hatred towards the English people which ring through Germany are the voice only of a limited military group of men over-mastered by war fever, we find ourselves confronted everywhere by the assurance that it is the German people as a whole who wish us to hear their sentiments expressed in the 'Hymn of Hate' and in the malediction which is being deliberately taught even to little children in the homes and schools of Germany. Personally I still desire to disbelieve this, and to retain my ancient confidence in the Christian spirit and goodwill of the mass of intelligent and religiously minded German citizens: but I seek in vain for any assurance on the part of German friends that my hope is justified. With the single exception of the sermon by Pastor F. Lahusen, a copy of which you have kindly sent to me, everything which I see and read points lamentably the other way It is for this reason that in sheer sorrow of heart I have (like the author of Psalm xxxix) 'kept silence even from good words', lest I should do more harm than good.

With regard to the pamphlet on the Kamaroons, written by Pastor W Stark, which formed the subject of your letter of April 26, I have made all the enquiry in my power, and from the very full official papers and reports which I have before me it appears that the allegations of ill-treatment of a grave sort can be definitely shown to be untrue, and that the minor accusations of what is described as rough and inconsiderate treatment relate either to the inevitable discomforts of a rather crowded steamer or to rudeness on the part of native Africans at a moment of great excitement and confusion when it is presumably difficult for European officers, whether German or English, to secure the decorum and courtesy which are desirable. I have seen within the last few days accounts from the same region of an incident of much graver character, including the expression of regret by a German officer in the Kamaroons that he had been unable to prevent his men from entering a hospital and shooting some of the patients in their beds. I can hardly doubt that there must be exaggeration or misstatement, but the possibility of such a story being current shows the difficulties of the situation where, in an uncivilised country, native troops are concerned.

I turn to the European picture. In face of all the incidents of this ghastly war, and in face of one's feeling of personal helplessness, I should find it, as I have said, much easier and less painful to say nothing. During the last few weeks however I have been seriously ill, and have perforce had much time for quiet thought, and it seems to me on the whole that the genuine respect which I feel for yourself, as a Christian teacher and friend, to whose words, spoken and written, I owe much, justifies or even requires me to tell you simply and with fraternal openness how the situation now presents itself to my view. Though I dare not hope to secure your full agreement, you will, I confidently believe, pardon and even welcome my openness of speech. You have indeed by sending me your American letters invited me to tell you what is the impression they leave upon my mind

Let me say then that the first impression left is one of sheer bewilderment as to how I am to reconcile what you write about the origin of the war with my knowledge of your well established usage in the handling of documents and in the compilation of evidence therefrom You have been accustomed to treat documents sacred or secular with fearless frankness, taking obvious care not to keep back evidence of importance. We may agree or disagree with your conclusions, but we have recognised the value of your method Hence our bewildered surprise in finding that when you put before your American readers, as in letter 26 (May 29, 1915), a summary statement on the matter, to the effect that Germany throughout strove for peace and England insisted upon war, you ignore the existence of the chief documents which have led reasonable and impartial men to a conclusion opposite to your own. I cannot of course in this letter handle the complicated details of that controversy, but I know that my surprise with regard to your own statement is felt also by others of your friends. The mere fact of England's unpreparedness for war seems to us to prove incontestably what we know, by other evidence, to be true. I must not expect you, however, to share my convictions Nor will you perhaps attach importance to my statement that my intimate personal knowledge of the English statesmen on whom chief responsibility rested enables me to speak with absolute assurance as to their wholehearted and unwavering efforts during that momentous week and in all that had preceded it, to avert from Europe the unspeakable calamity of this war.

In the next place I am even more perplexed at finding in your long series of papers no reference to the terrible evidence which has now been formally produced and marshalled relating to the conduct of the German soldiery in Belgium and in France during

the earlier months of the war. We have to deal in that matter not with unsifted accusations or hearsay reports emanating from anonymous or unknown sources. The statements made have been investigated with scrupulous care by seven public men of the highest possible authority, experienced in the sifting of evidence, biassed, if they were biassed at all, against giving credence to stories of outrage and wrong, and incapable, as the whole world knows, of deviating in the least degree from the fairness of balanced and well-considered statement. This weighty committee, under the chairmanship of Lord Bryce, whose name has for many years been almost as well known and honoured in Germany as in America and England, presented a unanimous Report, based wholly upon first-hand evidence, including, and I lay special stress upon this, the autograph diaries of German officers and the officially published proclamations of German Generals The facts authoritatively brought to light in the Report are of so terrible a character and affect so gravely the reputation of the responsible officers of the German Army that I find it simply impossible to understand the absence of any reference to them in the long series of your letters. The Report may be said to defy criticism as to the truth of what it sets forth, and the terrible deeds it recounts must, I am quite certain, be as detestable to you as they are to English readers. Their gravity as an element in men's appreciation of the whole story of the war is surely indisputable. How then are we to understand your silence respecting them? I simply do not know.

The same difficulty confronts me with regard to such acts as the deliberate sinking of the Lusitania with its hapless population of non-combatants, largely women and little children. I am not referring to the crime itself but to the silent condonation or apparent approval of it by the spokesmen of a Christian people. Once more, how to explain it I simply do not know

I have written to you, my dear Doctor Deissmann, without reserve, because I understand you, by sending me your series of letters, to invite my frank remarks upon them If my letter reaches you, and if you deem it right to send me any reply, I need hardly assure you with what respect and attention I shall read anything that you say. For I should like to end, as I began, with an expression of my unshaken belief in the *bona voluntas* of friends like yourself, and of my earnest hope and prayer for the return of happier days when the fraternal Christian intercourse, which has meant so much to the great central group of Christian thinkers and teachers in Germany and England may again prevail among us, for the good of both our peoples and for the furtherance of the Kingdom of Our Lord among men.

924

The Archbishop's original intention was to give sufficient time for a reply to reach him from Dr. Deissmann, and then to publish the letter. One or two friends who had seen the letter were very anxious that it should be sent to the Press. But the Archbishop was determined not to publish until he heard for certain that the letter had reached Dr. Deissmann. On November 24, the Archbishop was ready to publish, but was not quite sure of the form of publication. There was a little delay owing to the Archbishop's absence from London. And on November 30, the Archbishop received a letter, dated November 11, from Dr. Siegmund-Schultze in Berlin, telling him that Dr. Deissmann had received his letter a few days before and was replying to it. He also received a message from Dr. Siegmund-Schultze through Mr. W. H. Dickinson to say that Dr. Deissmann had replied to it. He therefore decided to wait until the reply came before publishing his letter. But Dr. Deissmann's reply was never sent; and instead he only referred to the Archbishop's letter in one or two of his Weekly Letters to American Protestants. So the Archbishop's Letter was never published in the English Press. Dr. Deissmann's own reference to the letter is, however, worthy of reproduction:

Letter 83. Berlin, June 21, 1916.

Among these men of good will I count the Archbishop of Canterbury. I am in possession of a long letter from him as answer to mine, to which I already referred in 'Letter' No. 49 (November 6, 1915). In it he dwells at length and in detail upon the war, its causes, and present methods. His point of view is widely variant from mine, and I believe, because England is almost hermetically sealed against any reports from Germany, during the war a really fruitful discussion is practically impossible. For the time being, at least, I have given up my first intention of answering at full length, but regard the letter of the Archbishop as a sign that, as soon as God grants us the possibility of an open discussion with English Christians, the noble Christian spirit of the Archbishop will be a guarantee for the helpfulness of such a discussion.

III

Two great centres of German missionary work lay in India and Africa—on the east coast as well as on the west. Each centre, as the War went on, had to be closed: and there is no doubt that the German Church leaders in Berlin felt the suppression of the

work, as well as the internment of their own missionaries as aliens, very keenly. The Archbishop was, naturally, chiefly concerned with this problem as it affected Anglican missions or dioceses; but he was also kept in close and constant touch with the whole international mission problem, both by the Anglican societies, and especially by Mr. J. H. Oldham, the secretary of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland. It is impossible to chronicle the whole of the work which he did in this field. But we may illustrate his interest and influence by taking two examples, the first concerning the actual closing during the War of a particular German mission in India, the second his treatment of the highly perilous question of the future status of ex-enemy missionary work after the War. On July 2, 1915, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel received a telegram from the Bishop of Chota Nagpur (Dr. Foss Westcott) containing these words:

> Germans interned How many men can you possibly send, and when?

A letter warning the S.P.G. of such a possibility had explained that the Germans of the important and prosperous Gossner Mission in Chota Nagpur would be placed in a concentration camp till the end of the War The Archbishop was at once informed by Bishop Montgomery, Secretary of the S.P G., and in July received a full account of the whole situation from the Metropolitan of India (Dr. Lefroy), enclosing correspondence with the Bishop of Chota Nagpur (Dr. Westcott). The Metropolitan said

The BISHOP OF CALCUTTA *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

23 June, 1915.

The accompanying correspondence deals with so grave a matter that I believe you will feel that I am justified in troubling you upon it.... It seems to me that it will be disastrous if the Government attempt just at this time, when feeling is running so very high, to settle the supremely difficult question of what our relations to Germans in general, and German missionaries in particular, are to be after the war. At the same time, I need scarcely say that great pressure is being brought to bear upon them to do this very thing, and, if the information which has reached Bishop Westcott is correct, there seems too much reason to fear that they are giving in to the outcry. The matter is, however, of course one

which must be dealt with by the Government at home, and I am sending you the papers in the hope that you may find it possible to bring influence to bear in some form.

It was a large and difficult problem, for in that district alone—an area as big as England—there were over 300 German schools, and some 400 teachers in them, besides 42 German Pastors and nearly 500 Catechists. It involved the temporary oversight of nearly 100,000 Indian Christians who were not in communion with the Church of England. The Archbishop wrote back to the Metropolitan:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF CALCUTTA

16 July, 1915.

I need hardly tell you with what intense interest I have been considering the strangely difficult question which has arisen about the action which we ought to take in consequence of the interning of the German Missionaries I do not think I have ever known a more perplexing condition of things. It has its wholesome side as showing the critics at home—young Curates and others—that it is not so easy as they think to lay down universally applicable rules off-hand as regards our relation to non-Anglicans But it is surrounded with perplexities, and I am glad it is in such wise hands as those of yourself and Foss Westcott I have had some talk with Montgomery about it, but he rightly shrinks, as representing the Society, from saying more than that the Society ought to aid the Bishops with men and money in what they desire to do. I do not think anything would at this moment be gained by my own intervention, and probably I shall hear further from you, or from Bishop Westcott, before long You may rely upon my using any influence that I can in the whole matter. Sir Arthur Hirtzel will obviously be a very helpful counsellor. At present I am not clear as to what is Bishop Westcott's plan, even supposing he had the men and the money

Meantime, I wish you were able to give a better account of your own health. I should like to hear of you as being really robust again God be with you day by day.

Bishop Westcott, with the help of the Metropolitan, took the matter in hand at once, and made wise and statesmanlike arrangements for dealing with the situation. He had always been on the most friendly terms with the German Mission and Pastors, and there was now no friction. On the contrary, he received the warm thanks of the interned Missionaries for the delicate and

sympathetic manner in which he faced the crisis. With what help he could obtain from England, and from other dioceses in India, he took over the administration of the Mission. But it was made quite clear that there was to be no attempt whatever to proselytize or to influence in any way the religious convictions of these Lutherian Christians. The Anglican administrators would take no Service, nor would they give religious instruction in the schools. All such matters would be left to the Indian pastors, catechists, and school teachers. Behind them, in all their duties and responsibilities, would stand certain Anglican clergy for the purpose of administration The workers of all kinds would have to be paid, and all accounts accurately kept. Further, Indian pastors and workers would have to be supported in their duties of discipline and control, and buildings kept in repair. If the pastors and other workers needed advice, the Anglican superintendents would be at hand sympathetically to advise them, and would do so in full accordance with the regulations and principles of the Mission.

The Archbishop warmly commended the steps that were taken, and wrote to the Bishop of Chota Nagpur on September 4:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF CHOTA NAGPUR

4 September, 1915.

Your letter of August 13 gives me just the information I wanted, and I thank GOD for all the wisdom, courage and judgment which has been shown by you and by the Metropolitan in dealing with this large, anxious and possibly complex problem. I am certain that what has been done is absolutely right and we shall have guidance given us for what is needed as the time runs on.

I have been seriously ill, and this is one of the earliest letters I have dictated. May GOD bless and help you in all these complexities.

In November, a fresh complication was added, when the Archbishop received a letter, dated November 12, from Archbishop Soderblom of Upsala, in which he said:

The ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

12 November, 1915.

. . . The mutual position, in which the present war has placed the greater nations of Europe, has unfortunately had a disastrous effect

also on the international work for spreading the Gospel to non-Christian peoples, which has in our days gained a more vigorous development than ever. Mission work within the Colonies of the powers at war, has of course been most deeply and heavily affected. The undoubted desire and the efforts of their respective Governments to keep Missions outside the strife of nations, have from political reasons not sufficed to protect the Mission work from serious derangements.

Thus the German Missionaries, who work in British India, have, especially during the last months, been placed in a more and more difficult position, and the whole of their work will apparently have to be given up, unless it can be taken over by Missionary organisations belonging to England, her allies, or some neutral nation.

The so called Basel Missionary Society, whose German Missionaries were all interned during the earliest stage of the war, has already had recourse to this latter expedient. This mission, which has been carried on by Germans and Swiss jointly, has with the consent of the Government been committed to its Swiss elements, who have altogether undertaken the work.

The Mission in South India, carried on by German and Russian subjects, with which the Church of Sweden Mission has for decenniums worked together, has appealed to the said Mission to undertake the direction and management of its Mission field among the Tamil people, at the same time becoming the possessors of their property. This step has been taken in consequence of the decision of Government to withdraw its grants to their schools, and of its proclamation that all German Missionaries liable to military service should shortly be interned, while those of advanced age, and also women and children, should be sent home.

The Committee of the Church of Sweden Mission feel their responsibility no less strongly than do their workers out in the field—who have declared themselves willing, in addition to their previous duties, to take upon them this enormous burden of work —to rescue if possible, from deep injury, nay perhaps destruction, this venerable Evangelical Mission, which has for two centuries been of the greatest importance to the natives of South India. After earnest consideration the Committee made an agreement with the Kollegium of Leipzig to the effect that the Church of Sweden Mission should, from the time of the impending internment, take the direction and management of the whole Evangelical Lutheran Mission in India, with all its stations, congregations, schools and other places of instruction, and with full proprietary rights to all the property of the Mission, both real and movable.

An essential condition to such an agreement is, of course, the

Consent of the British Government in India. An application to that effect has, however, not yet led to any official reply. Not until such sanction be given, can the agreement come into force, and the Committee have carefully pointed out to those in charge in India the importance of acting with perfect openness and loyalty to the Authorities of the country. . .

The Archbishop, in acknowledging this letter (Nov. 22, 1915) assured the Archbishop of Upsala that 'you may rely upon my anxiety to be helpful in every way that I rightly can', and promised to send him a fuller report as to what was being done in this 'most difficult' matter. Meanwhile, the Archbishop sent on Archbishop Soderblom's letter to Bishop Montgomery, with the request that he would prepare a Memorandum on the subject, and added: 'It is important on all grounds that we should keep in with Soderblom, who is a strong friend of England, though a neutral, and probably a friend also to Germany. It would be disastrous to push him on to the German side.' Accordingly Bishop Montgomery drafted a statement on the arrangements already made for German Missions in India which was sent to Archbishop Soderblom. The Archbishop also communicated with the India Office with regard to the specific point of the management of the Leipzig Mission in South India, and wrote as follows to Upsala:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

Old Palace, Canterbury. 23 December, 1915.

. I have made enquiry with regard to the matter about which you write in your letter of Dec 11th. So far as I can ascertain, the India Office in England has no information at all as to the facts mentioned in your Grace's letter, but I am quite sure that I may say without hesitation that the Government of Madras, to whom, as I understand, the German Mission has already addressed communication, will give all possible assistance in arriving at a workable arrangement consistent with the public interest . .

The Permanent Under-Secretary at the India Office, however, had added a note of warning in a letter written earlier in December on the general subject:

SIR ARTHUR HIRTZEL *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

It is quite true that the Bishop of Chota Nagpur undertook charge of the Gossner Mission in Chota Nagpur as a temporary measure

for the duration of the war. But a good deal has happened since July, and you must now reckon with the possibility—amounting perhaps to a probability—that, after the war, German Missionaries will be permanently excluded from India. You may like to know of this possibility in order to be considering in good time the problem which will arise if it becomes a fact.

It is to this latter possibility, and the action taken by the Archbishop, in conjunction with J. H. Oldham and others, that we must now turn.

IV

The question of the future operations of German Missions in British territory was described by Dr. Davidson, in May 1919, as '*one of the most difficult questions of modern Christianity* and International relations'. As soon as the first German missionary was interned as a war measure, it was bound to arise and the best that could be hoped was that any permanent decision about a particular mission might be postponed till the War was over. At the same time, preliminary thinking had to be done, and all through 1917 the Archbishop was in close touch with the War and Missions Committee and the various Government departments. The point to be decided was not simple. On the one hand, there was the principle, repeatedly affirmed by British and German missionaries alike, of 'the supra-national character of Christian missions', due to the fact that they represent the first and highest allegiance of Christian men to the King of all the earth, in whom His disciples of every race are one. On the other hand, as citizens of particular countries, missionaries did in fact owe a particular political allegiance which, in time of war, with the best will in the world, they found exceedingly difficult to conceal; and, in the case therefore of missionaries of 'enemy nationality' it sometimes led, or was supposed to lead, to action which, in the interests of public safety, the Government was compelled to restrain. Before the War, freedom had been accorded to missions of all nationalities in every part of the British Empire. To deny that freedom after the War, would be likely to have very unfortunate effects. For example, the imposition of unnecessary restrictions on American missionaries would make a bad impression on public opinion in America, in face of the policy of the American Government as declared officially in

various Treaties and Documents.[1] It might also be used as an argument for retaining, and even increasing, such restrictions by other Governments, like France, China, and Japan. The problem was an African problem, and an Indian problem—but Indian most of all. It was therefore in communication, in the main, with the India Office that the whole future policy of the Government had to be discussed and determined.

A conference was arranged between the missionary representatives and the representatives of the various Government departments, in which the Archbishop was to be the missionary societies' spokesman. Before attending it, Dr. Davidson took the precaution of writing to Mr. Balfour, the Foreign Secretary, to press upon him its great importance, and urging full attention by the Foreign Office to the issues involved—in view of 'the magnitude of the interests, religious, educational and civilizing which are affected'. It was also deemed best by the Archbishop that the non-Roman representatives of the non-Roman missions should meet the Joint Conference by themselves, as the relations of the Roman missions to the Vatican opened up a different set of considerations.

The conference took place on December 12, 1917, at the India Office. The proposals made on behalf of the Government, for discussion, were of a very drastic character. Briefly they involved (1) the exclusion from certain prescribed parts of the Empire of all 'enemy' organizations and individuals engaged in philanthropic, educational, or medical work; (2) the adoption of a system of licences, in certain prescribed parts of the Empire, for all foreigners engaged in such work; (3) in the event of (2) being considered invidious, the extension of the system of licences to British organizations as well. The severity of this plan was no doubt due in part to the peculiarly anxious situation at the Front, and the strained condition of public opinion. But the Archbishop had to point out, on behalf of the missionary repre-

[1] From a Statement made by the Solicitor for the Department of State at Washington to the Commission on Missions and Governments, World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh 1910 'The policy of the United States is to regard the missionary as a citizen, and, in the absence of specific treaties granting exceptional rights and privileges, to extend to him the protection ordinarily granted to American citizens in foreign parts, to advance missionary enterprise in so far as it does not raise political questions and interfere with the orderly and constitutional development of the country in which the mission is located to favour the mission in all proper ways . to secure for them the right to hold property.'

sentatives, that it was a plan likely to be viewed with great dissatisfaction. He appreciated the difficulty which the Government had to meet, but he pointed out the misapprehension inevitable both among civilized and uncivilized peoples (and not least in U.S.A.) if the British Government were to impose restrictions and disabilities on missionary, philanthropic, and educational agencies which were not to be imposed upon traders! He pleaded for a definite assertion of religious liberty in any official document dealing with this question; he said that the missionaries would help the government in working out a plan for securing loyalty on the part of the foreign missionary to the government of the country. He asked at the least for delay before any drastic or novel steps were taken: and he begged the Government to do nothing by their attitude to discourage the men and women who were giving their lives unreservedly for the bettering of the Empire and the world. 'We don't apologize for our missionary work, it is one of *your* greatest assets if you knew it.'

The representations of the Archbishop and the deputation (including Mr. Oldham) had considerable effect; and the final memorandum of Government policy embodied the following principles: (1) A declaration of welcome and appreciation of missionary work, irrespective of nationality; (2) the placing of no restrictions on American missionaries, the door being left open for similar treatment to be accorded later to missionaries of other nationalities; (3) an undertaking to use the national organizations of missionary societies in Great Britain, U S.A., and India as intermediaries in all questions relating to the admission of missionary societies and agents of alien nationality for work in India and other parts of the Empire. Subsequently, by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the property of German missionary societies was transferred to boards of trustees composed of persons holding the faith of the mission whose property was involved; and the Allied and associated governments undertook to safeguard the interests of such missions. The effect of the action then taken is that all the German missions which have desired to do so have now returned to their old fields in the British Empire, excluding India, West Africa, East Africa, and Hong Kong, and have had restored to them in all cases the full use and, except in a few instances where the necessary legislation has still to be passed, the full ownership of their former property.

There were other particular problems relating to the work of German missionary societies in the British Empire with which Davidson had to deal. But the case of the future status of German missions generally after the War has been treated with some fullness as of special importance, and as an illustration of the way in which Archbishop Davidson's help was sought by the missionary societies, and his word carried weight with the Government authorities, where questions of high policy were raised.

V

While the War lasted, direct correspondence between the Archbishop and friends of old days in Germany was impossible. We have spoken already of certain letters exchanged on one or two occasions in the early part of the War. But between September 1915 and the Armistice, there was silence, only broken by a verbal message now and then borne by Dr. Battin or Dr Mott on their travels. This did not mean that there was lack of thought, or of remembrance, or of hope for the re-knitting of the bonds that had been so cruelly broken: and we have seen how Davidson, throughout these years, did what he could to stem the spirit of vengeance and hatred at home. With the signing of the Armistice, new possibilities arose. And when an appeal, couched in urgent tones, reached him from his former correspondent, Dr. Deissmann, he was quick to reply

It was in Upsala, the ancient University and Cathedral city in Sweden, that Dr Deissmann first heard the news of the catastrophe which had overwhelmed alike Kaiser, Army, and people. The Archbishop of Upsala was his host—and Dr. Soderblom has more than once recalled the consternation and deep gloom with which the news was received. Dr Deissmann returned to Berlin, and thence addressed a telegram to his host in Sweden, which he begged him to transmit to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

Berlin, Nov 15, 1918.

Christian circles of all belligerent nations desire, after the agonies of the struggle, an age of mutual forgiveness and conciliation, in order to fight in unison against the terrible consequences of the war, and to serve the moral improvement of the nations and of mankind. The German people having declared its readiness to

make extensive sacrifices, and to make good again (Wiedergutmachung)[1] sees, however, in the conditions of the truce now imposed a presage of a peace which would not mean reconciliation, but an aggravation of the misery.

After a four years' war of starvation, millions of the weakest and innocent would once more be endangered for incalculable time, and the deep bitterness thereof would prevent for generations the fulfilment of all ideals about Christian and human solidarity. But the state of mind among us has never been more favourable for a conciliation between the peoples than now Armistice being concluded, a democratic[2] movement, pouring forth with elemental power, began to give political foundations to our country. The endeavours of this movement for social improvement and the strengthening of the spirit of fraternal solidarity among all fellow-citizens and between all nations find an answer to ardent collaboration in the hearts of innumerable German Christians. To disturb this hopeful situation, by ruthlessly exercising the idea of brute force, would mean an unpardonable sin against the new spirit passing through mankind, and in its noblest motive powers closely akin to the Gospel Manifestations from earnest Christian leaders, especially in the Anglo-Saxon communities, above all the manifesto from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, in May, 1917, have proved that this spirit is also to be found amongst our antagonists.

Standing from the beginning of the war in the work for international Christian understanding, I now find it my duty at the end of the war to make an appeal to the Christian leaders, whom I know in the belligerent countries to use all their influence so that the approaching peace may not contain the seed of new universal catastrophes, but instead release all available conciliatory and rebuilding powers between the nations. I beg you to forward this telegram to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Federal Council in America.

This telegram, sent from Berlin on November 15, reached Lambeth by way of Upsala on November 21. The Archbishop realized its importance at once, and discussed it fully with Lord Robert Cecil. The Archbishop would not accept Dr. Deissmann's presentation of the situation. He had never wavered in his view

[1] This was the English translation published at the time But Dr. Deissmann has pointed out to the biographer that the correct translation for *Wiedergutmachung* is 'reparations'

[2] The proper translation for *Volksbewegung* should be 'popular movement', but 'democratic movement' was that published at the time.

that Germany had committed a great crime in letting war loose on Europe: and he had condemned her actual conduct of the War. 'When once Peace terms have been decided upon and accepted by Germany', he wrote to a friend, 'the whole situation will in my opinion be changed. But until that time I cannot confabulate with Germany on mere terms of Christian amity.'

He accordingly wrote the following letter to the Archbishop of Upsala:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1. Nov. 25. 1918.

I have received your telegram embodying the full message which Professor Adolf Deissmann asks you to convey to me in relation to the approaching Conference about a Peace Settlement. It would not be easy to answer such a message by telegram, as I find myself under the necessity of explaining my position rather fully. I can do this better in the form of a letter, and, as Professor Deissmann invites you to be the intermediary, I hope that you may be able to communicate to him what I desire to say.

Professor Deissmann's statement as to the present situation is not one which I can accept as correct. He speaks of the European situation as though all that is needed, on the part of Christian circles in the belligerent nations, were 'mutual forgiveness and conciliation in order to fight in unison against the terrible consequences of the war and to serve the moral improvement of the nations and of mankind'. This form of statement ignores, as it seems to me, both the historic origin of the war and the manner in which Germany has conducted it. I called attention to those essential matters in a long letter which I wrote to Professor Deissmann on September 22, 1915. To that letter he sent no reply except a verbal acknowledgment. We in England did not choose this war. On the contrary, every possible endeavour to prevent it was made by our statesmen up to the very latest moment. Upon that subject no fair-minded or impartial man can entertain any doubt. We were forced into the war, though unprepared for it, because a grave wrong had been done, which cut at the very root of international honour and of faith to plighted word, and ran counter to the principles which must regulate the conduct of Christian nations. Our object was the vindication of freedom and justice, and the ultimate securing of a righteous peace, which should make war with all its horrors impossible of recurrence.

We have fought without hatred, and, so far as possible, without

passion; and now that victory crowns the cause for which we fought, we desire to be equally free from hatred and passion in the course which we follow as victors. But we cannot forget the terrible crime wrought against humanity and civilization when this stupendous war, with its irreparable agony and cruelty, was let loose in Europe Nor can we possibly ignore the savagery which the German High Command has displayed in carrying on the war. The outrages in Belgium in the early months, and indeed ever since; the character of the devastation wrought in France, including the inhuman deportation of innocent citizens; the submarine warfare against passenger ships like the Lusitania and the rejoicings which ensued in Germany, the unspeakable cruelties exercised on defenceless prisoners down to the very end, including even the last few weeks; all these things compel the authorities of the Allied Powers to take security against the repetition of such a crime. The position would be different had there been on the part of Christian circles in Germany any public protest against these gross wrongs, or any repudiation of their perpetrators.

The conditions of the armistice offer the best preliminary guarantees against a renewal of hostilities and a consequent postponement of peace There is, I firmly believe, no spirit of mere bitterness or vindictiveness in the hearts of those who are imposing these conditions. The peace we hope to achieve must be a peace, not of hate or revenge, the fruits of which might be further and even more terrible strife. We wish by every means to avert that possibility. But righteousness must be vindicated, even although the vindication involves sternness. And the making good (Wiedergutmachung), to which Professor Deissmann refers, must be genuine, and, so far as is possible, complete. There is, however, as I need hardly say, no wish on the part of the Allied nations to crush or destroy the peoples of Germany. Evidence to the contrary is happily abundant. I thankfully repeat to Professor Deissmann what I wrote to him in September, 1915, my firm assurance that, in spite even of the horrors of this world war, we recognize the sacred ties which bind together in ultimate unity the children of Our Father who is in Heaven, the deep and enduring ties of Christian fellowship. That fellowship may be broken or impaired, but it cannot perish, and it is my hope and prayer, that when the right and necessary reparation has been made, we may be enabled once more to lay hold of that fellowship, and to make it mutually operative anew. It is in proportion as that Christian fellowship is sincerely maintained among the Christian people of all lands that the sorrows of the world can be healed, and true peace and good will established unbreakably among men. To that sacred end you

are yourself, my dear Archbishop and brother, labouring, and I therein join you with my whole heart. Pray let Professor Deissmann be assured that that is not only my hope and prayer, but that it will be the ultimate object of my untiring effort.

The Archbishop's letter was a bitter disappointment to Dr. Deissmann. It was a moment when an added word of kindness might have done inestimable good. He did not reply direct, but in the Evangelical Weekly Letter dated December 20, 1918, he dealt fully with the points which it contained. While expressing his conviction of the Archbishop's bona fides Professor Deissmann was equally sure that the information on which his Grace relied was fragmentary and defective. He demurred to the Archbishop's account both of the origin and of the conduct of the War by Germany; he spoke of the credulity of the public in wartime and also of a table of parallel atrocities for which the Allies were responsible 'not less frightful' than those attributed to German arms But the principal point which he made concerned the blockade, begun in the autumn of 1914 and, at the very moment of the Armistice in November 1918, made more stringent. 'Everything is thrown into the shade by the great action of England beginning in the autumn of 1914, which was the real cause of the German submarine warfare, because, under the innocent name of blockade it has been a war of extermination against the German civil population, especially against the weak, the women, the children and the old people. On this point I miss so far any explanation by the Archbishop ' And then by way of preface to some pages of statistics dealing with the increase of mortality and sickness which it caused, Dr Deissmann uses these mordant words to describe 'the most brutal and inhuman way of annihilating innocent people'.

One thing must be admitted. The blockade does not look as brutal as it is It has a certain appearance of '*eleganz*', and avoids blood, bomb and 'brand'. It works in the world as a gentleman criminal, quiet and unobtrusive, and decks its visiting card with the doctorate of international law. In contrast with the dramatic scenes on sea and land, it cannot be worked into the atrocity film; its victims do not fly into the air or into the deep mutilated by explosions, but are extinguished unheeded and noiseless in some miserable garret in a crowded town They do not even die of 'Blockade'. That illness is not on the register. Modestly the Blockade yields the *pas* to her murderers, decline, tuberculosis, pneumonia.

There is much besides, sharply critical in character, which Deissmann's bitter disappointment drove him to set down. Certainly the Archbishop himself would be the last to deny that 'war as such is the atrocity of atrocities and you cannot pick individual actions out of the hideous chain'. But it is needless to say more. To the Archbishop it was 'obviously clear' that Deissmann's original appeal through Upsala was 'political rather than ecclesiastical, though I do not question the sincerity of Deissmann's desires for religious intervention in favour of gentleness and peace'. And there was something in the Archbishop's mind which was outside Deissmann's comprehension. For Deissmann himself confessed, before the end of his letter: 'In any case, from my personal knowledge of the man, I wish to utter a warning against rash judgement of him'; and again, 'From the answer from Lambeth discussed in this letter, one does not get quite a correct picture of the Archbishop, because it is incomplete'. Before the War they had been friends. Then came the madness and the poison. After the War, so both might hope, some substance or some shadow of the former friendship would, in time, return.[1]

[1] For the next meeting, over four years later, between the Archbishop and Dr. Deissmann at Lambeth Palace on March 9, 1923, see p 1170.

CHAPTER LVIII

AFTER THE ARMISTICE

It is not our business to collect trophies, but to bring back the world to peaceful habits. VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (1769–1822), *Memoirs and Correspondence*, x. 486.

THE days and weeks which followed the signing of the Armistice were crowded with work of all kinds. Peace questions, League of Nations questions, problems relating to the Christians of the East, as well as the urgent need of action by the Representative Church Council on Church and State, constantly claimed the Archbishop's attention. An illustration of his own frame of mind is to be found in the perplexity by which he was troubled about being fit to tackle the next Lambeth Conference. According to precedent, the sixth Conference should have taken place in 1918—ten years after the last. But that was impossible. On November 18, the two Archbishops discussed whether the date should be 1920 or 1921. Archbishop Davidson said: 'I don't want to be on stilts at all, or talk affectedly, but I don't think I shall preside over the next Lambeth Conference.' The Archbishop of York protested with some vigour that his weight and his moral influence were greatly needed, and asked who but he could restrain those who might easily prove its wreckers, like the Bishop of Zanzibar. The protest visibly impressed the Archbishop, even though he urged characteristically the precedent that the same Archbishop never had presided over two Lambeth Conferences.

I

Archbishop Davidson's attitude to Germany and to possible conditions of peace, we have already seen in his reply to Professor Deissmann's telegram, forwarded through Archbishop Soderblom. In answer to a formal invitation from Archbishop Soderblom himself to a Conference at Upsala, respecting the holding of an International Church Conference at Upsala or elsewhere, he wrote:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF UPSALA

25 November, 1918

In your letter you write that you and others are strongly of opinion 'as to the necessity of such a Conference when Peace is in sight or after Peace has been concluded'. I am sure that the second of these two alternatives which you suggest is the right one. Such Conference, if it took place at all, should be held after Peace had been concluded and not during the discussions and deliberations preceding the conclusion of Peace. A Conference held during these diplomatic and international negotiations would undoubtedly be regarded, however mistakenly, as an attempt to intervene in the negotiations themselves. To this I could not be party, for I am sure that the position of those who represent Christian Churches and religious influences would be misunderstood were such Christian Conference held concurrently with the State negotiations. Christian Churches and Communities will be able to speak both more freely and with greater weight after the conclusion of Peace, when the process of reconstruction under new conditions is going on . . Mr. Hellerstrom told me that there is some possibility that you may yourself be paying a visit to England before long. If so, it would be most important and most agreeable to me that we should have full conversation upon the subject. But in any case this letter will I hope make my own position clear—namely, that Christian conference of any formal kind wherein the belligerents on both sides are represented can only take place advantageously after Peace has been concluded.

On November 25, Archbishop Meletios Metaxakis, Metropolitan of Athens, dined at Lambeth. It was the first of many occasions on which he was to have dealings with the Archbishop of Canterbury. He was a tall, vigorous man of forty-seven—with bright eyes, a black beard streaked with grey, and possessed of a strong voice. He was an ardent church reformer, and a great champion of the Reunion of Christendom. He was also a staunch supporter of M. Venizelos. He expressed himself with vehemence as to the infamy it would be if the Allies failed to restore S. Sophia, Constantinople, to the Christian Church. The conversation was followed by a dinner at the Athenaeum given by Mr. Riley—at which the Metropolitan of Athens, the Greek and Serbian Ministers, and many more were present, and a meeting on December 4, in the Central Hall, Westminster, about the persecution of the Eastern Christians, at which the Metropolitan again spoke. The

Archbishop of Canterbury also wrote to Mr. Balfour on December 4, pressing for the transfer of S. Sophia from the Turks, but received a guarded reply. And, in spite of an influentially signed Memorial, the danger of violent Moslem resentment effectively prevented such a transfer into Christian hands. So early in the post-Armistice months did the Eastern question knock at the doors of Lambeth.

A few days later, while President Wilson was crossing the Atlantic on his way to Europe for the Peace Conference, the Archbishop sent him a telegram inviting his presence at a special meeting representing the Churches in London. But, though he saw the President later, it was not possible for any such meeting to be arranged.

II

The General Election took place on December 14. The Archbishop could not approve of the flood of hatred and passion let loose on the hustings; but he kept silence. There were some who wished him to raise his voice in protest against the loud cries for the hanging of the Kaiser and the crushing of the German nation; and he was urged to denounce what was described as 'Lloyd George's infamous breach of faith in declaring himself, and almost declaring England, to be in favour of demanding indemnities from Germany independently of what is called reparation for wrongs done to civil property'. The Archbishop thought the charge of a definite breach of faith a little over-rated, though he agreed that the indemnity claim was wholly novel when compared with the popular speeches of Lloyd George himself, not to say President Wilson. He noted (December 8):

> Every day has added, in my judgement, to the evidence that the holding of a General Election is in the highest degree harmful, for the heckling of candidates for Parliament about indemnities, expulsion of aliens, trial of the Kaiser, and many other things, is beyond measure mischievous, as those who have to make answer have given no study whatever to those exceedingly difficult subjects, and yet may be committed to making promises for votes. And all this before the Peace Conference has begun to sit.

But it was a misfortune that the Archbishop, though entertaining these opinions, did not proclaim them to the world.

On January 4, he left for his second visit to the Front. This time

(for he had been ill in December, and there were many qualms about his wisdom in going) he was accompanied by his friend Sir Alfred Pearce Gould, the distinguished surgeon. Together with Bishop Gwynne they visited all the Army Head-quarters, including the Second Army at Cologne. Conferences were held everywhere with the chaplains and with the officers. The subjects were this time far more concerned with the future than with immediate needs. The Reports given at Lambeth afterwards show the variety of the themes—Church Unity, Reform, Demobilization, Church and Labour, Y.M.C.A., Permanent Diaconate, etc. There was a good deal of criticism of the rather sensational appeals then appearing in the press for the Central Church Fund, and a good deal of interest in the Enabling Bill, and impatience at its apparently slow progress. The Archbishop also had the opportunity of testing on the spot the unrest among chaplains, and the discontent of some of their number with the 'official' Church of England. This unrest had been reported to him before by Bishop Gwynne, who took such notable care to keep Lambeth *au courant* with what was passing in the chaplains' minds. There was a plan of equalizing stipends in the benefices and curacies to which the chaplains would return—called the *plus* and *minus* scheme, meaning that each would be told what was fair for him to receive, and would surrender any superfluity. Another was a scheme of 'rovers' in each diocese—a kind of Flying Squadron of special missioners under authority. A third plan was for clergy to go and work as artisans in factories, and do their spiritual work in a voluntary way without benefice or licence. Indeed, one leading chaplain urged that all chaplains should strike when the War was over, and refuse to come back save on their own terms. The Archbishop knew all this—and sympathized, though he did not find the chaplains very constructive in their views. Some of the unrest, the rebellion (in mid-war, before the armistice), was, he thought, due consciously or unconsciously, to an unwillingness to face the old parochial grind. Possessing so much freedom, how should they ever be bond servants again?

Very good it was, then, to have the old Archbishop out in the midst of men with such experiences as theirs! good for them to see him with his humanity, simplicity, and utter lack of pride, and to know that they were understood, and had his sympathy.

He returned from his visit on January 24, much cheered, and in excellent health.

It will not be out of place here to say something of a very practical scheme, with which Randall Davidson was intimately concerned, born of the brains of chaplains and of the needs of the War. At least as early as the spring of 1916, the thought of a special call to the ministry for soldiers and sailors then on active service was brought up at Lambeth. Young officers and N.C.O.s who entertained the hope of being ordained were known to several chaplains—and their numbers grew with the progress of the War, though they were sometimes exaggerated. There were two problems in particular, after a reasonable sifting of the men: finance and training. The Archbishops, with no little courage, guaranteed the first, giving the pledge that no soldier otherwise fit should be denied ordination for lack of money. The pledge was honoured, and altogether £378,000 was spent on the training of 1,039 Service candidates. The Central Board of Finance of the Church of England, with Canon Frank Partridge as Secretary, raised the necessary funds, and also found the persons to administer them; thus rendering a great service to the Church. The other question was the place and manner of their training, especially a training of a pre-university type. With astonishing ingenuity P. B. Clayton found a disused jail at Knutsford, which, with the Archbishop's unstinted backing, was converted (in 1919) into an Ordination Test School. Here for three years a total of 675 candidates were trained (of whom 435 were eventually ordained) with F. R. Barry as their Principal, and a first-rate staff. Both Clayton (founder of Toc H) and Barry (each of them Army Chaplains through the War), were altogether uncommon men—vigorous, brave, and full of imagination. There could not have been better men for the task in hand. But they themselves would be the first to confess that, had they been without Randall Davidson as their Chief, their whole work might have been unattempted, or attempted in vain.

III

In the New Year the statesmen were busy in Paris with the Covenant of the League of Nations. Late on February 3, the Archbishop heard from Mr. J. H. Oldham that there was a real

risk of the accidental omission of any provision, such as appeared in the Berlin Treaty, for freedom of conscience or religion. He wrote post-haste to Lord Robert Cecil in Paris, and had the satisfaction of receiving the following reply:

LORD ROBERT CECIL *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

British Delegation, Paris.
February 7, 1919.

Many thanks for your Grace's letter of the 3rd which I have just got. It arrived in the nick of time, and I will see whether I can safeguard the point you mention. Of course I fully recognise the immense importance of the point.

It was just in time, as the draft agreement for a League of Nations was presented to the Plenary Inter-Allied Conference on February 14, 1919, and the Archbishop thus had the satisfaction of contributing both a principle and a phrase to the Covenant. The phrase (freedom of conscience or religion) appeared in what subsequently became Article 22, as follows:

Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience or religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals....

The Covenant was accepted, and, with the rest of the draft Treaty, was presented to the German delegation on May 7. The following correspondence took place:

LORD ROBERT CECIL *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Private. British Delegation, Paris 4 May, 1919.

Now that the Covenant has been accepted, I venture to write to you to suggest that some action should be taken to ask God's blessing upon it. That has, of course, been necessary in all its stages. But it is daily brought home to me here that there is on the Continent, and especially among the Governments, very little appreciation or even understanding of the conceptions upon which it rests. Machinery—and the Covenant is nothing more—has no value of itself unless it is put in motion by some power. Humanly speaking that power can only come from the peoples of the world, and especially the English-speaking peoples. Unless, therefore, they are inspired to make a real attempt to improve international life, no covenants or Leagues will be of the slightest use. Indeed

there is to me something approaching to blasphemy to expect anything from mere machinery. I express myself badly, but doubtless you will understand. It is not for me to suggest what should be done—but it should be something as solemn and as little splashy as possible Perhaps a Special Communion Service in all the Cathedrals and in as many churches as possible?

Would this not be an opportunity for the C E M S.?

Could you speak to the Archbishop of York about it?

I am trying to communicate with the Pope.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* LORD ROBERT CECIL

12th May 1919.

I agree with every word that you say about the League of Nations and the need of our securing a spiritual basis for all our action instead of trusting to machinery, however good. I believe the machinery to be good, but we must see more emphatically to the spirit that is to lie behind and below. I am going to Scotland next week to speak to the General Assemblies, both Established and Free, on the subject of the League of Nations and the Restoration of Peace, and I shall express myself emphatically in the direction you indicate indeed it would be the substance of what I have to say. I have already spoken of it in Convocation, and I am in communication with the Archbishop of York about it I am sure that we do not want a great splash in our religious recognition of the League of Nations We need quiet inculcation of prayer, not now only but for some time to come, and this I am setting myself to promote in every way that I can. Possibly we may put forth, as you have suggested, some unsensational injunction as to special celebrations of Holy Communion in Cathedrals and Parish Churches.

More serious anxieties about the whole Treaty of Peace disturbed the Archbishop as they disturbed others. Speaking in Convocation on May 6 he said:

It is an important thing that in a great document like this, agreed to by the representatives of all the prominent nations of the earth, there should be recognition given to the fact that, in the administration of territory occupied by uncivilised and semi-civilised nations, we should insist on conditions giving freedom of conscience and religion, prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, arms traffic, and liquor traffic, and so on, and that there should be a recognition of the high purpose underlying that combination of the national powers. That seems to me to be essential with regard to all that the Peace Conference has done. We have been dis-

appointed at the dragging of it on from week to week—perhaps unfairly, but we have been disappointed. We have been disappointed a little at the absence of that kind of glad unanimity which we should have liked to see, but which I am afraid history has shewn us is very difficult to obtain when allied nations are agreeing upon excessively complicated subjects. But whatever disappointments we may have had, we do at least thank God always that the Covenant has been signed, that the peace arrangements outside the Covenant of the League of Nations are in prospect of something like settlement, and that we have no clear evidence at present of wide division of policy and purpose among the nations. That is something for which we can be profoundly thankful.

He knew only too well how much 'screwing up' of terms there had been, and privately deplored the false promises and ruinous threats which had been so freely uttered. He recorded his own feeling 'that we have no statesman big enough to handle these problems . . . certainly not Lloyd George'. He discussed with some of his friends the difficulties of speaking out. Should he, for example, attack the proposed Peace Terms, so far known, at Edinburgh when he was speaking at the General Assembly on the League of Nations? His friends advised against—on the ground (as Lord Robert Cecil put it to him) that nothing should be done to give the Germans a handle for not signing—with the consequent horrible continuance of the Blockade. Instead the Archbishop wrote as follows to the Prime Minister:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON D. LLOYD GEORGE

Private. 24th May, 1919.

I venture to write to you on a very important matter It is one which must be constantly before your own mind, and you will not suppose that I underrate the gravity and difficulty of your position at this juncture We think of it constantly, and we remember you steadily in our prayers.

I have thought that it may be not unprofitable that I should tell you how many communications are reaching me from people who to a large degree eschew ordinary politics, and who are as conscious as I am of the inability of us folk who are outside the central diplomatic and international circle to see the case all round, to the effect that they are anxious and disquieted about the terms of Peace. I have said, and shall continue to say, that we must trust you, and those who are working with you, to secure what

is both just in its bearing on the wrong-doers, and righteous and Christian in its fundamental character. I have absolutely declined to be led off myself into discussions by people who, without adequate technical knowledge, insist on trying to handle such questions as the amount and nature of reparation, the boundary lines of the new States, the transference of Silesia, and so on. What my friends to whom I refer keep saying is, that while presumably each item may be plausibly justified, the cumulative effect is to ask impossibilities. It is perfectly certain that this view is entertained with almost trembling earnestness by a great many people who have no sort of wish to minimise German wrong-doing and its necessary outcome, and who are patriotic to their own land and absolutely loyal to the victorious Allied cause and its necessary expression in action.

I am myself going to-night to Scotland, in order next week to speak in the General Assemblies of the Established Church and of the United Free Church—a curious incident in ecclesiastical history. They want me to speak about the Peace and the League of Nations. I shall be very careful in what I say, but my point will be that we trust you and your colleagues to succeed in securing a Peace which shall correspond with our purposes in entering the War, which shall be such that we can ask God's blessing upon it, and which shall be of the kind that will be lasting and not the beginning of new strife You must, of course, be receiving abundant communications both from those who may be roughly called pacificists and from those who have no other thought than the humiliation of Germany. I am not thinking of either of these parties I am thinking of, and indirectly voicing, a great central body which is ordinarily silent and which has no adequate representation in the ordinary channels of the Press

You will not, I think, mind my having said all this to you. I am anxious to deliver my soul because of the number of communications which are reaching me from really weighty and trustworthy people. But of course this letter is in the fullest sense private.

The letter was shown to the Council of Four.[1] It elicited the following friendly reply:

The Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd George *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

Personal. British Delegation, Paris. 30th May 1919.

Thank you very much for writing to me in regard to the pro-

[1] These were M. Clemenceau (France), Mr. Lloyd George, President Wilson (U.S.A.), and Signor Orlando (Italy).

posed terms of peace with Germany. I can assure you that we have given most careful consideration to every aspect of the proposed peace, in fact the Peace Conference was assailed for weeks for its delay and procrastination simply because it felt that it could not hurry or scamp its work in so all-important a matter.

We shall certainly give the fullest and most impartial consideration to the German reply. We have given them an extension of time, in order to make sure that they had time in which to marshal their case. If they can establish a just case for modification, I am sure modifications will be made. We shall not be influenced by public clamour if we think that we ought to make concessions to meet the German point of view.

At the same time, I am certain that what is most important is that we should not weaken the fundamental principles which underlie the peace. It is always difficult in human affairs to adjust mercy and justice, and, if it is important that we should remember mercy, it is not less important that we should remember justice. No nation has ever committed such a crime against its neighbours as have the German people, under the instigation of Prussian Kultur. It will not make for lasting peace, for early appeasement, nor even for the future well-being of the German people themselves and their future position in the world, should we refrain from imposing on their country the conditions which justice demands.

I have just perused the German reply. It seems to establish a strong *prima facie* case for reconsideration of the Eastern boundary.

The Treaty was signed on June 28. On July 6, the Archbishop preached at the great Thanksgiving Service in St. Paul's, in the presence of the King and Queen, the Ambassadors, members of the Government, and an immense congregation. He spoke of the events of the four previous Julys, when in Italy and the East the banks and plains of the Piave and the Jordan and the Tigris were still alive with war (1918), when there was a great daylight raid on London (1917), when woods and villages in what were once the lovely valleys of the Somme won imperishable fame (1916), when the world's records of heroism were being enacted by what Gallipoli can tell (1915). He dwelt on the horribleness of war, the need of peace, the significance of the League, the peoples' part—of 'the rugged pathway' which 'may want, I think it will want, consideration and adjustment here and there as the months

or years run on'—the need of stern discipline and of the tasks immediately ahead:

> Outstanding surely among these is the staying, throughout Europe if we may, of one of the darkest ravages of war, the scourge of impending famine.

IV

Two other memories mingling war and peace may be quoted. The first is connected with chaplains. There was a Memorial Service for Chaplains in the Abbey on June 27. Sir Douglas Haig came to the Vestry when all was over, and, in answer to Bishop Ryle who thanked him for coming, simply said 'I could not do less'. It is significant of Randall Davidson's own close sympathy and comradeship with the chaplains as a body and their chief out in France that Bishop Gwynne, D.C.G., sent him the following letter, just as he was leaving to return to Khartoum:

BISHOP GWYNNE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

P. & O S N Co. S S. Assaye July 30, 1919.

I am writing, on my first day out, to some of my friends who have been an inspiration and support to me during these five years of war, and your name has come first on my list. Never before have I had any conception of the vastness of your responsibilities and problems, until I took over a tiny corner of the whole I have often spoken unwisely and unadvisedly with my lips, as if we of a younger generation were the only people who knew. I know now that the very power to make any forward move towards a new development came from the work and life of those who had gone before. God let me see how exceedingly small of all we had—which we had not received from God through the labours of our forbears. I want to thank you Sir, for all that you have been to me—your humility, your generosity, and your great faith will be a great inspiration to me in days to come. My tongue was tied because of the knowledge of my own unworthiness when you spoke so generously of what I tried to do in France.

I go back with my heart full of gratitude to God for all the experiences of the last five years. There are about 20 of my own Khartoum flock on board this boat, and you can imagine the real joy and happiness of being with them again.

The other memory is more painful, and concerns the statesmen. On August 13, the Archbishop and Lord Stamfordham had

breakfast with Lloyd George; the Archbishop for the purpose of talking on episcopal vacancies. At the table Lloyd George was in characteristic form—full of conversation about Clemenceau and Wilson. Clemenceau disliked 'the President Wilson' (as he always called him) very keenly. On one occasion Wilson had spoken for three-quarters of an hour about moral principles being greater than force. All the time Clemenceau had listened with bowed head. Then he lifted himself up, and crushed Wilson's arguments completely. He talked to Lloyd George about 'force'. The President had said that Napoleon had put force below moral principles on his death-bed. Clemenceau's comment was, 'It took him a long time to find out, and then he was wrong.' Force made America. Force kept America together in the Civil War, and has kept it going since. As to himself, Clemenceau said he had had a tempestuous life, was deserted by his mother, betrayed by his wife, disappointed by his children. Now he was an old man—'But I've got my teeth left and I mean to use them!'

V

Throughout the year there had been a good deal of unrest in the industrial world, both above and under ground. At the end of September, a very serious railway strike commenced. It was suggested that, possibly, J. H. Thomas, the Railwaymen's leader, would not be sorry to find some channel for negotiation with the Government. The Archbishop offered his services, and wrote both to Mr. Thomas and Lloyd George. Each replied in a friendly way—and the Archbishop was given to understand, before the strike ended, that his offer of mediation, merely as an offer, had done good. The incident is mentioned, in view of the action taken, some years later, on the occasion of the General Strike. And it is interesting for the same reason to note that in 1919 a joint appeal to the nation was issued in the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, Dr. F. B. Meyer, and the Rev. J. Scott-Lidgett, and also in that of Cardinal Bourne. The appeal included the following words (*The Times*, Oct. 2, 1919):

> We frankly deplore the strike, the suffering it entails, and the precipitancy with which so grave a step was taken But we deplore still more the currently expressed opinion that such a struggle was inevitable and must be fought out. We believe this to be one of

those 'strong delusions' with which from time to time the powers of evil distract the world.

Never was there a time in England when the whole community was so resolutely set upon securing really worthy conditions of life for all grades of industrial workers. The comradeship of the war has quickened the public conscience, and we do mean, please God, that all who work for the community should be able to live as men and women ought to live. Upon that vital issue an appeal to our fellow-citizens will be more successful than ever before. But to be effective the appeal must be made to reason, and not enforced by coercion. Coercion which threatens to paralyse the life of the community alienates the very sympathies which are everywhere awake, and, by the general suffering which is involved, engenders passion instead of fellowship.

In November an attempt was made, like that of two years before, to raise money for the State by the issue of premium bonds. The Archbishop again published a strong protest against it; and the attempt again collapsed.

More difficult, in view of the state of public opinion, was the task he set himself to secure justice for the conscientious objectors who were returning to civil service after the War during which they had done work of national importance. He had to deal with the question as it concerned the British Museum, and was told that the present House of Commons would not approve of reinstatement. He wrote as follows to the Chancellor of the Exchequer:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN

19 November 1919.

Last week I discussed with you not only Premium Bonds about which I have already written, but the matter of Conscientious Objectors and their return to Civil Service employment. I find that Sir Frederic Kenyon, as Director of the British Museum, has had an interview with Sir Malcolm Ramsay. Sir Frederic learns that the position the Government takes is that these men, when they were suspended from their employment in the Civil Service and sent to take up work of National importance in lieu of Military Service, ceased thereby to be permanent Civil Servants, and that they are now taken back, if the Heads of the Departments so choose, on a purely temporary basis, and that it is not yet determined whether they shall be permanently reinstated in their

former positions. To me it seems that this is an indefensible position in the case of a man who acted in strict accordance with what the law allowed—i.e. declined to fight, but undertook other work of National importance assigned to him instead. We may, if we will, condemn or dislike or despise him and his works, but surely a man, when external work of National importance done in lieu of fighting is over, goes back to his former position unless Parliament has decided that he is to be permanently degraded and lose the right of pension belonging to Civil Servants. I cannot find that Parliament has ever so decided, or that it could so decide without a formal Act. I do not want to raise a disturbance on the matter if it can be avoided, but I find myself, as a Trustee of the British Museum, implicated in what seems to me an act of real unfairness, and the very feelings of hostility which I entertain towards these men make me anxious to guard myself from the bias towards unfairness. You kindly undertook to look into the question and, I suppose, to let me know the result. May I hear what the facts are as they now present themselves to you?

Mr. Chamberlain replied that the matter was to be left open until the bulk of the civil servants who had fought had been demobilized. But the Archbishop's letter stated a claim which had to be admitted in the end.

VI

Reference has already been made to appeals which the Archbishop received from time to time from Germany for interests of various kinds. One or two more instances may be given, as indicating the reliance placed at least on the Archbishop's sincerity and friendliness.

In December 1919, Prince Max von Baden appealed to the Archbishop on behalf of the 400,000 German prisoners still kept as hostages in France. After describing how his other attempts to remedy the position had failed, he continued:

PRINCE MAX VON BADEN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Salem.
1 December 1919.

. . . I have turned to your Grace, remembering that, when war passions ran high, you, as did the Bishops of North and Central Europe[1] and of Winchester,[2] have taken a strong stand against

[1] Dr. Herbert Bury.

[2] Dr. E. S Talbot.

privations being inflicted on innocents. The ugly usages of war become fiendish crimes when maintained after there is an end of war and war-necessities, and the coarse war-spirit should have gone too.

I am told the conscience of the British people is to-day denouncing the Blockade which was maintained against the German people after the close of hostilities. The prisoners languishing in France to-day are as helpless and innocent as were the German women and children killed during the Armistice-period.

In addressing you, my Lord, I should like to appeal at the same time to British soldiers who have returned from German captivity. I am thinking particularly of those who were exchanged during the war, and whose joy I was able to witness.

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* PRINCE MAX VON BADEN

Old Palace, Canterbury. December 23, 1919

I have received Your Highness' important letter on the anxious and difficult subject of the position of German prisoners who are still in France. Indeed I have received one copy from yourself, and another sent to me through H R.H. the Crown Princess of Sweden On receiving these letters I communicated with Earl Curzon, as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and I have seen him upon the subject. Lord Curzon points out what is indeed evident that the matter is one falling under the responsibility of the French Government, and he obviously feels that it would be in a high degree inappropriate were the British Government to intervene or attempt to intervene in a matter wherein it has no real status If that be true of His Majesty's Government, it is not less markedly true of the Ecclesiastical authorities in this country. Advice from such Ecclesiastical quarters tendered to the French Government would, I am afraid, be regarded as somewhat unwarrantable.

We know so well in England how kind and how persevering have been the efforts made by Your Highness on behalf of prisoners belonging to different countries, and on behalf of those subjected to suffering, that it would at all times be to me a special privilege to be able to associate myself with Your Highness in the beneficent work with which you have been identified in relief of distress or hardship. Your Highness may rely on my being at all times watchful and ready to be useful in those directions when suitable opportunity is given me, and I feel keenly the importance

of everything which may help to reduce to a minimum the suffering and trials incidental to a great war, not only during its continuance but after the actual warfare has come to an end.

A final work of mercy, in which all Christians took part, may be mentioned. In view of the suffering of children, from famine and disease in many countries, an appeal was made by the Save the Children Fund (founded by Miss Eglantyne Jebb) for a collection in all places of worship, on the last Sunday of the year, a very appropriate day for the purpose, being the Feast of the Massacre of the Innocents. The Archbishop took an active part in promoting this, and largely by his efforts, and through the kindly offices of Count de Salis (the British representative at the Vatican), the Pope, as well as the leaders of the Reformed Churches, the Patriarchs and Archbishops of the Orthodox Churches, and the Primates of the Anglican Communion, all appealed to their flock to offer their alms.

Fitly enough, at the end of the year the Archbishop published a selection of the addresses he had given during wartime. They bore the title *The Testing of a Nation*, and were recognized at once as veritable sections cut from the atmosphere of thought and feeling in which our world moved in the several crises of the war. Lord Haldane, on receiving a copy, wrote (December 29):

The Viscount Haldane *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

These sermons and the addresses you delivered through the War are part of the history of the time. I only wish that some of your speeches in Parliament had been included, and even more that the standard of the Government in action had been like that laid down by the leader of the Church of England in the deliverances in this volume.

CHAPTER LIX

THE ENABLING ACT

Yet still there is reason that propositions for such laws should sometimes come from the Church, which we must suppose well skilled (or in her proper business) in forming and digesting such new regulations, before they come before the consideration of the Legislature. . . . For to have laws framed and modelled solely by the State and (without previous communication) imposed upon the Church, is making of it the meanest and most abject of the State's creatures.

WARBURTON, *The Alliance between Church and State*, Part II, Section 3

A REMARKABLE change in the relations of Church and State was effected by the Enabling Bill of 1919. The immediate origin of the change is to be found in a Resolution adopted by the Representative Church Council in July 1913. For some considerable while, there had been a growing dissatisfaction with the difficulties which stood in the way of legislation for the Church through Parliament. The position of the Church of Scotland was quoted, and Lord Halifax wrote to the Archbishop:

The VISCOUNT HALIFAX *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

June 24, 1913.

. . . I have been in communication with Lord Balfour of Burleigh in regard to what has been happening in Scotland, and Lord Wolmer and others in the House of Commons who, as your Grace knows, go by the name of 'The Church Lads' Brigade', are anxious to utilize the opportunity for setting on foot a movement which should enable the Church here to deal with its own affairs without discussion of them in detail in Parliament, and without the chance of such Bills as the 'Sheffield Bishopric Bill' being blocked as they now are. If something in this direction could be done, it would not only get rid of all these questions of Disestablishment and Disendowment, but it would unite all Churchmen in a common object about which, I should imagine, there could be but little difference of opinion

The dissatisfaction was specially acute for those who were foremost in their resistance to the Disestablishment of the Church of Wales. As Lord Wolmer, who was destined to play a highly influential part in securing the change, wrote to the Archbishop:

The VISCOUNT WOLMER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

June 25, 1913.

Lord Halifax tells me that he has mentioned to you the idea which has been occupying the thoughts of several keen Churchmen besides ourselves, that the time has come when there might be some devolution of ecclesiastical legislation from Parliament to a Body strictly representative of the Church.

Those of us who have been engaged in the work of Church Defence have been taunted by the promoters of Disestablishment with the fact that it is, under the present conditions, quite impossible to carry legislation that is necessary for the full development of the Church's work, and that the present state of affairs deprives the Church of all real liberty.

The force of this argument cannot be denied, but it seems to us that the answer should be that we should claim for the Established Church in England the same liberty of self-government as is enjoyed by the Established Church of Scotland.

Sir Alfred Cripps, in the Representative Church Council in July 1913, by way of answer (so it was understood) to Mr C. F. G. Masterman's speech in Parliament in favour of Disestablishment, moved the Resolution which started the new system, having Lord Wolmer as his seconder. It was carried in the following form:

That there is in principle no inconsistency between a national recognition of religion and the spiritual independence of the Church, and this Council requests the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consider the advisability of appointing a Committee to inquire what changes are advisable in order to secure in the relations of Church and State a fuller expression of the spiritual independence of the Church as well as of the national recognition of religion.

I

The Archbishops' Committee on Church and State was duly appointed, with Lord Selborne as its Chairman, and a very representative and influential set of members. The Archbishop was well aware of the difficulties which the appointment of a Committee on such a subject was bound to raise. They were admirably and, in view of the Prayer Book controversy thirteen years later, prophetically described, in a letter from Mr. Arthur Balfour who wrote:

The Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

Whittingehame, Prestonkirk, Scotland. Jan. 9th, 1914.

Private.

I am strongly in favour of the principle of spiritual independence, and have never admitted any fundamental inconsistency between this and the principle of establishment. As evidence of this I may point to the part I took in giving the Church of Scotland control over its own symbols. Control over its own ritual it already possessed.

I wish something similar could be done for the Church of England; but I confess to being anxious on the subject. The Church of Scotland had in its origin not a trace of compromise, and, if it is now in practice one of the most liberal of churches (in the good sense of the word liberal), this has been entirely due to a process of internal evolution The 'Wee Frees' in the Highlands really represent the original tradition!

Now the case of the English Church is entirely different. It has been from the start a comprehensive Body, and this great merit was attained at the beginning by compromise, and, amid all the changes of centuries, the original marks of the compromise have never been obliterated.

All this is commonplace; but it leads up to my point, which is this. Increased autonomy means increased strain within the organisation and between its parts. Do you think the fabric, weakened by these immemorial lines of cleavage, is sufficiently strong to stand it? If not, I would rather rub along as we are than risk a change which may lead to schism.

What makes the case of the Church of England more difficult than the case of the Church of Scotland, under modern conditions, is the fact that so many of its differences centre in ritual; and where ritual is concerned, mankind seem more than usually incapable of retaining any sense of proportion. I greatly fear, therefore, that autonomy may mean serious disturbances in an important percentage of Parishes, especially rural Parishes. Will the parson consent to allowing his parishioners, or even the communicants in his Parish, to determine the question of vestments and other matters on which the ritualistic section of the High Church Party feels strongly? What powers is a High Churchman prepared to give to the laity? Can you deal with the question of autonomy without settling these preliminary questions of principle? And is there on this question of principle the least chance of coming to a working agreement? If not, will not the attempt to increase

the autonomy of the Church increase and emphasise its one weak point?

These are the questions which I anxiously ask myself, and which, before joining your Committee, I should like to talk over with you. I certainly cannot unconditionally refuse your invitation, for that would look as if I do not desire the object which the Committee is intended to attain. As a matter of fact, I desire it passionately. My only fear is lest in our attempt to fly from ills which we know only too well, yet worse ills, which we can easily foresee, may come upon us.

The Archbishop discussed the difficulties with Mr. Balfour, who agreed to serve, having great confidence in Lord Selborne as Chairman; and he accepted the Archbishop's points that some risks must be faced, and that the harmfulness of refusing to appoint such a Committee, when it had been asked for *nem. con.* by the Representative Church Council would be greater than the harmfulness of running the risk of these difficulties with their eyes open to them.

The Committee, which had hardly started its work when the War broke out, nevertheless, thanks to the admirable leadership of Lord Selborne, published a unanimous Report in July 1916. It was a first-rate piece of work, with invaluable appendices, both historical and constitutional; and the principle on which its recommendations were based was clear The Committee did not set forth, as some had expected, a whole series of measures. Instead it proposed that the Representative Church Council, composed of Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, after certain reforms, should receive statutory recognition, and be given real legislative powers in Church matters, subject to a Parliamentary veto.

The Representative Church Council was itself a youthful body. It had started in 1903, the same year as Randall Davidson became Primate. It consisted of three Houses, the House of Bishops, i.e. the Upper Houses of the Convocations of Canterbury and York sitting together; the House of Clergy, i.e the Lower Houses of the two Convocations sitting together; the House of Laymen, i.e. the Houses of Laymen of the two Provinces sitting together—a body of seven hundred persons all told. The reforms which the Archbishops' Committee proposed gave the Parochial Clergy a majority in the House of Clergy and provided *inter alia* for the special representation of wage-earners and students and

teachers in the Diocesan Conferences through which the members of the House of Laity were elected. The electors to the Diocesan Conferences and the Parochial Church Councils had to be either actual communicants or persons who had been baptized and confirmed. The Parochial Church Councils themselves were to be endowed with new powers after the Representative Church Council had obtained its own constitution and powers.

The method of legislation proposed may be summarized as follows:

A measure shall not be deemed to be passed by the Church Council unless it secures a majority of votes in each House.

Special provision is recommended to protect the powers of the Episcopate in regard to all questions of doctrine.

Any measure that is passed by the Church Council shall lie upon the tables of both Houses of Parliament for forty days. To assist Parliament in the exercise of its powers over ecclesiastical legislation, the constitution of a Special Committee of the Privy Council (to be known as the Ecclesiastical Committee) is recommended. This Committee, after consultation, if necessary, with a Committee of the Church Council (called the 'Legislative Committee'), is to draft an advisory report to the Crown on the measure, such report to be laid before Parliament with the measure.

This report is intended to show the effect of the measure in question, what alterations in existing Acts of Parliament its enactment would entail, and whether there is any objection from the point of view of the State to its passage. If the report is favourable to the measure, it shall automatically be presented for the Royal Assent on the expiry of forty days, unless either House of Parliament by resolution direct to the contrary.

If the report is not favourable, it shall not be presented for the Royal Assent unless both Houses of Parliament by resolution order that it shall be so presented.

Any measure on receiving the Royal Assent shall acquire the force of an Act of Parliament.

The Report was, on the whole, very cordially received. A special meeting of Bishops was held in May 1917, and announced their general assent to the principles underlying the proposals of the Committee. The Upper House of Canterbury Convocation welcomed the Report in July 1917; but the Archbishop warned the over ardent—

It is obvious to anyone that it is impossible to make this a *fait accompli* during the war.

II

In addition, an official Church Self-Government Association was formed to promote the plan. And another movement of a more vehement kind was created. It so happened that 1916 was the year of the National Mission which, amongst other events, brought large numbers of enthusiastic Churchmen together all over the country. It was followed by the nomination of special Committees dealing with special departments of the Church's task. The Rev. W. Temple[1] (who had been on the Archbishops' Committee), the Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard[2] (who had not), and a number of other friends got together. The former wrote to the Archbishop on February 4, 1917, with special reference to his fellow enthusiasts:

> The War and the Mission have brought them to boiling point. It is a psychological necessity that they should explode.

It was vital, he said, that the more ardent members of the company should be prevented from breaking off and giving up in despair of the Church, and that there should be 'some recognized expression of the desire for a forward move'. At first the 'forward move' was not precisely described, and the Archbishop remarked to Mr. Temple as its sponsor that he had 'not the least idea' what 'a forward move' in those general terms covered. But in the early summer the forward move assumed the name of the Life and Liberty Movement, which had as its object: 'To win for the Church the liberty essential to fullness of life.'

An enthusiastic meeting was held by this group in the Queen's Hall, London, on July 16, 1917. It passed the following Resolution, with the Dean of Durham (Dr. Hensley Henson) as the only dissentient:

> That whereas the present conditions under which the Church lives and works constitute an intolerable hindrance to its spiritual activity, this Meeting instructs the Council, as a first step, to approach the Archbishops, in order to urge upon them that they should ascertain without delay, and make known to the Church at large, whether and on what terms Parliament is prepared to give freedom to the Church in the sense of full power to manage its own

[1] Afterwards Archbishop of York.
[2] Afterwards Dean of Canterbury, later Canon of St. Paul's.

life, that so it may the better fulfil its duty to God and to the nation and its mission to the world.

The Archbishop received a deputation from the Life and Liberty Council, and the deputation went away contented. But he was not specially pleased with the Queen's Hall Meeting, or the Chairman's speech:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. W. TEMPLE

Private 17 July, 1917.

You will just let me say this: While you say nothing, barring a question of the possibilities of the present hour in Parliament, to which I could take the slightest exception, I confess that, if I had read the speech knowing nothing about the circumstances, the impression left upon my mind would have differed a good deal from what are the familiar facts as I know them. I try to picture, if it were conceivable, someone reading that speech 50 years hence, without any knowledge at all of what were the contemporary happenings in England. Would such a reader conjecture that there had, during the last year been a National Mission inaugurated by the Archbishops 'off their own bat', and that the Committees appointed, as a result, for dealing with the practical questions of the hour were now vigorously in session, and that the Secretary of some of these was the Chairman of this meeting? On the contrary, I should have pictured Bishops of the order of Lucretian divinities, or say like the 18th century Archbishops (Cornwallis or Moore) bewigged and besleeved, who might doubtless pass placid Resolutions in Convocation, but had no thought of putting them into action. I know that this is not the sort of picture you meant to draw. Probably you take for granted that nobody would suppose such to be the facts Here I think you are mistaken. However, that matters comparatively little, except that it obviously makes what the Bishops are trying to do a good deal more difficult. The point of practical importance which emerges is that which I spoke of to you before I saw the Resolution. You are going to ask us, as Archbishops, to go to Lloyd George and his War Cabinet—men who are over head and ears in affairs of hourly pressure as to the Nation's existence, and cannot be even got at for five minutes' conversation—and to bid them forthwith 'make known to the Church at large on what terms Parliament is prepared to give freedom to the Church' etc. We are to do this at a time when such representative laymen as the Church possesses in the Representative Church Council have stated by an overwhelm-

ing majority that even the Council, full as it is of Church interest, cannot meet at present because all men are absorbed in War thoughts. The Prime Minister is then to say what Parliament will do. Presumably he can only do this by asking Parliament, and how he is supposed to do this I cannot even dimly conjecture. That is the practical difficulty which strikes me in the matter. Perhaps you will say it does not affect the purport of the speeches of yesterday, and I daresay this is so as regards their large motive and principle. But what does it really come to in practical possibility, while we are at death-grips with the Germans? Could I really insist on an interview at Downing Street, which generally means calling the Prime Minister out from a Cabinet meeting, to speak standing up in the ante-room, and ask him what conditions of Church life he would regard as the right ones for the future?

The single dissentient gave his view of the meeting as follows:

The DEAN OF DURHAM *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

The Athenaeum, Pall Mall, S W 1. July 17, 1917.

It occurs to me that you might care to have a record of the impression which last night's meeting of the 'Life and Liberty' agitators made on an unsympathetic but never deliberately unfair observer. So far as numbers went, it was a good meeting; indeed, there was an overflow. The audience was three-parts composed of women, and the remaining part was mainly made up of youngish parsons. Socially, I conjectured that the meeting consisted of upper middle-class people, who form the congregations of West-end Churches. There was no trace of the working classes perceptible. The ecclesiastical type of the audience was, perhaps, disclosed by the circumstance that, when the Apostles' Creed was repeated, the crowded platform *seemed* to make the sign of the Cross unanimously. I was quite startled by so unusual a phenomenon. This petty incident was significant because ordinary English Churchmen are not accustomed to the practice of signing themselves with the Cross. The Headmasters seem to be deep in the movement. David of Rugby read prayers, and the Headmasters of Eton and Harrow were on the platform. Of course family reasons may have led the latter, rather than personal conviction. but this display of pedagogues set me thinking. The academic, the feminist, the Socialist, the clericalist—these are not the constituents of an ecclesiastical policy which is likely to be tolerant, or virile, or just, or large. Temple's speech was well-phrased and well-delivered. He has an admirable voice, and, though his manner is a little too dogmatic and professional, he is in the succession of orators. There

was not much stuff in the speech, perhaps, because he had 'said his say' in a pamphlet which had been distributed in the seats: but he made it very plain that the 'Life and Liberty' movement intends the *present* Parliament to pass the requisite legislation, either to grant autonomy, or to disestablish. The duration of the War was spoken of as an 'accepted hour', in which the Church of England must 'find salvation' or for ever fall! None of the other speakers were adequate. Miss Maude Royden was confused, incoherent, and, when intelligible, irrelevant. 'Father' Carey adopted a jocose manner, unworthy of the occasion, and seemed to blame the Church for the defects of the individual clergy. A returned Chaplain in khaki assured us that great numbers of officers and men were eagerly longing for the prompt and drastic handling of the Church: and Mr. 'Dick' Sheppard concluded with an ecstatic appeal for enthusiasm. *Voilà tout!*

I cannot say that the meeting seemed to me in any marked degree enthusiastic. Partly this may have been due to the great predominance of women: but mostly, I suspect, it arose from the fact that neither the Catholic, nor the national note was sounded, but only the 'denominational', and you can't get up much enthusiasm over sectarianizing a national Church I do not doubt that both the E.C.U. and the Church Defence Institution could get together more enthusiastic meetings. The Bishop of Oxford's name was greeted with applause, but then the meeting was 'Gore's Crowd'.

I held up my hand against a resolution that said what my experience for 30 years past proves to me is untrue, that the present conditions of the Church's life constitute 'an intolerable hindrance to her spiritual work'. No clergyman who speaks the truth can really say *that* of his personal knowledge. But I will not embark on a discussion, where I only designed a description.

A considerable controversy followed, in the next few months, in *The Times* and elsewhere. Nevertheless William Temple and his Life and Liberty men pressed vigorously forward, and tried to get the Archbishop to act with far greater speed than His Grace thought was fair or likely to produce the desired result. When, for example, the Representative Church Council met, after an interval of two years, in November 1917, and, at the end of two days' debate upon the recommendations of the Archbishops' Committee, decided to appoint a Grand Committee 'to prepare a Report thereon and if they think it desirable to prepare a scheme to be presented to the Council at its next Meeting', the

Life and Liberty Council instructed Mr. Temple as its Chairman to express in a letter to *The Times* 'our great disappointment that no direct vote was taken on the broad issues of self-government for the Church . . . the procedure adopted certainly does not suggest urgency' (December 7, 1917). The Archbishop wrote a personal letter to Mr. Temple:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. W. TEMPLE

7th December 1917.

I am not, I think, apt to be over-sensitive or thin-skinned in matters of this sort, or to seek to evade a criticism which, however rough, may be most useful. But of course you are right when you say, or imply in your private letter that, by what is now published, my own personal difficulties are greatly augmented. This is a comparatively small matter unless it hinders the cause which I, like you, have at heart. This I fear it may do, but I shall endeavour to prevent it as far as possible. There is nothing in the letter which could be called violent or rude Pray feel quite relieved on that score.

I am looking forward keenly to the outcome of your Missionary effort to awaken the sense of Churchmen generally to the need of changes. I am certain that in that policy you are right. It is what specially needs doing at present, and it is just what can at present be done. Where I think that you and others are mistaken is in your belief that we could, with advantage to the cause of wise reform, take steps at the present moment for propounding schemes in Parliament, or committing thoughtful people who care about the Church's life to a particular and detailed policy. I am mixing for hours on most days in the week with the men prominent in our public life, on whose aid we should have to rely if the changes we want were to be made, and I do not literally know one of them who would share your view as to the practicability of the forward push in an official way at the present moment, when every thought and every ounce of energy is absorbed in England's struggle for its very life. This makes me absolutely certain that I have been right in advocating or insisting upon the necessity of our eschewing a policy of hustle and push in matters ecclesiastical, during these months of daily and nightly strain upon the thoughts and time of every public man who is worthy of the name.

The Archbishop knew the world better than his correspondent. He was perhaps a little hurt, but went calmly forward. A Grand Committee was duly appointed under the chairmanship of

Bishop Ryle. The first few months of 1918 were heavy with anxiety, due to the Spring offensive in France. But the Grand Committee went on with its task, and the Report, which included a Scheme, was signed on October 3, 1918. Peace drew near, but with peace came the practical certainty of a General Election. This meant not only that it would be impossible to hold a meeting of the Representative Church Council at the end of November, but 'that unless other steps are taken the Church would have no clear policy in regard to self-government to lay before the country at this crucial moment'. The Life and Liberty Movement and the Church Self-Government Council therefore asked that 'a small deputation' might wait on the Archbishops to express that view. The 'small deputation' came, eighty strong, on October 24. In the dining-room at Lambeth Palace the Archbishops faced a company of whom some at least were very ready to explode. Six speeches were made before the Archbishops replied, all asking that a definite lead should be given to the Church. One of the speakers, claiming to represent the younger 'impetuous and unreasonable people', expressed his regret that 'no leadership had been given in the last four or five years'. Another warned the Archbishop before the meeting: 'We want you to scream.' All were passionately convinced of the necessity of dramatic public action being taken at once. The Archbishop was fully aware of the critical character of his audience, but he refused to be rushed He pointed out what had already been done to promote the consideration of the Report in the official assemblies. He said that the Archbishops had a tremendous responsibility; they were not individuals, but Heads of the Church which spoke in its representative bodies. He did not think that 'going over the top' really applied either in Church or War to those who had to think the matter out. 'In Church History the best things have not been done by spasm or scream, but by determination.' He was prepared with all his heart to advocate the proposals of the Church and State Committee as urgently necessary for the life of the Church to-day, but while Life and Liberty might shout or cry on the house-tops, the Archbishops must go forward 'reasonably, progressively, constitutionally', and the need of sureness was all the greater now in view of the feverish excitement all round. Yet, though the Archbishop's words had a somewhat chilling effect, and the deputation went away discouraged, the

Archbishop was more impressed as to the need of a definite pronouncement than he showed at the time. Parliament was dissolved. The Report of the Grand Committee of the Representative Church Council was published. On December 2, the Archbishop wrote a letter to Lord Selborne, which was issued to the Press, in the course of which he said:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EARL OF SELBORNE

2 December 1918.

. . . I gladly reiterate my own deliberate opinion that the proposals thus commended to us are sound in principle, and that if they can be adopted and made operative in something like the form now proposed, it will be to the great practical advantage of all our work. In such a matter criticism is of course easy, and it may be very helpful to us in matters of detail. Difficulties there must inevitably be. But a full discussion will shew, I think, that they can be satisfactorily overcome. It is my earnest hope that the Representative Church Council will give so marked a support to the new scheme as to strengthen our hands immeasurably in the endeavour to secure its constitutional adoption.

Both the Church and the Nation will, I am convinced, have cause for gratitude if, by God's blessing, our efforts are successful

III

The scene of the next act in the drama was laid in the Representative Church Council on February 25–8, 1919. It met in the Hoare Memorial Hall, as the Australians were still in occupation of the Great Hall of the Church House. The main points in which the scheme presented by the Grand Committee differed from that of the Selborne Committee were: (1) The body on which legislative powers were to be conferred was called the National Assembly of the Church of England; (2) the omission of proposals for the reform of the Lower Houses of Convocation which were deliberately left for these Houses themselves; and (3) the alteration of the franchise from Confirmation to Baptism, with a declaration that the elector was a member of the Church of England and did not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England. On the third point, a vigorous controversy took place in the Press.

There were nineteen pages of amendments on the Order paper,

and the opposition, some of it from convinced champions of the *status quo*, like the Bishop of Hereford (Dr. Henson), some from High Churchmen, like Mr. Athelstan Riley and Major Edward Wood,[1] was very strong. The occasion was critical and needed consummate powers of chairmanship. The Archbishop, who presided, left the Chair on the afternoon of the first day, and made a speech which produced a profound effect. It was based on his forty years' experience of the need of reform, and the impossibility of getting adequate Parliamentary time for considering Church Measures. He spoke strongly of the tradition and spirit of the National Church, and said:

> If I thought, with the Bishop of Hereford, that by passing this scheme we were in actual peril of losing that which I for one value so much, namely, the maintenance of those traditions and that spirit, very real though very indefinable, I should feel bound to support him in opposing the scheme as it stands. But I think nothing of the kind.

But he had a word also for some of the enthusiastic supporters:

> On the other hand, I am bound in fairness to say that a great many enthusiastic supporters of this scheme seem to me to expect from its adoption much more inevitable results, much more far-reaching results, and much more immediate results than I believe would follow if the change were made. 'Life' and 'Liberty' are large and splendid words. I believe in both. I believe that by what we are now doing, if we go on with our plan, we shall gain more of both of them, and that they will increase and grow But it will not be by the waving of a wand or by the mere adoption of a scheme.

The main bulk of his argument was to show, and he gave example after example, that not from opposition, but sheer inability, Parliament could not add this to all its other work:

> Not once or twice, or five times or perhaps ten times, have I brought before the Ministers in power during the last quarter of a century matters which, big or little, I thought needed attention at the time in the Church's life, and the answer has been again and again the same, 'Probably you are quite right; but with the present pressure upon the time of Parliament and the present atti-

[1] Subsequently Viceroy of India, with the title Lord Irwin, afterwards Viscount Halifax.

tude of the House of Commons towards the varied work that lies urgently before it, we never could ask the House to give up the days or the weeks that would be necessary'. They did not say, 'We are opposed to it', or 'We are objecting to what you do', but rather 'You are asking a machine to do it, which is already so clogged with work, and work of a different kind, that you are asking an impossibility'.

The Archbishop made it clear that this 'quite dully, quite prosaically' was the real position. He said that the work of the Church was hampered just as a man who had important work to do was hampered by a broken finger-nail or a bad toothache. His health was not permanently injured, he was not going to die! He could not subscribe to the large statements as to an intolerable hindrance:

> We find ourselves prevented from doing it better by things which it is in our power to get removed. Therefore we want to get them removed, not necessarily to satisfy any large and far-reaching theory, but for the practical doing better of the work with which we are entrusted as administrators for the sake of all.

The speech was an immense success, and was praised enthusiastically, even by Lord Wolmer and Mr. Temple, in spite of its minimizing tendency. When the Archbishop sat down he received an ovation. The hostile amendment moved by Mr. Riley was immediately withdrawn, and the Report was 'received for consideration'. During the next four days, the Representative Church Council considered the constitution of the new Church Assembly, and the provisions of the Enabling Bill itself. The main division concerned the franchise. After a long debate, an amendment in favour of a Confirmation franchise instead of the Baptismal with a declaration, was defeated, the figures being as follows:

	For	*Against*
Bishops . .	7	17
Clergy . .	37	62
Laity . . .	65	80

On February 28, the scheme and the Enabling Bill were adopted by the Council, almost *nem. con.* It had been a remarkable week, and the Archbishop's powers of chairmanship were seldom seen to greater effect. The following letter came from Bishop Gore

who had been defeated on what he conceived the crucial question of the franchise:

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Cuddesdon, Wheatley, Oxon. March 1st, 1919.

I am going to write to you—less agreeably—about *the R.C.C.* Now I will only say that I hope you were not over-tired. You have not my cause of dis-satisfaction and, eliminating that, I should think the whole meeting was an almost brilliant success—thanks to you.

IV

This letter was followed by another letter, disagreeable but decided, declaring that he (Dr. Gore) had decided to resign.

Bishop Gore had threatened resignation on other occasions, but this time there was no going back. In reply to his first letter of March 4, the Archbishop begged him to come for a talk, though not for reconsideration, and wrote:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF OXFORD

Private. Lambeth Palace, 4 March 1919

. . . There is perhaps no change which could come about in the 'College' of Bishops which would affect me so deeply and bewilder me so much, for (what must be at most) the few remaining years of my tenure of this appallingly difficult office. I can only 'fall to prayer' and ask for guidance and strength in a veritable bereavement.

As a result of the talk, on March 10, the Archbishop persuaded Gore to modify some parts of his official letter of resignation—altering *established* to *national*, and adding certain words:

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Cuddesdon, March 15, 1919.

I am writing to tell you that I have decided to resign the see of Oxford. My main motive is the conviction, which has been growing in me for some time, that the best way in which I can use the rest of my life, for the Church and other causes in which I am deeply interested, is by seeking such leisure as would enable me to do serious study and to write something better than 'little books', and I hope to have the opportunity of more continuous preaching and speaking than my present position makes possible. As you know very well, being bishop of such a see as this leaves one no

chance of such leisure. I have had 17½ years of being a bishop, and for me at least that is enough. I used to discuss the matter with my predecessor Francis Paget. We agreed that there was no obligation upon us to continue being bishops till we were decrepit. His life was cut short alas! But I hope he approves what I am doing.

I know I shall be told that it is wrong to resign in such critical times for the Church: and I can quite believe that when some anxious debate is taking place in Convocation or the Lambeth Conference, I shall have a 'bad moment' of doubt whether I am justified in being absent by my own act. But I have faced the question as well as I can, and very often: and I am convinced that I am right on the whole The crisis, I feel sure, in the Church will continue, and indeed, perhaps become more acute for years to come: and I believe that I can serve the causes of reconstruction best by getting time for thinking, studying, writing and preaching. I am not, of course, in any sense resigning my ministry, but only one kind of administrative office which, in our enormous dioceses, with all the attendant work on central committees, gives no opportunity for these things. Moreover my resignation does not imply any kind of weakening in my allegiance to Anglican principles, but only the choice of what is, I think, the better way for serving them.

I must add that, while the main motive for resigning my bishopric is what I have described, the choice of the moment is partly due to the decision of the Representative Church Council a few days ago about the future franchise. I am convinced that, in abandoning the present basis of franchise which includes confirmation, we have sacrificed principle to the desire for larger numbers on our rolls, and that largely for the sake of maintaining the 'national' position of the Church. I know this does not represent your point of view, or that of others of my friends who gave their vote for the baptismal franchise. But it represents, I think, the effect of the vote on the whole. And it leaves me in a very embarrassing position. I cannot fight against a movement towards autonomy for the Church to which for many years past I have largely devoted my life: but I cannot any longer co-operate cordially with the movement now that it has placed itself on what I think is so false a basis However, as I say, this is not my main motive.

I do not want to lay any share of responsibility on you. I know you have formally to consent by accepting the document of resignation. But you cannot force a man to continue in any office he is determined to resign. I propose to sign the document as soon as I have heard from you, and to announce the fact in the diocesan magazine for April: but to ask you to accept it and make it effective

on July 1st, after which date I desire to be free. Perhaps I need not say that I do not propose to ask for or take any pension.

You know how grateful I feel to you for all your kindness and generosity to me over so many years.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF OXFORD

Lambeth Palace. March 17th, 1919.

You will know of the distress with which I received your letter of March 15th. From many talks about such matters during recent years I have been aware of your personal feeling that it is as a teacher and writer rather than as the administrator of a Diocese that you can most effectively serve Church and people, and it would therefore be unfair to yourself were I to say that your letter takes me altogether by surprise. I agree with you that a man cannot rightly be pressed to retain an office which he deliberately thinks it to be his duty to resign. I must not therefore oppose your decision, deeply as I regret it. In the intimacy of our close friendship during so many strenuous years, I have gained from you more than I can here express in words, and on the aid which comes from such fraternal counsel I know that I can still confidently rely. Its usefulness to me has often been greatest on occasions when our difference in opinion or conclusions has been, and has remained, most wide. What I chiefly deplore, for the whole Church's sake, is the loss of your constant and faithful contribution to our united Episcopal discussions, formal and informal, upon the problems and issues which we have daily to handle in matters both sacred and secular. You have unfailingly put before us with wide knowledge, large thoughtfulness, and fervid conviction that aspect of each question which is most vivid to yourself, and I do not exaggerate when I say that the loss of that contribution seems to me at present to be almost irreparable. But we have work to do, and we must go forward to the doing of it, each in his own way.

Of the particular occasion or incident which has given point to your final decision, I will only say what you already know, that I cannot regard as you do either its character or its consequence. To discuss these in this letter would be useless and out of place.

I pray God that for many years to come, and long after my own working days are over, your learning, your devotion, and your personality may be as heretofore at the service of the Church and people of England.

The parting was a real distress to Randall Davidson, and caused anxiety in other quarters lest, without responsibility and the need

of consultation with other Bishops, Dr. Charles Gore might become an added element of peril. A proposal for making him a Bishop *in partibus* was half-seriously proposed—but did not seem practicable to the Archbishop. So the Bishop retired to write books, and deliver lectures on theology in King's College, London; and he took great pains to avoid being a cause of embarrassment to his former colleagues. There was no doubt about his own personal feeling of relief, as he wrote just before his resignation took effect:

May 10, 1919.

I feel selfishly radiant at the prospect before me, and 'full of beans' as the boys say . . .

V

The next step was the introduction of the Enabling Bill into Parliament. It is important to observe that, while the constitution of the Church Assembly was the subject of prolonged debate by the Representative Church Council, while the Enabling Bill was passed with little discussion, it was the Enabling Bill alone which formed the subject of debate in Parliament. The constitution of the Church Assembly was withdrawn, and intentionally withdrawn, from Parliamentary enactment. It was not made a schedule to the Bill, but was referred to in the title, which was as follows:

An Act to confer powers on the National Assembly of the Church of England constituted in accordance with the constitution attached as an Appendix to the Addresses presented to His Majesty by the Convocations of Canterbury and York on the tenth day of May, nineteen hundred and nineteen, and for other purposes connected therewith

The reason (to which strong exception was taken by Lord Haldane in the House of Lords) is given in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State (p. 61):

The Bill might also contain in a schedule the constitution of the Church Council and its legislative procedure. But this would be objectionable both on theoretical and on practical grounds. For it would mean that the constitution of the Church would be fixed by Parliament; and though Parliament might use its opportunity of framing a Church constitution very sparingly, or might even acquiesce silently in whatever scheme was propounded by the authorities of the Church, it might on the other hand make important modifications in the constitution which could only be rejected by the Church at the price of wrecking the whole scheme, and

might under this pressure be accepted by the Church. But such acceptance would be a sacrifice of spiritual independence indefensible and offensive to the sentiments of Churchmen.

The distinction was fundamental, and accordingly the Constitution was embodied in an address laying before His Majesty:

A recommendation agreed to by both Houses of this Convocation on the 8th day of May 1919, that, subject to the control and authority of Your Majesty and of the two Houses of Parliament, powers in regard to legislation touching matters concerning the Church of England shall be conferred on the National Assembly of the Church of England constituted in the manner set forth in the Appendix attached to this Address

From the middle of April to the beginning of July, a controversy raged in the Press on the whole question of Church and State, led by the Bishops of Hereford (Dr. Henson) and Manchester (Dr. Knox), with the help of a few Broad Churchmen. Some Nonconformists were favourable, like Dr. Scott Lidgett and Dr. Selbie. Others were opposed, like Dr. Clifford and Dr. Forsyth. The Enabling Bill was variously described as 'a blank cheque for absolutism', or 'a masked revolution'. By some it was thought to be certain to precipitate a cleavage between Clergy and Laity, to give more power to the Ritualists, to make reunion more difficult, and orthodoxy more rigid. By others it was charged with being an attack on the constitutional rights of the Englishman. The Bishop of Hereford put this objection succinctly thus in a letter to *The Times*:

The BISHOP OF HEREFORD *to the* EDITOR *of* '*The Times*'

May 17. 1919.

Before the Reformation, the Church of England was the local branch of the Holy Roman Church, two provinces of the Latin obedience Since the Reformation, the Church of England has been the Church of the English nation, in which every Englishman has rights, and for which every Englishman has responsibility Henceforward, if the Enabling Bill passes into law, the Church of England will be a denomination, one among many, though still suffered to possess the ancient religious endowments of the nation . . The Enabling Bill implies the total, if gradual, destruction of the Establishment

The opposition, especially that which appealed to the interests of the Establishment and the dread of Ritualism, was of a powerful

character. It was supported, incidentally, by *The Times*. 'It is because the Bill if passed must destroy some of the most valuable elements in the life of the Church of England that we hope it will not become law.'[1] It is not too much to say that a championship of the Enabling Bill based on the theoretical idea of spiritual independence, and merely denouncing the intolerable hindrance to spiritual activity of the present conditions in which the Church of England lived, would have tumbled to ruin. It was accordingly once more as a practical statesman that the Archbishop of Canterbury expounded the merits of the Enabling Bill, when he moved the Second Reading in the House of Lords on June 3. He spoke for over an hour to an attentive and well-filled House. His opening words were characteristic: 'My Lords, I ask your Lordships to give a Second Reading to a Bill to enable the Church of England to do its work properly.' He added that the proposals in the Bill had been widely discussed and criticized, and went on, with a disarming simplicity.

> Its opponents—and there may be some of them in this House—descry in it perils, which I think are either quite imaginary or are no greater than those which attend all brave and adventurous legislation. Those fears I altogether repudiate. As to its friends, I find a little difficulty in making my own all the hopes and ambitions which have found eloquent expression in the fine body of men and women who have advocated it.

He begged the House to remember that they were not dealing at all with deeper spiritual things but only with the framework, 'the outer secular rules within which our work has to be done'. He spoke of the growth in population of the last two hundred years, yet with little change in the system of Church machinery. In 1700, there were just over 5,000,000 people in England and Wales, 'and now we have to apply the same machinery, roughly speaking, as was applied in the old days, to 36,000,000 people, and infinite complications and difficulties have arisen, largely from that cause'. He asked their Lordships to look at Stephens's Ecclesiastical Statutes, the second volume of which, containing 1,106 pages, was devoted exclusively to the annotated Statutes between 1828 and 1844:

> The Pluralities Act, the great Act, which may want amending but which we have to act upon to-day, is one of 133 sections, and the

[1] *The Times*, May 30, 1919 (leading article)

foolscap edition covers fifty-four pages. Imagine attempting to-day to get an Ecclesiastical Bill of that size through Parliament!

He gave instances of the changes which had come over the whole scene since 1845, due to the altered conditions of English public life, and of the difficulties, of which he had first-hand knowledge during the past forty years of intimate connexion with central Church affairs. He dealt not at all with theory but showed how impossible it had been to get things done, even after Royal Commissions had recommended specific reforms. He claimed that the Bill was desired by the Church as a whole, by diocese after diocese, and by many Low Churchmen as well as High Churchmen; and with one strong word about the Establishment ('I would rather go on as we are, if disestablishment were the only alternative'), he again begged Parliament to help the Church to do its work better.

The Archbishop was followed by Lord Haldane, who moved the following amendment:

> That this House is unwilling, especially in the absence of independent inquiry, to assent to legislation which would exclude the greater part of the people of England from effective influence in the affairs of the National Church as established by the Constitution, and which is so framed as to enable members of that Church to pass laws that may wholly change its character without adequate supervision by Parliament.

He offered uncompromising opposition on Parliamentary and constitutional grounds, attacking the whole doctrine on which the Bill was based as rank treason to the doctrine of the Constitution. It was an able speech, and travelled across a very different territory from that of the Archbishop, suggesting before the end that the practical difficulties which the Archbishop had emphasized might be met through Orders in Council. Church and State, he said, were conterminous, the rule was conterminous. He claimed that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had saved each great party in the Church in succession, and that it was by Parliament that the Church must have its limits of powers over others prescribed. If the Enabling Bill were passed, it would convert the Church from being an organization representative of the nation at large into a denomination, and substitute the influence of episcopacy for public opinion.

Other speakers followed, but the Archbishop's speech once

again, by its attention to practical considerations, had cleared the ground. Next day was Derby Day, and the House of Lords did not meet. Between then and the division, conversations were started by Sir Lewis Dibdin, who had written to Lord Haldane admiring his speech, and asking him to explore the possibility of procedure by Provisional Orders. He suggested that such Orders might be made by a Secretary of State, for examination by an Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council. The Archbishops would have to satisfy themselves that the particular reform had the Church's approval. They would, he said, probably use the Church Assembly for the purpose. But Parliament would not have recognized the Assembly. Lord Haldane generally agreed with this plan—not so Lord Selborne, who objected to these conspiracies behind the scenes. The Archbishop, to whom Sir Lewis had written, was not so determinedly opposed, but in the end the idea was dropped. The division was taken on July 2, and Lord Haldane's amendment was rejected by 130 votes to 33.

The Committee stage was fixed for July 10. The Archbishop was conciliatory. Lord Haldane's amendment to delete the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council was lost by 78 votes to 17, and his other amendment to include the constitution of the Church Assembly in a Schedule to the Bill was lost without a division.

There was also an important amendment moved by Lord Willoughby de Broke, with regard to the Book of Common Prayer. He moved the insertion of the following proviso:

> Provided that no measure shall be submitted to the Ecclesiastical Committee which would make any alteration in the Book of Common Prayer as by law prescribed to be used in Churches at the passing of this Act.

The Archbishop, in his reply, said that he had listened to the noble Lord's speech with the greatest possible pleasure, but added some sentences, which ought perhaps to be recorded here in view of later events:

> At the same time I should be deceiving the House if I were to accept for a moment the proposition that we do not intend in any case to touch anything connected with the rubrics of Common Prayer. One of the very reasons why we find the present position difficult is that in small matters, but matters which are nevertheless of practical importance, we want to facilitate sometimes an

abbreviation, sometimes an adaptation of the existing form to slightly different circumstances, sometimes even the addition of extra Collects on particular occasions, such as the noble Lord has taken exception to. It is with the object of doing those things legally, instead of illegally, and being relieved from the responsibility of having done things for which the law gives us no sanction at present, and for which we could not get sanction without an elaborate process of going to Parliament, that we want to use—though we shall certainly use them most sparingly—the powers which this Bill would give us of altering, where the need requires, some things in the rubrics of the Prayer Book.

There was a further question, which the Archbishop answered, from Lord Chaplin:

Viscount Chaplin: What I want to ascertain from the promoters of the Bill is whether it would be necessary as the Bill now stands, for the permission of Parliament to be obtained in any circumstances before anything of that kind is done.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: Yes.

Viscount Chaplin: If that is so, I think it is quite satisfactory.

Lord Parmoor: There is no doubt that the permission of Parliament will be required.

The amendment was then withdrawn.

The Archbishop accepted two amendments moved by the Lord Chancellor (Lord Finlay). It had been originally proposed that 'after considering the Measure the Ecclesiastical Committee shall draft a Report thereon to His Majesty, advising that the Royal Assent ought or ought not to be given to it, and stating the reasons for such advice'. Lord Finlay's amendment, accepted by the Archbishop, made the paragraph run:

After considering the Measure the Ecclesiastical Committee shall draft a Report thereon to His Majesty, stating the nature and legal effect of the Measure, and their views as to its expediency, especially with relation to the constitutional rights of all His Majesty's subjects.

It had also been proposed originally that:

If the Ecclesiastical Committee shall have advised His Majesty to give His Royal Assent to the measure, then, unless within forty days either House of Parliament shall direct to the contrary, such measure shall be presented to His Majesty, and shall have the force and effect of an Act of Parliament on the Royal Assent being signified thereto.

The second amendment moved by Lord Finlay altered the whole character of the Bill. It provided that only 'on address from each House of Parliament asking that such Measure should be presented to His Majesty, such Measure shall be presented to His Majesty, and shall have the force and effect of an Act of Parliament on the Royal Assent being signified thereto'. This was a very different thing from allowing Measures to pass unless either House directed to the contrary. Nevertheless, the Archbishop accepted the amendment, thus making, as Lord Finlay said, what was a very substantial concession. The passing of the Bill through the Committee stage was thus secured without further difficulty.

Next morning, when Dr. Jenkins, the Lambeth Librarian, congratulated the Archbishop on the result, he said: 'My dear Jenkins, if people would only let me do things in my own way, the Church of England would get on all right!' He had gone through most of his life, he added, on the policy that half a loaf was better than no bread.

When the Third Reading was carried on July 21, Lord Wolmer, who had watched from the steps of the throne, congratulated the Archbishop, apologized for his former doubts and rudeness, and said that he was prepared to follow the Archbishop in the whole question of strategy in the House of Commons. This pleased the Archbishop much.

In the House of Commons, the main work was done by Lord Wolmer. He had been unflagging in his explanations, conferences, and correspondence. He had got together a large committee of supporters and had done first-class work. The Second Reading was carried by 304 votes to 16 on November 7. For three days the Bill was considered in Standing Committee E. On December 5, the Third Reading was carried with cheers. A number of small amendments were inserted. There was one amendment of substance, which did away with the Ecclesiastical Committee of the Privy Council and put in its place an Ecclesiastical Committee of both Houses of Parliament, consisting of fifteen Peers nominated by the Lord Chancellor and fifteen Members of the House of Commons nominated by the Speaker. The House of Lords accepted the amendments on December 15. On December 23 the Bill received the Royal Assent.

Thus a very notable change in the constitution of the Church of England was accomplished, and with a speed that is startling

to those who look back. Its achievement was due to Randall Davidson more than to any other single person. Without him it could not have happened when it did. The qualities which secured its success have been sufficiently indicated, it is to be hoped, in the course of this record. But at the same time, while Randall Davidson was the leader and accomplisher, it is right to acknowledge that it was also the enthusiasm of the younger men —even, it may be, their pressure upon the Archbishop and the driving force which they applied—that made the achievement possible. And among the younger men stand, on an eminence of their own, William Temple, the son of a former Archbishop of Canterbury, and Viscount Wolmer, the son of the main sponsor and author of the original Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State, Lord Selborne.

CHAPTER LX

THE WELSH CHURCH

As I returned to the inn I had a good deal of conversation with the landlord on religious subjects He told me that the Church of England, which for a long time had been a down-trodden Church in Wales, had of late begun to raise its head, and chiefly owing to the zeal and activity of its present ministers. . . . He seemed to think that the time was not far distant when the Anglican Church would be the popular as well as the established Church of Wales.

GEORGE BORROW, *Wild Wales*, ch. lxxii.

THE position of the Welsh Church after 'the date of Disestablishment' was left uncertain when the War began. As the War continued, steps were taken to elect a Representative Body and a (larger) Governing Body, with a view to the general management and government of the Church in Wales and its property. The first meeting of the Governing Body was held in London in January 1918. At the end of the War, two principal questions had to be solved. The first was what may be described as the political, including the financial, question. The second was the ecclesiastical, that is the relation of the four Welsh dioceses after Disestablishment to the Province of Canterbury.

I

In his letter of November 2, 1918, to Mr. Bonar Law, outlining the future policy of the Coalition Government, Mr. Lloyd George wrote:

The RT. HON. D. LLOYD GEORGE *to the* RT. HON. A. BONAR LAW

The Welsh Church Act is on the Statute Book, and I do not think that there is any desire, even on the part of the Welsh Church itself, that the Act should be repealed. But I recognize that the long continuance of the War has created financial problems which must be taken into account.

Writing to the Archbishop on November 18, the date of this letter's publication, the Bishop of St. David's,[1] who had seen Mr. Bonar Law, said:

The BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

I attribute the inclusion of the Welsh Church question side by side with the Fiscal question and the Irish question in the Prime

[1] Dr. John Owen.

Minister's letter, to the effect of the Memorial on the subject presented to Mr. Bonar Law with the signature of 182 members of the House of Commons, and to the strong resolution on the subject unanimously passed on Lord Selborne's motion by the National Unionist Association in the beginning of last October.

But though the Bishop of St. David's was ready to make the best of the position, there were others who took a very different view. Lord Robert Cecil, in particular, decided to leave the Government. He resigned, and announced as his reason the fact that he was deeply pledged by word and conduct to the defence of the Church in Wales. He told the Archbishop, in conversation at the Foreign Office, where the Archbishop had gone to consult him about Professor Deissmann's telegram,[1] that Bonar Law had 'betrayed the Welsh Church, and he would not, by remaining in the Government, delude his friends into thinking that all was well'. Lord Cecil added that the Bishop of St. David's had been deluded, 'poor innocent little man'. During the next few months a good deal of pressure was brought to bear upon the Government to reimburse the Church in Wales fully for the loss of its endowments. The necessity of revising the financial terms was generally admitted. No one worked harder, or understood the realities of the situation better, than the Bishop of St. David's, and he, as well as the Bishop of St. Asaph,[2] was in constant communication with the Archbishop of Canterbury. A special Welsh Church Parliamentary Committee was appointed by the Governing Body of the Church in Wales at Easter 1919, to deal on its behalf with any offer of settlement that might come from the Government.

In July 1919, when the Enabling Bill was going through the House of Lords, a draft of the Welsh Church Temporalities Bill began to emerge. The two senior Welsh Bishops had interviews respectively with the Prime Minister and Bonar Law. The Bishop of St. David's was a good deal ruffled after his interview with the latter, to whom, he said, he had to speak 'very plainly'. He was sore with the Archbishop himself for not seeing him at once when he sent a message to Lambeth, on July 22 or 23, when he said Welsh Church matters were very critical. 'The Archbishop has never failed me before—he has now.' But next time (July 31) he was in high feather. The Archbishop saw the two

[1] See p 935. [2] Dr. A. G. Edwards.

Welsh Bishops and Lord Robert Cecil together, and separately, that day in the House of Lords:

> It seemed that the two Bishops had agreed with Lloyd George and Bonar Law upon the terms of a Bill re-adjusting the Welsh Disestablishment Act of 1914, and they were privately of opinion that the terms offered by the Government were much better than they had anticipated. Robert Cecil was of opinion, however, that he must adhere to the line he had taken throughout of persistent opposition to any secularisation of Church funds, even if secularisation be much less than we had all feared. I may be mistaken, but it did not seem to me that Robert Cecil thought that the Bishops ought certainly to oppose the Government plan. It was only that he could not himself abandon his personal position, and this seemed to me a reasonable attitude on his part.

The Bishop of St. Asaph reported the interview with the Archbishop to Bonar Law and Lloyd George. In the evening of the same day, he and the Bishop of St. David's came to Lambeth at 9.15, when the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson were entertaining the American Ambassador and his wife to dinner. They now asked the Archbishop for a definite letter stating his approval of the Bill, which, if necessary, Bonar Law could quote publicly. The Archbishop complied with their request, after studying the Bill and the actuaries' memorandum. Under the Bill, the Church in Wales was to lose £48,000 a year in income from its ancient endowments. But without the Bill, the corresponding loss would have been £102,000 a year. The Bill, therefore, restored to the Church £54,000 a year of its lost property. This was possible principally through the allowance of £22,500 for the lapsed vested interests of incumbents who had vacated their benefices in Wales between September 1914 and the date of Disestablishment, and the allowance of £30,000 a year from the commutation of vested interests in tithe. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners were also empowered by the Bill to make an equitable compensation to the Church in Wales for its loss during the past five years in respect of capital and other augmentation grants which would have been made to the Welsh Benefices but for the passing of the Welsh Church Act —a compensation which, in fact, resulted in a substantial sum being transferred to the Welsh Church. The following letters passed:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH

July 31st, 1919.

I have read with care and interest the draft which has been shown to me of the Welsh Church Temporalities Bill, which is now, as I understand, to be introduced. The circumstances are difficult, and I appreciate your wish to have my counsel in the matter.

Taking everything into consideration, it seems to me that we should act rightly in accepting the Bill as now drafted. Nothing would, I think, be gained by delaying a final settlement, and I am of opinion that, in all the circumstances, the Church ought for the sake of peace to agree to the proposals now made. I have not in the least changed my view upon the general question of Welsh Church Disestablishment, but we must recognize facts as they are, and the prolongation of strife upon this subject would not, I think, be to the advantage of the cause of religion in Wales and in England.

I am not myself an expert in these financial readjustments, and it is possible that there may be some points which I have not accurately understood in detail, but the general position is clear, and, taking it as a whole, I consider that you and we will act rightly in accepting the proposals now made, and in setting ourselves to make the best of the inevitable difficulties, and to throw our strength into setting forward the Church's work in the new conditions which we are called to face.

The BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

The Athenaeum, Pall Mall, S W. 1. 1st August, 1919.

I took your letter this morning, and the Prime Minister and Mr. Bonar Law read it carefully. Notice of the introduction of the Bill (on Monday) is to be given this afternoon.

The next few days, however, witnessed an indignant opposition to the Bill on the part of Lord Salisbury, Lord Robert Cecil, and others, who were angry both with Bonar Law and the Bishops. For a moment it looked as if the Bill would fail. The Archbishop supported the Bill in the House of Lords, but two wrecking amendments were carried under the leadership of Lord Salisbury, who complained that he and his brother had not been consulted —one amendment giving the disused graveyards back to the Church, and the other making the withdrawal of the Welsh Dioceses from Convocation optional. On August 15, the Arch-

bishop was sent for by Bonar Law and Lloyd George, who told him excitedly that if the Lords persisted in their amendments the Bill would be wrecked. The Lords did not persist, though Lord Salisbury, writing to the Archbishop, expressed a strong sense of grievance:

The MARQUESS OF SALISBURY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

22nd August, 1919.

. . . I cannot think it good tactics to allow your protagonist to resign office on your behalf, and then to settle matters—to settle the very matter upon which he resigned, behind his back or at any rate over his head. This is however precisely what the two Welsh Bishops have done. I was therefore not sorry to see them sitting absolutely alone as the end was reached. As I stood by the Throne I noted that there was not a single peer on our Bench, and only two independent Unionist peers all told in the House. To do him justice I thought St. David's looked very unhappy.

The Archbishop replied as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* MARQUESS OF SALISBURY

As from Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1. 26 August, 1919.

I have received in Argyllshire your letter about the final stage of the Welsh Church Bill.

I am honestly most thankful that the Bill has become an Act, and that the episode is closed. The story is not, I think, a creditable one either to the Asquith Government which passed the original Bill, or to the Coalition Government of to-day, but I do not believe that by prolonging the controversy we should in the end have secured a fairer arrangement, or that we could have avoided a mischievous exacerbation of Welsh opinion with consequent damage to the cause of religion both in England and in Wales.

I hold no special brief for the Welsh Bishops, who were forced into the arcana of the final negotiations, but I realize that their position was an intensely difficult one, dragging political considerations into the religious field where their own obligations markedly lie. After all, they do know and understand better than we (or at all events better than *I*) do the cross-currents of Welsh religious opinion, and it was for them, far more than for us, to judge what the controversy meant in Wales in its bearing upon the really paramount matter, the religious well-being of their people.

They apparently had the practically unanimous opinion of their Welsh Councillors, including the three Judges as well as other laymen, with them in favour of the settlement, and, so far as I can judge, I should myself in like circumstances, and with like religious responsibilities, have acted as they did. They had throughout to look beyond the 'tactics' to which you refer, but their appreciation of your brother's action and your own has been enthusiastic, so far at least as I have seen and heard them. I do not know all the details of Lord Robert's original action, and I was not even aware (till this letter of yours) that he had consulted the Bishops about his resignation. Nothing could be more bravely consistent than his action throughout. It is characteristic of the man.[1]

We have all tried to do our best in an exceedingly difficult matter, and we have a right to expect that the following of a straightforward and high-minded course will meet with the benediction which will make it fruitful of good. It will be a matter of extraordinary interest, as well as of no small anxiety, to see what are the religious results of the change in Wales.

I think that with regard to the making of a Welsh Province, it will be well for us to act rather speedily so as to anticipate the coming into force of the 'impertinent' Parliamentary enactment.

II

There was another question of great importance which had to be solved. It was the question of the Province. The Welsh Church Act of 1914 had in the most high-handed way ordered that:

> As from the date of disestablishment the bishops and clergy of the Church in Wales shall cease to be members of, or be represented in, the Houses of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, but nothing in this Act shall affect the powers of those Houses so far as they relate to matters outside Wales and Monmouthshire.

[1] The Bishop of St. David's, in a statement to St. David's Diocese on the acceptance of the Welsh Church Temporalities Act 1919, writing after its passage, said 'Lord Robert Cecil, to whom the Church in Wales owes a greater debt of gratitude than it can ever repay, true to the noblest traditions of British public life, resigned high office rather than accept any responsibility for the indefiniteness of the Government's policy upon a question of principle, and with honourable consistency felt bound to condemn very strongly the inadequacy, in point of principle, of the Act of 1919. It is not surprising that so just a man, under all the circumstances, failed to appreciate justly the position which compelled the Welsh Bishops to believe it to be their clear duty with great sorrow to accept the Bill'

But whatever their feelings of protest against such an outrageous dealing with a constitutional body which was older than Parliament, the question had to be faced: Shall the Welsh dioceses still cling to the Church of England and try to remain, in whatever way possible, a part of the Province, or shall they form a Province of their own? The Archbishop was consulted and saw the Welsh Bishops. The following letters passed:

The BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

The Palace, St. Asaph. 23rd May, 1919.

The time has come when, as Chairman of the Governing Body, I venture respectfully to ask you for your Grace's guidance in reference to the provision in the Welsh Church Bill which excludes from the Convocation of Canterbury the representatives of the Church in Wales.

Would your Grace advise us as to the possibility and the wisdom of our attempting to retain our place in the Convocations of Canterbury, on, of course, the same terms of equality as heretofore?

Or would your Grace advise the Church in Wales to accept the new conditions and to form its own Welsh province?

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH

24th May, 1919.

I have received your very important letter in which, as Chairman of the Governing Body of the Church of England in Wales, you ask for my counsel respecting the future relation of the four Welsh Dioceses to the rest of our present Province of Canterbury. You are aware that I have continuously, on behalf of our English Bishops, pressed upon you and your Welsh brethren in the Episcopate the assurance of our simple wish to be guided by your wishes and the wishes of the Church in Wales as regards the relation of the Church in Wales after Disestablishment to the Province of Canterbury and its Convocation. We have learnt to value the presence of our four Welsh brethren so highly that the loss to us would be very great if, or when, they leave our Convocation House, and I am certain that the same feeling is entertained in the Lower House. I have protested publicly and privately against the proposed statutory enactment interfering, without any consultation with us, with the existing Constitution of Convocation. I have pointed out, in my evidence before the Select Committee of 1914 and elsewhere, the wrongness of such Parliamentary action and its unconstitutional character.

On the other hand, if, as seems now to be the case, the disestablishment of the four Dioceses must unhappily be regarded as a *fait accompli* to take effect after the War, we have to consider what ought in future to be the position of your four Dioceses. I have, as I think you know, taken counsel on the subject with most of our English Bishops, as well as with all the Welsh Bishops, and I am prepared to say that I have the support of, at the very least, the great majority of them in expressing my deliberate opinion that it will conduce to the happy and orderly working of the whole Church in England and Wales if by our own joint action a separate Province be formed for Wales: indeed, I cannot help fearing that unless this be done there is some danger of confusion and even chaos in the arrangements for the future. We shall hope in every possible way to retain the close fellowship in thought and action which has subsisted between the Bishops in the English and the Welsh Dioceses: but constitutionally the formation of a new Province will, as I believe, be essential to due orderliness and smoothness of working. If I had reason to believe that this advice ran counter to the deliberate opinion of the bishops, clergy, and laymen who have been devising a new Constitution for the Church in Wales, I should feel more hesitation than I do in giving you the advice which I here tender. Most gladly will I confer further with you and with your colleagues in the Welsh Sees, if you so desire. But the power and the resources which have been shown by the Welsh Church in the construction of its new arrangements, seem to make it improbable that if once your decision be adopted, you will be in need of any help at our hands. Whatever we can do with you and for you, at this juncture in our history, is wholly at your service, and I repeat that we are not going to allow the legal severance of some of the formal bonds which at present unite us to impair in the smallest degree the fellowship of the deeper kind which will continue to unite us in things spiritual.

The Governing Body of the Church in Wales passed the following Resolution, in June 1919, which was confirmed at Rhyl on January 6, 1920 (the Bishop of Bangor[1] and the Bangor Diocesan Registrar alone dissenting):

> That the Governing Body respectfully requests the President to invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to take such steps as may be necessary to constitute the four Dioceses of Wales into an Ecclesiastical Province.

The Archbishop responded to their request by two successive acts.

[1] Dr. Watkin Williams

He first sent each of the four Welsh Bishops the following release from their Oaths of Due Obedience to himself as Metropolitan:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF ST. ASAPH

24th January, 1920.

I have given full consideration to the Resolution transmitted to me from the Governing Body of the Church in Wales, as passed at Rhyl, January 6th, 1920, on the subject of the formation of an Ecclesiastical Province for Wales. I believe the decision arrived at to be eminently wise, and, with a view to effect being given to it, I write this formal letter to intimate to you that I regard you as being from the ensuing thirty-first day of March released from any obligation under which you lie by reason of the Oath of Due Obedience to the See of Canterbury, which was taken by you at your Consecration to your present See.

When our Convocation meets on February 10th, I hope to make a full and formal statement in public on the whole subject.

He then, in full Synod of the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, on February 10, 1920, but without any Resolution being adopted in either House, made a formal announcement of the facts, and then declared the four Dioceses of Wales to be from the 31st Day of March, 1920, separate from the Province of Canterbury, and free to form themselves, should they so desire, into an Ecclesiastical Province.

The roadway to the new Provincial life is therefore clear, and it will be my desire to co-operate, by counsel or otherwise, in every way that can be helpful, towards the due formation of the new Province and the clothing of its Metropolitan, when elected, with every necessary power and dignity. By my formal utterance from this chair to-day, following upon what has already been written, my brothers, by me and by you, we are performing ecclesiastically what must needs be done on our side, in conjunction with the action of the civil power, that all may be duly in order by the appointed day. Though our Convocation will be the poorer, the new little Province will, we hope and believe, be strong—strong in the memories of a richly-storied past, a past older than ours—strong, too, in the peculiar vigour which belongs to an old life's renewal of its youth. We shall have the Church of Wales entering upon its old new life, not without mark of storm and loss, but under a glow of sunrise, a glow which is to abide and to lighten into its perfect day. Brothers, solemnly, affectionately, hopefully, we who remain in these Convocation halls will wish you Godspeed.

It was not wonderful, when the Archbishop's patience and kindness is remembered, in difficult times and dealing with men of much sensibility, that the Bishop of St. Asaph, in acknowledging the formal parchment certificate setting out what had occurred, should exclaim (February 25, 1920):

> A thousand thanks for all your goodness and kindness to the Church in Wales[1]

The new Province was inaugurated at St. Asaph, on June 1, 1920, when the Archbishop of Canterbury enthroned the Bishop of St. Asaph in the midst of a great assembly, as first Archbishop of Wales. It was an historic occasion such as the Archbishop loved. Prince Arthur of Connaught was there, representing the King, the Prime Minister was there, the Archbishops of York and Dublin and the Scottish Primus were present. Not least remarkable was the attendance of official representatives of the Nonconformist Churches. The Archbishop wrote (June 27, 1920):

> The month began by the inauguration of the Welsh Province, the enthronement of St. Asaph as Archbishop in the movable wooden chair, a facsimile of St. Augustine's Canterbury *sedes*. The weather was propitious, and the whole proceedings were extraordinarily well arranged, and, so far as I can judge, every one, both Churchmen and Nonconformists, were well pleased with the doings of the day. The Prime Minister arrived at St. Asaph Palace the previous evening, a few hours after us, and I had abundant talk with him next morning before the Cathedral function. To our surprise, he and his wife appeared at the Early Service in the Cathedral. This has created a teapot storm in ecclesiastical circles of the *Church Times* sort, but in my judgement the net outcome will be entirely good. He did not come there to triumph, or to belittle what was happening, or to curry favour. He came as a religious man, who, I imagine, had no conception that any one would do other than welcome him. Nor did the new Archbishop.

When all was over after the enthronement, Archbishop Davidson went to spend a few days of friendship and peace with the Bishop of Bangor, the one Bishop who, though with complete loyalty and affection and taking his full share in the constitution of the new Province, had voted, and in his last session of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation lifted up his voice, against the parting of the four Welsh Dioceses from the Province of Canterbury.

CHAPTER LXI

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

I repeated to him an argument of a lady of my acquaintance, who maintained, that her husband's having been guilty of numberless infidelities, released her from conjugal obligations because they were reciprocal. JOHNSON. 'This is miserable stuff, Sir. To the contract of marriage, besides the man and wife, there is a third party—Society; and if it be considered as a vow—GOD: and, therefore, it cannot be dissolved by their consent alone Laws are not made for particular cases, but for men in general. A woman may be unhappy with her husband; but she cannot be freed from him without the approbation of the civil and ecclesiastical power.'

BOSWELL, *Life of Dr. Johnson* (1776).

A GRAVE social and religious issue was raised in the spring of 1920 by the introduction of a Bill in the House of Lords to extend the grounds on which a married person might apply for a divorce. The Bill, under the name of the Matrimonial Causes Bill, was promoted by Lord Buckmaster. It was based on the recommendations contained in the Majority Report of the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, over which the first Lord Gorell had presided. It proposed to repeal the existing Acts, including the Act of 1857, which allowed a marriage to be dissolved, but for only one cause, namely adultery; and to restate the law in a form embodying all the principal recommendations of the Royal Commission. It was not the first time since the publication of the Report in 1912 that legislation had been attempted. In August 1917, a strong Parliamentary movement was set on foot to press the Government to undertake legislation to give liberty to marry to persons who had been separated. This had been countered by a Memorial organized by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and signed by the two Archbishops, Cardinal Bourne, three Bishops, five Free Church leaders and a number of others, men and women, influential in public life. In November 1918, Lord Buckmaster himself introduced a short Bill to enable divorce to be obtained for desertion, and to give poor people access to the County Courts for the purpose of obtaining divorce; but it had been lost upon a Division by 39 votes to 29.

I

The present Bill was a much more serious affair. It was very comprehensive, and it was wholly based upon the Royal

Commission and its Report. It contained the provisions on which both the Minority and the Majority Reports of the Royal Commission were agreed, notably for the placing of men and women on an equal footing with regard to divorce, the decentralization of the sittings of the Court so as to help the poorer applicants, and for the giving of new grounds for obtaining decrees of nullity. But in the centre of the Bill five new grounds for divorce were added to the existing ground of adultery—according to the recommendations of the Majority of the Royal Commission. These five new grounds were: (1) desertion for three years; (2) cruelty; (3) incurable insanity after five years confinement; (4) habitual drunkenness found incurable after three years from the first order of separation; and (5) imprisonment under a commuted death sentence. The protagonists for the Bill were Lord Buckmaster and Lord Birkenhead, then Lord Chancellor—a formidable combination. The leaders of the opposition were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York (who with Sir Lewis Dibdin and Sir William Anson had signed the original Minority Report), and certain lay peers, among them Lord Selborne, Lord Phillimore, and the Duke of Northumberland. The contest was a sharp one —and the deepest interest was taken in every stage of the debate by the Press and by the public at large. In order to understand the gravity of the issue from the Church's point of view, it should be remembered that, while without doubt the Divorce Act of 1857 had changed the laws of the State, the law of the Church itself had not been changed. That law was declared by the Canons of 1604, which dealt only with divorce *a mensa et thoro* (separation) and cases of Nullity of Marriage, and not with divorce *a vinculo* (dissolution of a valid marriage). In other words, marriage was still treated as indissoluble, and divorce *a vinculo* of a valid marriage was unknown. To use Sir Lewis Dibdin's words, in an article in the *Quarterly Review*, October 1911, 'As Church law stood before the Reformation... so it stood under the Canons of 1604, so it stood after the Divorce Act of 1857, and so it stands to-day.' There was beyond doubt a difference of opinion, in the first fifty years after the Reformation, as to whether the 'law of God' recognized the entire dissolution of marriages when one of the partners was guilty of adultery, with or without the sentence of the Court. But no one doubted that the ecclesiastical

law in England in those years forbade a divorce *a vinculo* of a marriage validly contracted. At the same time, the fact that the Divorce Act of 1857 had been passed, allowing adultery as a cause, had beyond dispute affected the application of the Church's law. Many Churchmen still insisted on the complete indissolubility of the marriage bond,[1] save by death. But there were others—and the Archbishop of Canterbury was among them—who admitted that the bond might be broken by adultery; on the ground that in St. Matthew's version of our Lord's words, adultery was acknowledged as a reason for dissolving marriage.[2] It was a breach of the canon law of the Anglican (as well as the Roman) Church to acquiesce even so far. How, then, could the addition of new causes of dissolution be tolerable? Such was the problem.

Lord Buckmaster, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill on March 10, 1920, admitted that no argument and no persuasion could avail against those who regarded the marriage tie as so permeated and interpenetrated with divine sanction and authority, that to dissolve it under any circumstances was to cause offence against something higher than earthly laws. He did not attempt such argument, but based his appeal on the undoubted sufferings and difficulties of innumerable human lives. He laid great stress on the fact, brought out by the Majority Report of the Royal Commission, that 'experience teaches that causes other than death do in fact intervene to make continuous married life practically impossible and to frustrate the objects for which the union was formed'. And he quoted the Royal Commissioners' words, which were almost an epitome of his whole argument:

> We have to deal with human nature as it has always been, and as it is: and it is established beyond all question that for various reasons, amongst others improvident, reckless, and early marriages, drunkenness, sensuality, brutality, immorality, lunacy, and crime, many marriages become absolute failures, and married life becomes either morally or physically, or both morally and physically, impossible.

[1] Canon 107 (of 1604) said: In all sentences pronounced only for divorce and separation *a thoro et mensa*, there shall be a caution and restraint inserted in the act of the said sentence, That the parties so separated shall live chastely and continently; neither shall they, during each other's life, contract matrimony with any other person.

[2] St. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9.

No one who heard Lord Buckmaster could doubt how deeply he himself was moved by the hardships of those whose marriage for any of the causes named had been frustrated of its object. And he quoted instances in which cruelty, and especially desertion (not least in war time), had left poor women derelict and desolate, sometimes with one child and sometimes with more: women who often and often had the opportunity of remarriage, and yet were barred by the law, and often in consequence fell victims to the temptations of irregular unions. In the name of justice and humanity he pleaded for relief.

The principal speech against the Bill on the first day was made by the Archbishop of York, who affirmed the Church's view of marriage as dissoluble only by death, though recognizing the difficulty caused by the exception of adultery, which some believed on the authority of St. Matthew's Gospel to have been 'authorized by Christ himself'. The Archbishop, however, deliberately rested his arguments not upon the ground of religious authority but upon that of public welfare. On that ground he resisted the plea made by the accumulation of individual cases of hardship, and claimed that the general good of the community, and the interests of the institution of matrimony, made it most undesirable to add any of the proposed new grounds to the admitted ground of adultery, which was an offence 'constituting a breach in the marriage tie wholly unique in its character'.

The debate, after further speeches, was resumed on March 24 by the Lord Chancellor (Birkenhead) in a speech of great brilliance, though delivered in a manner which had something repelling rather than persuasive about it. He went through the new grounds for divorce in detail, and laid great emphasis on the experience of Scotland, where desertion was allowed, and where no ill effects followed: and, especially in dealing with the case of an innocent wife forced to separate from her husband by the latter's cruelty, he poured a great deal of scorn on the whole notion of judicial separation. He quoted with approval words which appeared in the Majority Report of the Royal Commission, describing it as 'this proceeding [which,] neither dissolving the marriage nor reconciling the parties, nor yet changing their natures' was 'one of the most corrupting devices ever imposed by serious natures on blindness and credulity . . . tolerated only because men believed as a part of their religion that dissolution

would be an offence against God'. But before taking the detailed points, the Lord Chancellor enlarged upon two principles of the greatest importance, not hitherto clearly brought out. First he claimed that the only real controversy—the only controversy on principle—was that between those who believed that marriage ought to be indissoluble for any reason, and those who did not hold that belief. But the principle that marriage was, and ought to be, indissoluble was 'excised with almost universal approval from our institutions 350 years ago', when it was first recognized that by the procedure of a private Act of Parliament, divorce ought to be obtainable on the ground of adultery.[1] The second main point of principle which the Lord Chancellor made was that 'the spiritual and moral sides of marriage are incomparably more important than the physical side', that 'a breach of that which is highest must be treated by the State as not less grave than a breach of that which is lower', and that the ecclesiastical case that, although marriage is not otherwise dissoluble, it may nevertheless be dissolved in cases where adultery has been committed, was a case adopted under the influence of an almost unconscious opportunism.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, who followed Lord Birkenhead, was well aware of the difficulties he had to face in reply. It was, he said, 'a formidable task' for a simple man who claimed no power of fervent eloquence. And he was not at his best. He did not deal at all with the question of principle—a failure which exposed him to a good deal of criticism outside. He contented himself with a careful dealing with the argument that the number of applications for separation orders was evidence of the number of cases in which people who ought to be divorced were not at present able to get divorce, and applied for separation orders instead. The practical argument, the handling of actual facts as opposed to theories, was characteristic of the Archbishop, and he had taken very great pains to obtain from the associated societies for the protection of women and children, from the Charity Organization Society, those who had had to do with Canadian soldiers in

[1] The reference is to the Act of Parliament of 1551–2, which declared the second marriage of William Parr, Marquis of Northampton, good, notwithstanding the first marriage and any canon or ecclesiastical law to the contrary. Parr had in 1542 obtained a sentence of divorce *a mensa et thoro* against Anne Bourchier, on the ground of her adultery. In 1547 (?) Parr married Elizabeth Brooke. See *English Church Law and Divorce*, Dibdin and Chadwyck Healey, 1912, pp. 62–9.

war-time, and many others, all the facts they could supply about the numbers of deserted wives. In the previous speeches, statements had been made about thousands, even tens of thousands, of desertions, and he was able to show very clearly that when the actual facts were examined, such large statements did not find support. For example, there were 412,000 Canadian soldiers in England during the War, but, in spite of all that had been said or implied, the number of deserted wives had been only 200. He further argued—and with this he closed his speech—that a Bill which contented itself with indicating the points on which the minority and majority of the Royal Commission were agreed—cheaper divorce, equality of sex conditions, and increased grounds for declaring marriages null—would do all that was needed, while to go farther was to set their feet upon a slippery slope.

After a few further speeches, the Second Reading was carried by 93 votes to 45.

II

Next time the Bill came before the House, on April 20, when the Committee stage began, the Archbishop of Canterbury took the opportunity to reply to Lord Birkenhead's charge that the Church attached chief importance to the lower or physical side of marriage, and that Churchmen like himself were committed to 'this monstrous and medieval paradox that they assent to divorce for a breach of the less important obligation, and they deny divorce for a breach of the more important obligations of marriage'. The Archbishop's answer was twofold. First he accepted all that the Lord Chancellor had said about the high and ennobling intercourse of soul with soul—memory, fellowship, hope, etc.—but he refused to isolate the spiritual from the physical. 'It is', he said, 'because these elevate and uplift and sanctify what he most inadequately called the purely physical or carnal side, that I am unable to follow him in the wide dissociation which he seemed to advocate between the different obligations of married life.' But next he pointed out that the allowance of adultery as the only justifiable ground for breaking the marriage tie, was not a medieval paradox, but 'the words are given in the Gospel as spoken by Our Lord himself' as quoted by St. Matthew—'I say unto you that every one that putteth away

his wife saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress, and whosoever shall marry her when she is put away committeth adultery'; and the Lord Chancellor himself had taken the trouble 'to assure the House that he agreed with St. Matthew'! The Archbishop added:

> We live in a free country, and as individuals we may repudiate these words—that teaching, that guidance. Those sanctions are sacred to most of us, but not to all. But whatever else may be said of them it is not a medieval paradox. It is not something which has grown up in corrupt ages of the Church, but which goes back to the Founder of our faith. If we make that guidance ours, and hold to these words, which I do, there is nothing more to say.

The Committee stage proceeded with successive victories for the upholders of the Bill. But it was still necessary to make plain, if the Bill became an Act of Parliament, how the Church would regard the subsequent marriages of persons who had been divorced under its provisions. Bishop Gore wrote to the Archbishop as follows:

BISHOP GORE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

April 25, 1920.

> I know how ill you were on the occasion of the 2nd Reading Debate on the Divorce Bill in the Lords. But I think I must tell you that on the whole, as far as my limited means of information suggest, a painful impression was created by both debates, among other than extreme churchmen, that the position had not been made clear that, whatever Bill might be passed and put upon the Statute Book, the Church could not recognize marriages, which lie outside what on any interpretation is the will of Christ, either in respect of the use of its churches or ministers or in respect of subsequent Communion.

The Archbishop determined to put an end to any doubt as to the Church's position. On May 4, he moved the insertion of a new clause:

> The marriage of a person whose previous marriage has been dissolved under the provisions of this act, and whose former husband or wife is still living, shall not be solemnized in any Church or Chapel of the Church of England.

As the law stood under the Act of 1857, an incumbent was not entitled to refuse to solemnize a marriage in his church of 'the

innocent party' in a divorce suit; and, though he might refuse to solemnize the marriage of 'the guilty party', he was bound to allow the use of his Church for the solemnization of such a marriage by any other clergyman, 'entitled to officiate within the Diocese, who is willing to perform the ceremony'. Lord Buckmaster, under his Bill, was proposing to leave the discretion with the individual clergyman as to whether or no he would solemnize the marriage of *any* divorced person whose former spouse is still living. The Archbishop's amendment declared in a clear and challenging form that in his view no marriages of divorced persons should be allowed to take place in church in any circumstances whatever.

There was a good and attentive House. The Archbishop spoke admirably, with great force, simplicity, and earnestness. It was a grave and weighty appeal to the House and to Lord Buckmaster for fair play, and a cogent statement of the intolerable position in which the Church would be placed if an indiscriminate practice prevailed as a result of this Bill. He quoted again the text from St. Matthew, and pointed out that those who accepted the theory of divorce which the Bill embodied must disregard these words:

> If the Bill becomes law, the State will allow divorce for causes which the whole Church of the West has quite invariably repudiated.

To expect the Church of England to give up its rule and put a Parliamentary rule in its place, was a quite impossible position for him to accept:

> If any of your Lordships think that the mere connection of the Church and the State, or the application of the system which we call 'establishment' carries with it that, I utterly and entirely repudiate it.

It was one of the Archbishop's best speeches, crisp and vigorous, and was received with much sympathy, the House cheering loudly and generally when he resumed his seat. Lord Buckmaster could not accept the amendment as it stood, but offered the forbidding of the marriage of the guilty person in Church. Lord Birkenhead said that, if the Archbishop held to his view about the threat to the Establishment, he for one among many 'profound believers and supporters of the policy of Establish-

ment' would find it necessary to reconsider the basis upon which his belief depended. When the division was called the amendment was lost by one vote (50 to 51). The two Archbishops and eleven Bishops were in the minority. The Archbishop did not conceal his regret that more Bishops had not been in their places, for, as Sir Lewis Dibdin said privately afterwards, it was the only occasion that he remembered when there was a straight issue on the laws of the Church *versus* the laws of the State.[1]

Another example of the cleavage between the law of the Church and the law of the State arose with regard to the admission to Communion of persons who had been divorced. Lord Selborne moved an amendment to secure 'that no clergyman should be penalized for refusing to admit [such persons] to Communion'. The Archbishop was not best pleased with the amendment, as he did not think that the question of admission to Communion was suitably discussed in Parliament. But he could not decline to support an amendment when put forward. The justification for the amendment was due to a ruling by Sir Lewis Dibdin as Dean of the Arches in the case of *Banister* v. *Thomson* (1908). Sir Lewis had there held that a man who had contracted a marriage which the law of the State allowed, though it was condemned by the law of the Church, did not become thereby a notorious evil liver, and that therefore the clergyman was bound to admit him to Communion. Unless something more

[1] The form in which the Clause 34, 'Saving for rights of clergymen of the Church of England', was ultimately passed on report with the amendment offered and moved by Lord Buckmaster, was as follows:

(1) 'A clergyman in holy orders of the Church of England shall not be compelled to publish the banns of marriage of or to solemnise the marriage of any person whose previous marriage has been dissolved either in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and whose former husband or wife is still living, and shall not be liable to any suit, penalty or censure for publishing the banns of marriage, or for refusing to publish the banns of marriage of, or for solemnising or refusing to solemnise the marriage of any such person.'

(2) 'If any minister of any church or chapel of the Church of England refuses to publish the banns of marriage of, or to solemnise the marriage of any persons who but for such refusal would have been entitled to have their banns published or their marriage solemnised in the church or chapel, the minister may permit any other clergyman in holy orders of the Church of England entitled to publish the banns of marriage, or to officiate within the diocese within which the church or chapel is situate to solemnise the marriage in the church or chapel Provided that the marriage of a person who as a defendant has been divorced under the provisions of this Act and whose former husband or wife is still living, shall not be solemnised in any church or chapel of the Church of England.'

direct and special than appeared in the Deceased Wife's Sister's Act were put into the proposed Matrimonial Causes Act, the result, it was feared, would be the same. The Archbishop of Canterbury spoke on lines similar to those on which he had supported his own previous amendment. The State might indeed make new marriage laws, but 'you must not go on to say that therefore and thereby the Church must change its rules and accept for full Church privilege any one who is conforming to the State law, even if the Church believes these new enactments to be contrary to God's law'. Marriages made under the Act would be legal marriages—he did not dispute that: but the men and women who would have contracted them, while 'perfectly good, honest, straightforward citizens', would have 'placed themselves outside the rules of the Church of England, and the Church must retain its power to deal with each case on its merits as it arises'. And as to the Establishment:

> I yield to none in my sense of the value to the nation of the Establishment, for which I care with my whole heart; but there are higher considerations even than that, if you do force us into the position of loyalty to the one thing or of loyalty to the other thing. I cannot believe that your Lordships, when the facts are fully before you, desire to place us Bishops as well as the clergy—perhaps more than the clergy—in that intolerable position. Most seriously do I protest against it, and tell you that from this protest I cannot conscientiously depart.

The point was further emphasized in the question and answer which took place immediately before the division:

> *The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury*: I want to be quite clear whether I have misinterpreted the noble and learned Lord. As I understood him, the position is this. Let Parliament pass a law giving any conditions you like for divorce and re-marriage, the Church is powerless and must follow suit and regard such people as capable of taking part in the highest and most spiritual functions. I want to know whether that is really so or not. The noble and learned Lord told us early in the debate that although the Bill went quite far he would like to go further, and therefore we were left with the expectation of possible further advance. Are we to understand that whatever happens we shall be expected simply to follow suit and to make our rules correspond?
>
> *Lord Buckmaster*: What may happen at other times I cannot tell you, but unless a person is an open and notorious evil liver, or a

depraver of the book of Common Prayer, as the law stands to-day he is entitled to have access to Holy Communion.

No wonder that the Archbishop should protest against such a position. But Lord Selborne's amendment was lost by 61 votes to 87.

The final scene in the drama took place in the House of Lords on June 22. The first two speakers moved and seconded the rejection of the Bill, but hardly did justice to the opposition, Lord Braye, a Roman Catholic peer, being indistinctly heard, and Lord Halifax, though pathetic in his appeal, forgetting himself in the middle of his speech and, after long pauses, sitting down. The Archbishop followed, and by arrangement was the only episcopal spokesman. He said that he knew, and had great sympathy with, hard cases, but hard though they were they were capable of being enormously exaggerated by comparison with the homes of England as a whole, and many hard cases would remain untouched by this Bill. He repeated his acceptance of the one exception of adultery for which marriage might be dissolved—and, in answer to a direct question by Lord Birkenhead, acknowledged that he did not consider the innocent party who remarried to be guilty of adultery. He spoke of the extraordinary unsettlement of the times, the absence of any mass of popular demand, and the impossibility of ever going back from such a change if it were to be made. Four more speeches followed from the Lord Chancellor, Lord Selborne, Lord Buckmaster, and Lord Finlay, after which the Third Reading of the Bill was carried by 154 votes to 107.

So much space has been given to the deliberations on this Bill, because it was by far the most serious debate on marriage and divorce which took place in Parliament during the episcopate of Archbishop Davidson, and also because the whole question clearly brings out the Archbishop's own view of a subject of the gravest importance. He stood firm on the ground which he believed to be the right ground—making admissions with regard to the consequences of the excepting clause in St. Matthew's Gospel which were very unwelcome to some of his allies. And he also insisted, in the most unmistakable way, that the Church had its own rules, and that those rules were not to be changed at the will of the State. To the proposals for cheaper divorce, equality of the sexes, and the increasing of the grounds of nullity,

he was ready to assent, and he supported a Bill to enact these proposals, introduced in 1921 by Lord Gorell.[1] The Matrimonial Causes Bill itself, however, in spite of the support received in the House of Lords, did not proceed further and, though it was reintroduced in later years by Lord Buckmaster, without being debated upon the same ample scale, so far as its main provisions were concerned, it has still (1935) failed to win the approval of Parliament.

[1] This Bill was, however, altered during its progress through the House of Lords, through the making of desertion for three years a cause for divorce, and the Archbishop therefore withdrew his support, as also did Lord Gorell.

CHAPTER LXII

THE SIXTH LAMBETH CONFERENCE

Il faut compter parmi les plus grands maux de notre temps le fait que les Églises soient si disunies. Pour ce qui me concerne, si l'on a besoin de moi, je n'hésiterai pas à traverser dix océans pour ce but. JEAN CALVIN, *Lettre à Cranmer*, 1552.

THERE can be no doubt that the decision to hold the sixth Lambeth Conference so soon after the War was very wise. As far as the Bishops themselves were concerned, the idea of a coming home from the ends of the earth, after the years of strain and suffering and isolation, was most welcome. There were, besides, all sorts of questions, just emerging in the post-war world, which demanded counsel and answer. And in the different provinces of the Anglican Communion, indeed among the English-speaking peoples as a whole, men desired illumination. A conference, with a history behind it, composed of Bishops of an ancient Church now widespread in the new world and the old, all with very definite duties and responsibilities of their own, was better adapted to leadership, on some at least of the issues, than any new and untried conference on Faith and Order, or any special congress born merely of the needs of the time. Moreover, the general trust in the judgement of Randall Davidson, and the affection for his personality, which the Anglican episcopacy entertained, gave an added weight to the influence which he would naturally exercise as Archbishop of Canterbury.

I

Yet the difficulties in the way of a successful accomplishment of the Conference's aims were of a serious character. Some of the subjects calling for attention were unusually contentious. There were the various questions concerning marriage, there were the racial problems, the controversy raised by the ministry of women, and the challenges flung out by theosophy, spiritualism, and their like. Would there be a split between the stricter and the more liberal Bishops on some of these? Or would the Bishops utter 'mere platitudinous statements that this or that heresy (spiritualism, Christian Science, etc.) has a basis of truth, but

that one must safeguard Catholic Order?' As the Archbishop shrewdly noted, 'Any of us could say that, and we should be a laughing-stock if we bring people from the ends of the earth to put that on paper.'

There were two questions which the Archbishop judged to be specially acute, Modernism and Reunion. As Bishop Gore put it from his point of view:

BISHOP GORE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Private. Jan 13, 1920.

I hope that Divine Providence intends the Church of England to exist over the next year or two without a schism which would separate off the Catholic section, but I dread the Lambeth Conference and its consequences. It seems to me that the whole hope of the Church of England is in danger of being sacrificed (i) to the Modernists, who are daily becoming more and more conscious that their objections to the Creed are fundamental both as to ideas and to miracles, i.e. that the Sanday-Henson position is impossible. (ii) to Reunionists who yield themselves to their amiable impulses and do no clear thinking. There is no doubt always a crisis: but this is unique. But I know how much and deeply I differ from you, and I ask no answer.

And, as the Archbishop himself wrote in a private Memorandum, looking back when all was over (15 August):

> We had to deal for the first time, as frequently pointed out in conversation, with the probability that we should find a minority in the Conference who would not be content to be an acquiescent minority, but might march out denouncing us, or raise cohorts outside.

Of the two issues, Modernism seemed the more dangerous; and certainly public sympathy, and general Church sympathy, would be far more readily extended to a schism or revolt which had credal questions as its cause than to one due to questions of order. It must be admitted that the Archbishop was often a little inclined to over-estimate perils, and that the alarms sounded by Dr. Gore were not so substantial in fact as they seemed to be in his imagination. But at least the anticipation of dangers caused him to be singularly well prepared to meet them should they come. And Randall Davidson was determined to do everything he could to prevent the creeds forming a subject of discussion,

These found no place on the Agenda prepared in July 1919; the Bishops interested contented themselves with the assurance that they would try to introduce something strong in the Encyclical Letter. In May, there was what the Archbishop playfully called Lollards' Revolt—in the shape of a letter from the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Gibson), with the support of the Bishops of Ely (Dr. Chase) and Chichester (Dr. Burrows), who had rooms in the Lollards' Tower. This letter expressed the view that the Creed and its interpretation could 'hardly be altogether excluded from consideration when we come to the Resolutions', and went on:

The BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Private. 12 May 1920.

Though we realize fully the difficulty of saying *any*thing, yet we are agreed that *some*thing ought to be said, though *what* this should be requires most careful consideration. We cannot but feel that there is grave danger of some unguarded and perhaps exaggerated resolution being suggested if we do nothing.

The Bishop added that he was in consultation with a number of other Bishops on the subject.

The Archbishop's attitude is clearly stated in his reply:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

15th May, 1920.

Your exceedingly important letter of May 12th has given me abundant food for thought.

I gather that you and other Diocesans, whom you have consulted, think that we have done wrong in not giving, through the Agenda Paper of the Lambeth Conference, an opportunity to the Bishops to discuss the need of our urging a stricter adherence on the part of the clergy generally to the credal obligations which they have undertaken, and that you would like still to endeavour to get emphasis laid upon these obligations by resolutions of the Conference or by the encyclical letter.

No one, I think, can feel more strongly than I do the gravity, at this moment, of our right handling of the whole question of what is meant by 'Credal Loyalty', but I do quite distinctly feel that we run a very grave risk of alienating some of the best and most devout among the younger men and women of to-day, who are intellectually keen, religiously earnest, and wholesomely progressive in thought, if we try to stiffen the obligations incumbent

on a Christian believer, and encourage the clergy to such action and influence. I quite see that there is another side to all this, but, to my mind, the danger is infinitely greater in the direction I have indicated than in the opposite direction. You will remember the labour that was devoted to this subject by the best brains among us at the Conference twelve years ago, and, as at present advised, I remain distinctly of opinion that we should be more likely to do harm than good were we to attempt a general revision of these questions with a view to—what would be regarded as—a 'warning off' of men and women who are feeling their way towards a firmer Faith at a time of profound unrest and of much experimental and provisional thought.

I should not be honest with you if I did not say this frankly in reply to your letter, but of course I have no right to be dogmatic or autocratic on the subject, and it is quite obvious that, in an encyclical letter or in other ways, opportunity may be found of giving expression to our position and its obligations, without incurring dangers which seem to me to be very real.

You know that forces are to be brought into play, immediately before the Conference, with a view to bringing pressure upon the Bishops in the direction, I will not say which you have indicated, but which the promoters indicate in no uncertain way. You may feel that for that very reason it is desirable that what you think is needed should be said wisely instead of being said in a truculent and minatory way. Personally, unless the phrases chosen be of so mild a sort as would not satisfy you, I should rather prefer a truculent and minatory attitude to have its free expression, and produce its appropriate result. My own belief is that our best line of advance is the firm adherence to our quiet and steady assurance of the truth of what is committed to our keeping, and that we serve this best by shewing, rather than proclaiming, our allegiance to it. But here again, I am expressing what, obviously, is a matter of opinion only.

Till the very end of the Conference, the Archbishop was 'in daily anticipation' of receiving a request for some strong statement, on the Bishop of Gloucester's lines, in the Encyclical Letter. But none came. One precaution the Archbishop had taken. In the Address, at the opening of the Conference, from St. Augustine's Chair in Canterbury Cathedral, he spoke strongly and firmly about the vital significance of the old Creed:

The phrases though cast in other days, other surroundings than ours, and retaining their birthmarks, are no empty survival of

effete or dying things. They live. They have hands and feet. . . . To this chair cling varied memories. An Anselm, a Langton, a Cranmer, a Secker, a Benson, had each of them a revelation to understand and to assimilate, a message to carry to his contemporaries, an interpretation to offer. So have we. But for us, as for them, it is the old Creed which stands.

In addition the Archbishop noted in his private Memorandum:

For the drafting of the Encyclical Letter, I invited the help of Ely among others, partly to occupy him on the lines we had laid down, and partly because I felt that, if the question of credal obligation were raised, he would be the most helpful representative of that school.

II

The second critical issue had the principal place on the Agenda of the Conference as 'Relation to and Reunion with other Churches'. In each of the last three Conferences, it had been the subject of a Report and Regulations, and the War had given the whole movement towards Church Unity an additional impetus. The East African Bishops would certainly want to say something more about Kikuyu.[1] A union scheme had just been started in South India, in which the Anglican Church was very much concerned. The Bishop of London had discussed reunion with a group of Wesleyan ministers, on the basis of episcopacy. The American Episcopal Church was considering a proposal whereby any congregationalist minister who desired it might be confirmed and episcopally ordained without giving up his Congregational membership and ministry. There had also been conferences at Mansfield College, Oxford, between Anglicans and Nonconformists, which appeared to go a long way in the direction of intercommunion and mutual recognition. And there was the well-known project of a World Conference on Faith and Order initiated in 1910. No wonder then that alike the fears and the hopes which such prospects aroused should make a clamour at Lambeth. One group said—to quote the Archbishop's words:

If you yield one jot to these would-be reformers who are trying to validate non-Episcopal Eucharists and non-Episcopal Orders, we must reconsider our position in the Church of England, and we warn you also to beware how you move an inch towards releasing

[1] See ch. xlii.

the obligation of a plain interpretation of the Creeds. We regard the Bishop of Norwich and Tissington Tatlow as leading us into harmful comprehensiveness, and Henson and Rashdall as leading us, if they only could, into perilous unorthodoxy. Beware what you do, for we do not mean to keep silent if you thus offend.

On the other side there were earnest people who pressed 'almost tearfully':

It is simply impossible for us to go on in friendly relation to these Nonconformists whom we reverence and trust, and with whom you bid us take counsel on missionary and other similar matters, and then to be barred from preaching to them, or they to us, in a regular way, or from an occasional fellowship in Eucharistic worship and Communion. We mean indeed to use what we believe to be our true liberty, and not to wait for Episcopal authority before reverently joining them in things sacramental

Each side turned to Randall Davidson for protection and encouragement—not for advice, as their minds were fully made up—and the outlook was neither bright nor simple. And yet, as we shall see, out of this real conflict there came the greatest achievement, the resounding success, of the whole Conference, the Appeal to all Christian People.

III

The published Report gives the conclusions to which the Conference came on the various topics. But it should be stated that no small part of its success was due to the trouble taken in planning it beforehand. By the time the Conference met, there was in existence a mass of material[1] quite different from anything that previous Conferences had had, and to this the Archbishop personally attributed a good deal of the smoothness with which the Conference worked For the first time, a whole series of papers on the points to be raised was circulated to the members; and also for the first time episcopal secretaries, in addition to the main secretary, the Bishop of Peterborough,[2] were booked in advance for the several committees, the Archbishop thinking it best to

[1] A bibliography giving some recent books on subjects to be considered in the Lambeth Conference in 1920, and various printed memoranda, were circulated by the Archbishop to the Bishops well in advance of the Conference

[2] Dr. F. T Woods, subsequently Bishop of Winchester.

leave the election of chairmen to the committees when chosen. There was an even more abundant atmosphere of hospitality than in 1908, less stiffness (it was noticed) between the English Bishops and those from overseas. There were many stories and not a few amusing incidents. The American Bishops in particular regaled one another with stories in the off hours. Thus Dr. Gailor, Bishop of Tennessee, who was their Presiding Bishop, told how a man had come up to him and said in the free American way, 'I reckon you're a Preacher.' 'Yes', said the Bishop. 'What Church?' 'Episcopal.' 'Ah, that's an old historic steady institution, had time for its religion to calm down. My religion is a new religion—we have to make plenty of noise as we're just blasting the foundations.' 'What religion is that?' asked Bishop Gailor. The other replied, 'The True Seed in the Spirit' (which turned out to be a very particular form of the Baptist belief). On another occasion the Archbishop was very much troubled with lumbago. One of the English Suffragans ran after him to suggest an infallible cure, 'Tie a fiddle string round your waist'; to which the Archbishop mildly replied, 'You are always very kind.' The devotional arrangements were all admirably planned by the Bishop of Dover (Dr. Bilbrough).[1] There was one difference in the composition of the Conference from that of former years. Before 1920, all the members were Bishops in active work, with responsibilities of a diocesan character. Thus, in the Encyclical Letter of 1908, they were described as 'All having superintendence over dioceses or lawfully commissioned to exercise episcopal functions therein'. On this occasion (though the Archbishop did not personally favour the plan) invitations were extended by Resolution of the Conference on the first day, to certain retired Bishops, among them Bishops Bernard, Gore, and Ryle. These three Bishops, however, refused on the ground that they no longer had responsibility, and therefore that their counsel would not be appropriate. As, however, three other retired Bishops accepted the invitation, the Encyclical Letter described the assembly as simply 'Archbishops and Bishops in full communion with the Church of England'.

The personnel of the Conference was strangely mixed. Almost all schools of thought and many types of character were represented among the 252 members. There was the American

[1] Bishop of Newcastle, 1927.

Bishop who delivered a wonderful speech about women, to which the Bishop of Durham assured the Conference that he listened with enjoyment and agreement 'but my enjoyment was greater than my agreement'; the Canadian Archbishop who announced with what dazed bewilderment he listened to the expression of advanced liberal sentiments in an assembly which he had every reason to expect would be staunchly conservative; a Bishop from India—a busy figure pressing his way through to the Library, with his smoked glasses, his patent leather satchels with steel handles, sometimes stamping his feet with indignation, sometimes bursting into tumultuous stammering speech on Church Unity; a Bishop from China speaking in gentle and persuasive tones of provincial organization and the Chung hua Sheng Kung hui, a name greeted at first by a surprised conference with a ripple of mild laughter. Most striking of all was Frank Weston, Bishop of Zanzibar, with his extraordinary mixture of generosity and menace—the latter revealed, for example, when, just as a mediating Resolution on a marriage question was about to be put at the end of a prolonged debate, he strode to the rostrum and said ominously that he would not like to determine his relation to the Lambeth Conference by a vote on such a Resolution in a House of such a size! There was also an Orthodox Bishop present for the first time at any Lambeth Conference. He came to confer with the Committee on Reunion as a delegate from the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He was Dorotheos, Metropolitan of Demotica, but he stood outside the Conference proper. He was a gentle old man with a quaint humour. 'Ah, c'est terrible, notre histoire!' said he once, as he told of the fearful indignities which the Patriarch used to endure in old days when visiting the Grand Vizier at Constantinople, kneeling and grovelling on the floor like a dog. He spoke also of the Patriarch's lodgings in a monastery at Constantinople, contrasting their narrow range with the splendour of Lambeth. Then, when he finally came to bid the Archbishop good-bye, after friendly talk and expressions of hope on either side for closer relationship between the two Churches leading to union, the Archbishop of Canterbury said 'Mais pas trop vite', and the words were echoed with gusto by the Metropolitan of Demotica, 'Pas trop vite'.

In such an assembly, the Archbishop's considered policy was not to act as the ordinary chairman but to treat every Bishop

with the utmost deference, so that none might say hereafter that the view of any Bishop of the Church had not had a fair hearing. 'The Archbishop of Canterbury is a wonderfully wise man', said the Primate of All Ireland, and in speaking of his patience, open-mindedness, and fairness, he spoke for every one. The first week, and the two closing weeks, the Conference sat together, and the Archbishop presided all the while—though for the first few days he was sorely crippled with lumbago, sitting in his chair with rugs over his knees and (to his disgust) a hot-water apparatus beneath. He attended most of the Committees at one time or another—hearing the debates or the evidence, and once at least giving evidence himself.

IV

The large Reunion Committee was the one which the Archbishop most frequented—and it was here that the Appeal was worked out. Of this Committee the Archbishop of York was Chairman. At first, as the various local schemes of federation or union were presented, progress was extraordinarily slow. Nobody seemed able to go further than envisaging such a plan as that put out in 1888 and known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral: (1) the Bible; (2) the Creeds; (3) the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and (4) 'The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nation and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church'. And there seemed very little chance of any favour for anything in the nature of immediate action. For many days the Committee sat in perplexity, and no progress was made. Then the Chairman, the Archbishop of York, conceived the plan of a Letter to Christian People, which might be warmer and more persuasive than any mere restatement of conditions of union. This plan seemed to fit in with an idea, which had been sketched in the opening week by the Bishop of Zanzibar, of a Great Church in which the denominations of non-episcopal origin might be groups: it had been taken up by one or two others, like Bishop Brent; and, with the Archbishop of Canterbury's connivance, a group of kindred episcopal souls met by themselves in Lollards' Tower to see whether anything might come from that. A new and hopeful 'statement on reunion' was prepared, with some of the

younger Bishops such as the Bishops of Bombay (Dr. Palmer), Pretoria (Dr. Neville Talbot), and Pennsylvania (Dr. Rhinelander) as its draftsmen. The Archbishop describes how on the Sunday (July 18) between the two Committee weeks:

> a little group sat all the afternoon under the tree on the lawn. It consisted of the two Archbishops, Bishop Rhinelander of Pennsylvania, Bishop Brent, the Bishop of Peterborough.... We went through the various drafts, Resolutions etc. which had been suggested, but on the whole decided to transpose it into an Appeal of a consecutive sort.

The Archbishop of York had an immense influence in the shaping of the Appeal, and in its presentation to, and acceptance by, the Conference—but it was without doubt the eloquent and unexpected championship by the Bishop of Zanzibar of the position the Appeal contained that proved the decisive factor:

> The surprise of the Conference was the line taken by the Bishop of Zanzibar (Weston). Had he been an unknown person who made his début at this Conference, it would have been said what a wonderful thing it is for the present time to have a Bishop of real learning and eloquence, who is a strong High Churchman, and yet holds such liberal, tolerant, kindly views and shows such readiness to see and appreciate the views of those who differ from him. He and Henson became personal friends, and Uganda and Mombasa were constantly by his side, and he and they desired that I should be photographed with them as a group. This was done. Whether his strange temperament will show itself by some outbreak of another kind now that the Conference is over, I cannot tell. I feel a little uneasy sometimes. I hope this is not faithless.

The great principles of the Appeal were these. It was an Appeal to all Christian people (not 'churches')—and the Bishops who sent it forth acknowledged 'all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body'. It recognized the grounds of disunity, the relationship of Anglican Churches to both the ancient episcopal communions of East and West, and the non-episcopal. 'We acknowledge this condition of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit.' The Appeal called for a new and wide

vision of a united Catholic Church, within which 'Christian communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service'. Such a visible unity would, the Bishops believed, involve the whole-hearted acceptance of the Holy Scripture, the Nicene Creed, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, and:

> A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

The Bishops went on to ask in the following paragraph:

> May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate.

The Appeal also expressed the desire that 'the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a representative and constitutional manner'. To the crucial question, what was to be done in the meantime, the Bishops replied by asking for 'mutual deference to one another's consciences'. They declared their belief that 'terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted', Anglican Bishops and clergy would willingly accept from the authorities of other Communions.

> a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life:

and hoped that ministers of non-episcopal Communions would accept:

> a commission through episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.

The Appeal concluded with these words:

> We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new

and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.

It was a fine and moving document: it was magnificently presented by the Archbishop of York, and enthusiastically adopted, with only four dissentients.

There was, however, a very notable addition to the Appeal, in the shape of a substantial Resolution dealing with the vexed problems of intercommunion and exchange of pulpits. The Bishop of Zanzibar and others made it plain that it would make a great difference to their attitude if the non-episcopal ministers and laymen concerned were agreed upon, and waiting for, a basis of Reunion. After a great deal of framing, and with one moment when the Bishop of Zanzibar said that he had felt that 'to-day might be the last day on which he could attend the Committee' —so great a line of cleavage had been shown—a Resolution was passed, explicitly disapproving, 'general schemes of intercommunion or exchange of pulpits', but stating that, '*in view of prospects and projects of reunion*:

> A Bishop is justified in giving occasional authorization to ministers, not episcopally ordained, who in his judgement are working towards an ideal of union such as is described in our Appeal, to preach in churches within his Diocese, and to clergy of the Diocese to preach in the churches of such ministers.

and also declaring that:

> Nothing in these Resolutions is intended to indicate that the rule of Confirmation as conditioning admission to the Holy Communion must necessarily apply to the case of baptized persons who seek Communion under conditions which in the Bishop's judgement justify their admission thereto.

The Appeal and the Resolution were almost unbelievable after everything that had been said before the Conference began. Not only were the lions in the path overcome, but something new and creative had been done, and a great blow struck for the Reunion of Christendom. With a very full heart did the Archbishop of Canterbury join in the Doxology which the brethren lifted up! The Archbishop did not minimize the difficulties in the way of working out the Appeal. He had too shrewd a sense of reality for that. He knew that the non-Episcopalians would urge that, important as episcopacy might be for future ordinations, it

was not important enough to render it necessary for Anglicans to ask those who were already Ministers to receive episcopal ordination: and that the non-Episcopalians would almost certainly propose that Anglicans should 'simply recognize their Ministry as it is, in the hope and expectation that they will gradually transform it into an Episcopal system for the future'. The Archbishop's private comment on any such proposal as he thus anticipated was as follows:

> This I am quite sure we cannot say (apart from the question of whether it is fundamentally sound) without creating at once and irrevocably a deep schism among our own people and giving triumph to the Romans and others who would laugh such a Conference to scorn—also to Easterns. Thus the difficulty really consists in our finding a mode of getting over the intervening period without either evoking defiance from non-Episcopals, or creating among ourselves an incurable schism.

The Appeal, and the whole Report of the Conference were received with general admiration. The Appeal itself was translated and on sale in six languages. The Encyclical Letter, largely the work of Bishop Palmer, summed up the general judgements of the Conference, and laid a very special emphasis upon the idea of Fellowship, in accordance with the Archbishop's own deliberate plan.

The Conference closed on August 7, with overflowing gratitude to the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson; and a beautiful ebony crozier was chosen for a gift to the President.

CHAPTER LXIII

THE CASE OF BISHOP MATHEW

Likewise Bishops, being principal pastors, are either at large or else with restraint; at large, when the subject of their regiment is indefinite and not tied to any certain place, Bishops with restraint are they whose regiment over the Church is contained within some definite local compass, beyond which compass their jurisdiction reacheth not. HOOKER, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. VII, Sect II.

ONE of the most curious figures whom the Archbishop met in the ecclesiastical sphere was a certain Bishop Arnold H. Mathew. He was, the Archbishop believed, personally virtuous, but partly through vanity, partly through an ill-considered enthusiasm for a special kind of reunion, he succeeded in doing a most embarrassing amount of havoc to the cause he professed to serve. To anticipate the Archbishop's words in his letter of September 12, 1917, to the Bishop of London, Bishop Mathew 'played fast and loose with great questions of Church order, and thus set going in different ways and in different lands schisms which it may take many years to heal'. The Archbishop first heard from the Rev. A. H. Mathew in July 1907, when Mr. Mathew, who was then fifty-four years of age and described himself as *de jure* Earl of Landaff, asked whether he could be given some ministerial charge in the Church of England, the Church of his baptism and boyhood. He recounted his preparation in youth for the Anglican Ministry, his Ordination to the Priesthood in the Church of Rome (1878), his marriage in 1892, his readmission to the Church of England, and his temporary service, under the name (it would seem) of Count Pavoleri, in a London curacy with the sanction of Bishop Temple. He had subsequently, he said, lived quietly in the country, discarding clerical dress and doing no ministerial work He desired to assure the Archbishop that he repudiated Papal claims, that he entertained no doubt about Anglican Orders, and that his wish would be to hold an incumbency in the Church of England. He had been a friend of Père Hyacinth Loyson[1] at Paris in 1889; and became later a friend of Father George Tyrrell, the Jesuit; and it was on the latter's advice that he desired to take up work with the Church of Eng-

[1] For Archbishop Tait's interest in Père Hyacinth see his *Life*, II 527, 547

land. These connexions were of interest; but the project was not quite as simple as Mr. Mathew expected. When the Archbishop explained that, in addition to adequate testimony to personal character, about which there would obviously be no difficulty, there must be some period of probationary and subordinate work before the question of such nomination as had been suggested could be even considered, Mr. Mathew replied, not unnaturally, that he preferred to abandon the project and to remain as he was. The Archbishop accepted this conclusion, assuring Mr. Mathew that he was not precluded from reopening the question at a future date should he so desire. Mr. Mathew took occasion to reiterate his conviction about the Church of Rome:

> The Papacy itself [he wrote (August 12, 1907)] instead of being the 'visible centre of unity', I regard as the centre and origin of ecclesiastical discord and disunion, the fomenter of schisms, and the seat of ecclesiastical despotism and tyranny.

Disappointed in his first wish, a few months later he made a fresh and more ambitious proposal, giving the first indication of his association with the Old Catholics. On December 19, 1907, he wrote to the Archbishop as follows:

The Rev. A. H. Mathew *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

> I think that a way to serve the Church of England as *une église amie* may be open to me, which will also, I hope, help forward the movement of Re-union of those Churches which reject the modern Papal pretensions. I have been approached within the past few days by several Roman Catholics who wish to embrace the tenets of the Old Catholic Communities of Germany and Switzerland and have implored me to assist them If this can be done in harmony and friendship with the Established Church I think a sphere of very useful labour is thus unexpectedly presenting itself, one also which it may be my duty to enter upon Should this prove to be so the enquiries which will have been made will have been very advantageous to our movement. I have long thought that if it were possible for a Bishop of the Church of England to accept the services of an Old Catholic Coadjutor, or Assistant, who could take part in Ordinations, the Roman Catholic and Oriental objections to Anglican Orders would be effectually silenced without any sacrifice of principle whatever. Such an arrangement might be difficult. I do not know,

On December 30 he wrote again, and stated definitely that he had decided to join the Old Catholics:

The REV. A. H. MATHEW *to the* ARCHBISHOP'S CHAPLAIN

In view of the difficulty of arrangements for entering the Ministry of the Church of England, I have at length definitely decided to abandon the idea and to throw in my lot with the Old Catholics. We shall open a Mission in this country for the benefit of those Roman Catholics who are unable to continue conscientious adhesion to the Vatican, and this we shall do in a spirit of perfect and cordial amity for the Church of England and in no spirit of aggression, still less of proselytism . . . I am now in correspondence with the Archbishop of Utrecht, who will formally authorise the formation of a branch of the Church in Great Britain on the lines I have indicated.

In his reply the Archbishop wrote:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. A. H. MATHEW

Jan. 20. 1908.

I do not gather that there is any step which you now desire me to take in the matter. I am, of course, at all times glad to learn of any movement within the Church of Rome in the direction of sounder principles of doctrine and usage. But, believing as I do that the Church of England is in this country the true representative of the Catholic Church as it comes down to us from the past, I can hardly be expected to look favourably upon the establishment in England of another society claiming that position, even though it does so in a less exclusive and arrogant spirit than that which finds its centre and expression in the Vatican.

Other letters followed, but no intimation was given of any proposed episcopal consecration until, on April 8, 1908, the Archbishop received, presumably from Mr. Mathew, a lithographed card stating that on that very day his 'Episcopal Consecration' would take place at Utrecht. It did not at once take place, for the reason, as was stated on behalf of the Old Catholic Bishops, that they had unexpectedly become aware of the fact that Mr. Mathew was a married man. A vigorous protest against such an action on the part of the Old Catholics of Holland was also immediately made (April 9) by Bishop Wordsworth of Salisbury to Bishop Van Thiel of Haarlem. The Consecration, however, took place at Utrecht on April 28, 1908. It appeared later that Bishop Mathew himself was deceived by an ex-Roman priest, who brought him Arthur Galton's article in *The Fortnightly Review*

about the Romanists in England who did not accept Vaticanism, and assured him, quite falsely, that there were some 250 priests who would like to be led by a bishop on the lines of Old Catholicism. But the harm was done, and Bishop Mathew claimed to be a regionary Catholic Bishop in the British Isles, with special supervision over foreign Old Catholics resident in England. The step was bound to lead to extraordinary confusions. The Lambeth Conference of 1908 passed a Resolution earnestly deprecating 'the setting up of a new organized body in regions where a Church with apostolic ministry and Catholic doctrine offers religious privileges without the imposition of uncatholic terms of communion, more especially in cases where no difference of language or nationality exists'. There really were no genuine Old Catholics in England to whom a special Old Catholic Bishop could minister. The idea of creating an Old Catholic Church in England for Englishmen, with English ministers ordained by an Old Catholic Bishop and receiving 'valid orders', was utterly repugnant to the Archbishop. 'I believe', he wrote in a private letter to Mr. Brodhurst, the Editor of *The Guardian*, February 22, 1909, 'that for Englishmen in England the Church of England covers the ground which Old Catholics occupy in such Continental countries'; and he objected strongly to what he described as 'the unnecessary multiplication of independent sections of validly ordained clergy in England ministering to Englishmen'. The confusion was still further increased by Bishop Mathew's preposterous proposal to get some kind of working alliance with the High Church party in the Church of England, and to secure by degrees the recognition of Anglican orders by Rome through the intervention of a new line of succession through himself. He began ordaining men to the diaconate and the priesthood. He actually gave conditional ordination to four Anglican priests who were uncertain about their orders, and he later consecrated some seven or eight men (including disaffected Roman priests) to the Episcopate.

In 1910, the Old Catholics of Holland, who found that they had been grossly deceived, broke with him. And he then described himself in various ways. Sometimes he was 'Catholic Bishop': sometimes 'Bishop in England and Ireland' of 'the English Catholic Church in communion with the Archiepiscopal See of Utrecht', later 'The Western Orthodox Catholic Church in

Great Britain and Ireland'. Next he became 'Archbishop of London and Metropolitan'. In March 1911, the title was 'Archbishop and Metropolitan of the English Catholic Church'. This became 'The Catholic Church in England, Latin Uniate Branch', and, two months later, 'The Catholic Church in England, Latin and Orthodox United,' under a leader described as 'Archbishop of England', and subsequently as 'Sa Grandeur Mgr. A. H. Mathieu, Archevêque de Londres, Comte de Landave, Metropolitain de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande, Evêque provisoire de l'Église Catholique Française'. As time went on, and his position became less and less favourable, his claims became more and more high sounding. In 1911, he petitioned the Eastern Orthodox Church for reunion, and, while refused by Russia, was apparently accepted by Antioch.

Accounts of his relations to the Roman Catholic Church were given in documents produced in the course of the unsuccessful libel action brought by Bishop Mathew against *The Times* newspaper in April 1913, the grounds of action being the publication by *The Times* on February 28, 1911, of the following words, used in a Papal document connected with the excommunication of two priests who had claimed to have received Episcopal consecration from Bishop Mathew:

> Nor was this information left without authentic testimony, for the person who was the chief author of this sacrilegious misdeed —a certain pseudo-Bishop named Arnold Harris Mathew—was not ashamed to confirm the fact in letters, full of self-assumption, which he has addressed to us. This person has, moreover, thought fit to bestow upon himself the title of Anglo-Catholic Archbishop of London.

In the early part of 1915, Bishop Mathew wrote to the Bishop of London, alleging that he had re-ordained 300[1] of the Anglican clergy, and inviting him to submit himself for re-ordination—*an offer which the Archbishop ironically mentioned in a Memorandum about Bishop Mathew which he published in May 1915.* Bishop Mathew's movement became weaker and weaker; and while he himself remained orthodox, though more and more solitary, at least half a dozen of his clergy became Theosophists. On April 15, 1916, the Archbishop gave him a personal inter-

[1] Bishop Mathew later denied that he made this statement, and said that he had in fact only given conditional ordination to three or four Anglican clergy.

view at Canterbury. Bishop Mathew described the history of his 'little movement', and told a curious story about his recent effort to be received back by Rome. The Archbishop was personally friendly, but could not disguise his condemnation of the position Bishop Mathew had adopted. In the course of the interview, of which he made a full Memorandum at the time, the Archbishop expressed himself 'almost exactly as follows', after thanking Bishop Mathew for putting the facts before him from his point of view:

> 'It will be honest that I should tell you plainly how the situation presents itself to me. I have never challenged your loyalty to the Christian faith, but I do challenge your loyalty to elementary principles of Church Order. You have handled—I incline to say trifled with,—the great questions of the sort which give force to our prayers against schism. Your relation successively to the Church of England, then to the Church of Rome, then to the Church of England again, then to the Old Catholics, then to the Eastern Church, then to the independent organisation under your headship, then to the Church of Rome again, and now, as you suggest, to the Church of England again, give a story of loyalties and disloyalties which seems to me incompatible with any adequate sense of the responsibilities belonging to membership in an organised body which has Christ as its Head.
>
> 'I cannot in honesty refrain from pointing out to you the position in which the men are placed who have been by you ordained or consecrated, whether validly or invalidly, and whose position now is—what? There are, I think, some seven or eight men, perhaps more, whom you have purported to consecrate to the Episcopate —Bacon, Scott-Hall, Hinton, Egerton, de Landes, Beale, Howarth, Willoughby, and there are many more to whom you have given, regularly or irregularly, validly or invalidly, the priesthood, and now you write to me that you have decided to "terminate the organisation". Is this a tolerable position to maintain?'

There was a good deal of correspondence afterwards. The Archbishop said that he could not authorize Bishop Mathew to officiate as a minister in the Church of England—he would only sanction his admission to Holy Communion in the Church of England as a layman. To this attitude, in spite of many representations, the Archbishop adhered to the end; and his view is stated in kindly terms in the following letter to the Bishop of London, after hearing of Bishop Mathew's sad domestic and financial circumstances:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF LONDON

September 12th, 1917.

I have read with attention and with great interest the letters you send me from Mr. Hay to yourself, and from Bishop Mathew to Mr. Hay. Of course I regard them as private documents, but I can write to you frankly on the subject, and I have no objection at all to Mr. Hay seeing my letter if you so desire. The story has now become a pathetic one. It is pitiable to think of Bishop Mathew's desertion by the lady whom he wrote about as Countess of Landaff, and whose picture he sent to us with pride. What is meant by her being able to claim the control of her children if she deserts her husband, I do not the least understand. The pamphlet about his earldom, and the pictures of his countess, look strangely now. It is also pathetic that he should now find himself in financial straits, if that is indeed so. I fear that the fomenting of schisms, and the founding of Churches, have involved much expenditure on some one's part, both in East and West, and it is possible that this has hit him hard. I feel intensely sorry for him, foolish and harmful as his doings have been. To those who only know bits of the long story, it no doubt looks as if we, and especially I myself, were harsh towards him Very likely it is best that this should be the popular view, and that I should bear the blame. I have no objection at all to that. Our duty to the Church in the matter is, as you well know, not doubtful; and if I chose to make everything public it would be easy to justify all that we have done, or refused to do. But the publication, or republication, of these strange doings would, I think, only increase the mischief, such as it is. Bishop Mathew is, to the best of my belief (though of course I speak without knowledge of what is said by his wife or any one else against him), a virtuous old fellow, with a delightfully attractive manner, a fine appearance, a certain amount of ecclesiastical learning, and a strange lack of balance. His harmfulness has lain in the real lightness (strenuously as he denies it) with which he played fast and loose with great questions of Church Order, and thus set going, in different ways and in different lands, schisms which it may take many years to heal. He has given to ecclesiastical adventurers less honest than himself, an example fraught with abundant peril. None the less, I have a personal regard for him, and, although he has only himself to thank for his present position, I should like to be able to help him, in some way which did not do harm to the Church wherein I am set to be a responsible custodian of what is right. I should certainly fail as such a custodian if I were to say now, what neither you nor any other

Bishop whom I have met would wish me to say, that, after all that has passed, we propose to recognise him as one who might rightly hold the trust of ministry in the Church of England.

Mr. Hay, I see, suggests that some work as a librarian, or some secretarial office might be found for him, or an extra-parochial chaplain, to some Hospital or Home. I cannot conceive how such a post could be found for him. He is not the sort of man to fit in appropriately to work of a secretarial sort, and to place him as a duly accredited priest of the Church of England in charge of the religious life of a public institution would, so far as I can judge, be wholly wrong. I must, as I have said, continue to bear the brunt of such criticism as his friends will quite naturally continue to make, but I am glad to know that, in what I have said and done, I have had the support, not only of yourself, but of the other Bishops, a limited number, but our wisest, who are conversant with the facts.

At the end of 1919, Bishop Mathew was still trying to get recognition for some sort of ministerial work. He begged, through the vicar of South Mymms, where he was residing, that he might at least be allowed to sit in the choir of South Mymms Church, robed as a Bishop or as a Priest, and read the lessons. And there is something pathetic in the fact that, while this last request was under consideration, the poor would-be 'Metropolitan of the English Catholic Church' died suddenly in the village, at the age of sixty-seven, during the week before Christmas (December 19, 1919).

The story closes with the Lambeth Conference of 1920, when a letter was received from the Old Catholic Bishops of Holland stating that the episcopal consecration of the Rev. A. H. Mathew in 1908 had been 'surreptitiously secured by the production of false testimony', and that the Old Catholics had no ecclesiastical relation with him or with those ordained by him. The following is the Resolution adopted by the Lambeth Conference:

27 We regret that on a review of all the facts we are unable to regard the so-called Old Catholic Church in Great Britain (under the late Bishop Mathew and his successors), and its extensions overseas, as a properly constituted Church, or to recognize the orders of its ministers, and we recommend that, in the event of any of its ministers desiring to join our communion, who are in other respects duly qualified, they should be ordained *sub conditione* in accordance with the provisions suggested in the Report of our Committee.

CHAPTER LXIV

COLLATERAL ILLUSTRATIONS

I interrupt, for a moment, Sir Walter's diary, to introduce a few collateral illustrations. LOCKHART, *Life of Scott*, ch. lxvii.

THE year of the sixth Lambeth Conference was more crowded than usual with affairs of high importance. The two other principal events in the Church's history were the enthronement of the first Archbishop of Wales, and the first meeting of the new National Assembly of the Church of England. The latter took place for two days just before the Lambeth Conference began, and set the machinery in motion. It was satisfactory to hear it described by the chief ecclesiastical critic of the Enabling Act (Dr. Henson) as, in spite of all, 'the most representative body of Church people that can as yet be devised'. In this chapter we propose to give examples of some of the lesser incidents, and also of some of the more personal relationships, in which the Archbishop was concerned.

On January 6, Dr. Davidson was talking of the anxieties which lay ahead, and of his own old age. He was now seventy-one. He went on to explain why he went so constantly to the House of Lords. The Bishop of London had told him he thought it was waste of time, but the Archbishop did not think so at all. It enabled him, he said, to be in touch and in close personal relations with many influential and important people. Besides, it was half a rest, though not entirely so; it was a rest which partook of the nature of work. Similarly he felt it was a great gain to the Church of England, just as attendance at the House of Lords was, that he should go to Grillions and 'The Club', meeting important people as friends. Once more, other Archbishops of Canterbury had been on ceremonial terms with the King and the Royal Family, but he was on terms of personal friendship—quite a new thing. All this was for the advantage of the Church of England, and in all this he was quite unlike other Archbishops who had been before him.

I

On February 26, Archbishop Davidson and the Archbishop of York received a deputation from the Federation of Catholic

Priests about Reservation. Dr. Darwell Stone and Father H. P. Bull, S.S.J.E., who led it, reported the alarm felt by their friends lest the recent case in which the Bishop of Truro (Dr. Burrows) had prosecuted the vicar of Cury, and another case at Taunton in which the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Dr. Kennion) was prosecutor, were introducing a new era of appeal to the Courts. After Dr. Darwell Stone had stated his position, and declared: 'If Bishops pursue the Cury policy, I cannot see any other upshot than a series of bitter conflicts', the following conversation took place:

The Archbishop: What do you think should be done?

Dr. Stone: First of all, personal influence, discussion, reasoned argument. Suppose, however, after this the Bishop failed, I should like to see the Bishop prepared to bear some defiance rather than go to a Court of law. When argument and influence have come to an end, then he must bear defiance as something that must be borne.

The Archbishop: I have looked up the Cury case. I do not want to go over the story of that to show whether or not Bishop Burrows was right. I do not want to go into the theory of Benediction. I have, however, looked in vain in your statements for an expression of view as to the manner in which the Bishop should persuade the Parish Priest to follow the right course. The Bishop has promised to exercise discipline—an awful responsibility—as he, as well as the incumbent, has charge of the parish. Do you tell me there does not exist on earth any mode for dealing with such a man as Wason? You say the institution of legal procedure is unjust. Do you mean that the Bishop must retire and give up the matter when the Priest persists in defiance? You say 'In the last resort I should accept defiance', but it is not the Bishop who accepts defiance. It is the people, his charge.

Father Bull: The Church of England has one hand tied behind it in the system of Ecclesiastical Courts.

The Archbishop: I agree that the Courts must be changed. I have done all I could to do this. Yet here are the Courts under which we were ordained in the meanwhile.

Dr. Stone: I did say that in the last resort the Bishop must accept defiance. But the cases would be fewer if Synodical judgement were exercised, the Bishop sitting with his Clergy.

The Archbishop: Conceivably. But we have not got it at present. Legal enactment would be necessary to get this through. In the meantime we have our present system. Sometimes—very

occasionally—a man does stand out against everything. Take the Cury case as given in the published open letter. Bishop Stubbs drew a ring round him. Bishop Burrows withdrew it in 1912, held a Synod in 1914, interviewed him, formally enjoined him, visited the parish, pronounced his formal judgement in the church, waited, asked Wason to advise on the Court, and at last was driven to the Court in 1919. The petition which you bring says 'No opportunity given for obedience to formal admonition'. Do you really hold this?

Dr. Stone: Yes, this gives our view.

The Archbishop: If this is so, we must accept it. You wish us to give an undertaking that we shall refuse to have authoritative regulation?

Father Bull: We object to ecclesiastical authority going to the Courts.

The Archbishop: At no time have Bishops been less willing to go to the Courts than now. I speak after 44 years' experience. Do you mean that when we have exhausted every other means we can do nothing?

Father Bull. Our position is that Church and State are so entangled that there is nothing that can be done.

The Archbishop· Since Constantine's time?

Father Bull. Yes.

The Archbishop: I have never had a case before the Court, but I could not undertake not to do it if I am to be faithful and loyal to my conception of duty. Does this Federation stand for obedience?

Father Bull: We have recommended all our Clergy to refrain from extra-liturgical Services till the Bishop gives sanction.

The Archbishop: Do you wish us to say 'Let a man be defiant enough and nothing will happen'?

Father Bull: No. Let the Bishop inhibit a man, showing that the Church does not authorise him, where the Creed is concerned.

The Archbishop: If I were in your place I should take the line that this is a matter for the Bishop's responsibility—lay it on him—and acquiesce in his ruling, however much under protest.

Dr. Stone: This is the attitude the Federation recommends. If *your* attitude could be, by your influence, that of all other Bishops, we should feel that the object of our deputation had been achieved.

II

On March 1, the Archbishop drove out to see Lord Rosebery:

I had a real interest yesterday. I spent three hours with Rosebery, talking right on end from the first minute to the last. I had offered

to go to Epsom to see him, and he welcomed it so cordially that I rejoiced to go. A glorious spring day. I drove from London, and got to him at the Durdans at 12.30. I found him much less ill than I had anticipated. He has largely lost the use of one side and completely of his left arm, but, barring this, one would have thought him very much as of old, only looking unkempt and as if he needed somebody to tidy him up—a rather melancholy condition. He wants a wife, or a sister, or a daughter.

But he was full of freshness and talk, and as keen as ever about all that is happening. He discussed rather eagerly the Peace Treaty, the mess that the Government have, he thinks, made of foreign affairs, the return of Asquith two days before for Paisley, and he poured out comparisons of all these with the days of Pitt, of Dizzy, and Gladstone, and his own experiences One felt that he would be so much the better for having more people to see him and talk about things, for, solitary as his life has been for many years, it is more solitary than ever now that he complains that he cannot read the paper properly because he cannot turn it over with one hand, and that his books tumble down when he tries to turn up things.

We walked about the garden, where he was proud of his crocuses and things in a rather pathetic way. But he was full of vivid reminiscences of past days, and of our friendship He asked rather earnestly if he might have a photograph of Edith, for her face had always given him some special thoughts, and so on. I promised him this He was very shrewd and wise about political affairs, as it seemed to me, and his whole talk brought home to one intensely the pathos of the country having had throughout the War this man with all his gifts and powers and knowledge and memories, and no hand's turn help given to the country thereby. It is largely, yes, almost entirely, his own fault, but it is the fault of former years rather than of now. A man who has been Prime Minister, and was one of the very best of Foreign Secretaries; a man who knew Bismarck intimately, and the French statesmen, and had been the trusted confidant of Gladstone, and Granville, and, on the other side, the friend of Dizzy, and intimate confidant of Queen Victoria, and still more of King Edward, and so on—and all this wasted. For he really does nothing with it now, save when now and then he pours out to a friend as he did to me.

He also talked about the higher side of things, and I tried to get in some helpful prods, for he is quite amenable to them for all his religious reserve. All the beauty of his quiet surroundings, among yew hedges and lawns, made one long that somebody were sharing it with him, or that he were giving out from what is really the

deep well of his knowledge and thoughtfulness. He did not, through our three hours of talk, say one bitter word about anybody, and he had abundant appreciation of all sorts of people, and was kindlier than of old, with less cynicism. He talked a good deal about ecclesiastical appointments and the responsibility of it and the care he had tried to take, and his affection for Kennion, and his belief in and interest in things I had tried to do. I thought I traced a sort of yearning after untouched, or at least unaccomplished, plans of his own, if plans be not too strong a word.

When I left him I had rather a lump in my throat, and wondered whether I should get such a chance again. I suppose he might have another stroke at any time. Or again one might fail to find him alone and so communicative.

Here is a reminiscence of a dinner at 'The Club' (March 2):

To-night I have had a singularly interesting dinner at 'The Club'—one of the best gatherings I have ever known in the way of interest and vivacity and range of talk. Arthur Eliot in the chair, and the following present—Prothero, Lord Sumner, Admiral Sturdee, Sir Henry Newbolt, Stamfordham, Kenyon, Bishop Gore, Pember of All Souls, Murray, Hugh Cecil, Sir Maurice Hankey, and myself. The talk was very general, and most brilliantly kept up, especially by Murray, Lord Hugh, and Arthur Eliot, with Gore and Pember taking part, and Hankey present for the first time on election, brimful of knowledge of the doings of every day in the Peace Conference and elsewhere. I thought Hugh Cecil at his very best, epigrammatic and thoughtful, but not cynical. We discussed Gladstone and Dizzy and Rosebery[1]—all this of special interest to me after my talks with Rosebery yesterday—also Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort, and, oddly enough, Hymns Ancient and Modern, about which Pember and Hugh Cecil and Prothero had things to say. Hankey I found intensely interesting in less general talk. I told him how we had this morning been rather sparring with the Foreign Office about the telegram to America—the American Bishops having telegraphed to me bidding us take heed to preserve the rights of the Christian

[1] In a conversation afterwards (June 2) the Archbishop noted one of the points made on a similar occasion about Lord Rosebery. The question had been raised, said the Archbishop, at 'The Club', 'What makes the difference between a first-rate statesman and others?' The names of Palmerston, Disraeli, Lord John Russell, and others came up, but Mr. Balfour replied, 'Being ready to go out in rough weather.' 'Well,' said Rosebery, 'you have done that more than most.' 'I have done my best,' said Balfour. But, said the Archbishop, Balfour did not return the compliment, as it was just this which Rosebery never could do. A sort of self-indulgence was his besetting sin.

folk under the Turks, and my draft reply sent to the Foreign Office, with a somewhat pointed retort that we should continue to do our best, but relied on America taking its share. These words had been cut out from our draft by Curzon, who thought America had had enough of it. So I sent Bell back again to the Foreign Office this morning to insist that I was not going to send the telegram without these words, else it would seem as if I accepted their criticism or condescending counsel to us. Bell had been quite successful, and the Foreign Office had sent off the telegram with my words in full. Hankey was specially pleased with this, as he thought America needed to have the truth rather more plainly spoken to her, and that this could be excellently done in my non-political way. Also he and I discussed the Easterns now in England—the Armenian Patriarch, and Bishop Severus, and Surma Khanim and her capacity. He knew all about it. I wonder whether any man had quite his experience before. A retired young naval officer becoming secretary of the Defence Committee, and then of the Cabinet, and then of the Peace Conference, with intimate personal knowledge of all that had passed and is passing—a great power of memory and of keeping his head, and a wonderful absence of self-consciousness or swagger, or affectation of humility. As one knows him better, he is really a striking contemporary.

On May 16 he wrote:

I feel like the May Queen, who passed from autumn to winter, and winter to spring, and heard the bleating of the lamb, for I have been silent since Easter, and it is now Ascension. . . . I have been feeling the burden of things rather heavily during the last six weeks, but there has been nothing gravely amiss, only a most uncomfortable form of indigestion which makes one feel like a collapsed India rubber ball. . . . As to America, I know nothing, nor, I think, does Stamfordham, of the communications which have passed unofficially between Lloyd George and the Wilson Group since Wilson's illness. There again I think while the American attitude is in the highest degree disappointing, inasmuch as they are failing to accept any part of the International burden which belongs to post-war settlement, especially in Turkey, and the East, I yet think that many English critics are very unfair to Americans in failing to realise how immensely the policy we want them to adopt differs from what was their immemorial principle and custom as regards non-intervention in far-away troubles of an international kind. I think they have failed to realise that the request we make to them is of necessity without precedent, because

the conditions are without precedent, and that, this being so, they ought to be prepared to go much further than they have gone in *helping us through the Mesopotamian, Armenian, and even Balkan troubles. . . . Another thing which is causing me great anxiety in our ecclesiastical world is the practical failure of the* Central Church Fund. At present I understand that our liabilities may amount to about £350,000, for which the Archbishop of York and I have made ourselves responsible, on the assurance by these leading laymen, Brassey, Selborne, Salisbury, Midleton, Grey, Kindersley, and many more, that there was no doubt about the money coming in. Selborne still thinks it will, and anyhow a great deal will, but the outlook is in a high degree alarming, and I am taking the strong measure of allowing a few spokesmen, Selborne, Partridge, and Dibdin (who is giving immense help) to come to a Bishops' meeting this week, and see a group of Bishops, and state the case bluntly and strenuously.

III

In May and June of this year, the Archbishop had to consider an application that he would confer a medical degree in peculiar circumstances. The general right which he was asked to exercise was obtained as a result of the Act of 1534 (25 Henry VIII, c. 21, forbidding Papal Dispensations and the payment of Peter's Pence), by which the Archbishop of Canterbury was given power to grant 'all manner such Licences, Dispensations, Compositions, Faculties, Grants, Rescripts, Delegacies, Instruments, and all other Writings . . . as heretofore has been used and accustomed to be had and obtained . . . at the see of Rome'. These Faculties included degrees. The degree most commonly given by the Archbishop was a Degree in Divinity, but Degrees in Music and in Civil Law were also given from time to time, and, up to the War, ordinary M.A. Degrees were given after examination. The last-named degree, however, was discontinued by Archbishop Davidson, as he considered that, with the growth of modern universities, the justification for granting it had been considerably diminished; though he allowed two priests to take the degree after the war who had begun to study before the new rule was in force.

The Archbishop always gave sparingly,[1] remembering that a

[1] In the twenty-five years, 1903 to 1928, Archbishop Davidson conferred the following degrees. 55 D.D.; 8 B D ; 1 D.C.L.; 14 Mus.Doc., 8 M.A., Total, 86.

lavish use of his power would produce legitimate criticism and diminish the honour. When he conferred a Lambeth Degree, he did so either to enable a man to hold some ecclesiastical office, for which a B.D. or D.D. was required by statute as a qualification, or on appointment to a bishopric, or as a recognition of distinguished service. In the last case he granted the degree only after receiving independent testimony from men of the highest eminence in the musical or other department, or, in the case of a Divinity Degree, from those who had indubitable right to speak for educational or missionary work.

The most notable instance of a petition to the Archbishop was that made on behalf of a distinguished manipulative surgeon, Mr. H. A. Barker. In twenty-five years, Mr. Barker had made an extraordinary reputation for his ability. In 1912, a leading article in *The Times* described him as 'a master of manipulative surgery, who relieves suffering for which no relief can be found elsewhere' (December 7, 1912). During the War and after, his reputation had grown even greater, but he was not a qualified physician or surgeon, and the General Medical Council had actually, in May 1911, removed the name of a qualified medical practitioner, Dr. Axham, from the medical register, as he had been 'adjudged guilty of infamous conduct in a professional respect, for having assisted Herbert Atkinson Barker, an unregistered person practising in a department of surgery, in carrying on such practice by administering anaesthetics on his behalf'.

In 1920, 307 Members of Parliament and ex-Members of Parliament prayed the Archbishop of Canterbury to confer upon Mr. H. A. Barker a Lambeth Degree, *honoris causa*. Among the petitioners were the Lord Chancellor (Lord Birkenhead), the Attorney-General (Sir Gordon Hewart), the Solicitor-General (Sir Ernest Pollock), Viscount Cave formerly Home Secretary, and Sir Edward Carson. It was clear that the Archbishop technically had the power of acceding to the request by conferring a Medical Degree. In the previous century, thirty-one persons had been made Doctors of Medicine by an Archbishop. But the Medical Act of 1858 (21 & 22 Vict. c. 90) had prescribed that the degree could not give any qualification to practise. The Archbishop was therefore fully aware that the conferring, by him, of a Lambeth Degree might unintentionally have the effect of deceiving the public, for even though Mr. Barker, after receiving

such a degree, had the right to describe himself as H. A. Barker, M.D., he would not thereby be any the more qualified in law to practise, and he would be subject, by section 40 of the Medical Act, to a penalty of £20 if he were wilfully or falsely to use the name or title of Doctor of Medicine, or any other description implying that he had been registered under the Act, or was recognized by law as a medical practitioner. The Archbishop consulted both legal and medical friends, amongst the latter, Sir Rickman Godlee, Sir Thomas Barlow, and Sir Alfred Pearce Gould. The doctors themselves were not prepared heartily to defend the General Medical Council's action with regard to Mr. Barker, especially in the case of the anaesthetist, and the Archbishop himself said, in writing to Sir Lewis Dibdin (May 27, 1920):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* SIR LEWIS DIBDIN

I feel bound to have a fling at the medical men who have, as it seems to me, acted in a rather intolerable way towards a man of genius who has got a knack denied to them. They might easily have safeguarded their professional rules while generously recognising his quite undisputed skill and gift.

He thought, however, that some other distinction, such as a title, would be a more appropriate method of recognition of the service of Mr. Barker, than a Lambeth Degree with the possible misrepresentation to which that might lead. He accordingly wrote the following letter:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. J. L. WALTON

21st June, 1920.

I have for some time had under consideration the Petition which you have transmitted to me, with the appended signatures of a very large number of distinguished men, including the Lord Chancellor, the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, Sir Edward Carson, and many other eminent lawyers, public servants, Members of Parliament, and men of political and literary distinction. They unite in asking me to confer a Medical Degree upon Mr. Herbert Atkinson Barker. The petitioners urge that the Medical Degree should be given to Mr. Barker, 'in order that his assistance may be more generally available for injured soldiers and sailors at the present time'. I have, as you will remember, enquired from you in what way Mr. Barker's possession of the title in

question would render his assistance more generally available. From letters which have reached me, I gather that some at least of those who have signed the Petition are, or were, under the impression that by holding a Lambeth Medical Degree *honoris causa* Mr. Barker would become qualified to undertake medical or surgical practice, from which as an unregistered practitioner he is at present debarred. This impression, as you fully realise, is a mistaken one. The legislation which limits registration to men qualified by the ordinary professional training expressly, and I think rightly, provides that the status acquired by registration is not given by the Degree which the petitioners invite me to confer on Mr. Barker. In your reply to my enquiry, you dwell upon the remarkable character and proved success of Mr. Barker's methods, and upon his desire 'to demonstrate his system before the medical authorities with a view to its adoption in the Medical Schools'. You point out, justly as I think, that Mr. Barker could not reasonably be expected at his age to enter upon the course of study necessary for obtaining a Medical Degree in the ordinary way. But, this being so, I am at a loss to know in what way Mr. Barker's assistance would be made more generally available by his holding a Lambeth Medical Degree, unless it were by leading the public to suppose that he possesses the technical qualifications of a registered practitioner. The popular use of the title 'Doctor' in connection with his name would, I imagine, have this probable result, but the supposition would not be in accordance with facts. On these grounds I come distinctly to the conclusion that I should not be acting in the public interest were I to accede to the prayer of the Petition. I should feel more at liberty to grant the request if the Degree were being sought simply as a public recognition of Mr. Barker's beneficial work in the past, and were being given, for example, on his retirement from practice, so that it could not have the misleading result which I have indicated. Indeed, I cannot help hoping that some means may be found of marking the public appreciation of what I cannot but call Mr. Barker's eminent service to sufferers, to whom his manipulative method has proved beneficial when other efforts of a more normal sort had failed. No one can read the published accounts—the general veracity of which is unchallenged—of what Mr. Barker has been enabled to do, or give attention to the individual testimony abundantly furnished to me by letter and by word of mouth, without reaching the conviction that he possesses some manipulative gift of a most unusual kind, and has the knowledge and skill necessary for applying that gift to the benefit of patients who place themselves under his treatment. I am myself, however, concerned simply with the

request that I should grant to Mr. Barker the Degree of Doctor of Medicine. I cannot do this without grave danger of misleading the public as to the exact character of the qualifications possessed by a remarkable man, who has, in the face of many difficulties, achieved a reputation for manipulative surgery which no one who looks into the facts can doubt that he has deserved.

The fitness of the reply was generally recognized. Mr. Barker himself, in a personal letter, expressed his gratitude to the Archbishop, and the Archbishop and the petitioners had the satisfaction a little later, as the result of an approach to the Prime Minister by some of the most eminent of his friends, of seeing Mr. Barker honoured by the receipt of a Knighthood from the King.

IV

At the end of June, just before the beginning of the Lambeth Conference, the Archbishop received a letter 'greatly perplexed and pained' from Prebendary F. L. Boyd, about his supposed attitude to the Anglo-Catholic Congress, the Congress which, he said, was first contemplated before the War, and was now being held for the first time in order to exhibit 'with all the weight of authority that we could gather together, the true content and proportion of Catholic faith and practice in the Church of England'. The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. PREBENDARY F. L. BOYD

29 June 1920.

I have received your letter of June 26th. I am grateful to you for writing to me fully and frankly, but I own to being simply amazed by the things which your letter contains. First you tell me that you hear it constantly said, with reference to the coming Anglo-Catholic Congress, that the Archbishop is 'rocking with laughter at it'; or, again, that I am 'deeply annoyed'; and so on. What these statements made to you are based upon, beyond wild conjecture, I have not the slightest idea. I never to my knowledge gave the slightest shadow of ground for either statement, and neither amusement nor annoyance could possibly be suggested by the meeting so far as I know about it. To tell the truth, I have spoken very little to people about it. It has not come prominently before me in any way, nor, of course, was I approached about it either in its inception or afterwards. I have received a certain number of unimportant letters of protest against it, and a few

quite insignificant and effervescent letters saying how the Congress will in its power show up the feebleness of the Bishops. But these are quite unimportant things in the ordinary day's correspondence, and I repeat that I literally cannot conjecture upon what the statements you refer to are supposed to rest. I think it possible that some people have been rather irritated with me that I have not given more time or attention to the fact that such a Congress is being held, but I have never had to do so, and yours is, so far as I remember, the first statement I have seen or heard from any of my friends about its beginning. I am much interested to learn from you how it originated, and what you and some others of its promoters have felt to be its true and useful purpose. I shall join with you in thankfulness if, as I hope, your expectations and intentions should be abundantly fulfilled. I have, I think, been quite casually asked by a few people during recent weeks as to whether they should take part in it, and to the best of my recollection I encouraged them in every case to do so. But I cannot be quite sure about this, as I may have felt that some particular man had better keep aloof from this kind of necessarily sectional gathering.

More serious, however, than that part of your letter, important as it is, is the statement you make to me that, after conversation with me some time ago, you went away with the impression that I 'regarded High Churchmen as pariahs—a real nuisance to the Church, to be repressed, and if possible extruded'. I own this to be amazing indeed. I should have thought that my whole public life had given abundant evidence of the utter baselessness of such a supposition. Not a few of my most intimate friends, men with whom I have for years taken counsel, belong indisputably to the section which I am supposed to regard as pariahs. Talbot and Gore are two of the most intimate friends and counsellors that I have, though I am glad to say that I have others belonging to different groups of religious thought to whose friendship I owe equal gratitude. If, however, a man with your knowledge of the Church and its life thinks that to be my attitude, I can only say that it makes one despair of getting people to understand anything. Ask Bishop Gore among the older men; or, say, Edward Talbot of Mirfield, or Father Kelly, or almost any other typical men of that school with whom I have been intimate; and you will see how strange has been your misapprehension. It is so fundamental that I feel it impossible to argue about it. Certainly as one grows older one learns how odd are the misconceptions which arise. Sometimes I have had to defend High Church principles from opinions expressed even by men like yourself. For example, when in your pamphlet about Kikuyu you contended that Communion

as administered in the Roman Catholic Church is invalid, I felt I had to stand up among my friends against such a theory. Probably you would say that that was not quite what your words meant. I instance it merely as an example of my desire to be honestly fair all round, in a Church which I believe to be comprehensive enough to include rightly men of widely varied opinions. I should greatly like a further talk with you some day soon. But unhappily the stress in these actual days is so terrific that quiet interviews are nearly impracticable, except upon matters of urgent public business which I cannot escape.

I have dictated this off-hand on receiving your letter. If anything else occurs to me on re-reading what you have said, I may perhaps write again.

After the Lambeth Conference, the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson took their holiday as usual in Scotland. They visited amongst others (the Archbishop noted at the time) 'the Haldanes at Cloan, the Burghcleres at Finavon, Annie Jones at Aberuchill, the Gordon Duffs at Drummuir (recalling vividly the old visits in my sporting years, say '69 to '85)'.

In September, there was a meeting of the International Committee of the World Alliance for promoting friendship through the Churches at St. Beatenberg. The World Alliance had been born at the very outbreak of the War, in August 1914, at Lake Constance, the fruit of the former Anglo-German Friendship Committee. But it had hardly been formed before its members had to disperse. It had met again in 1919 at The Hague, but the French had refused to attend because the Germans were present. It met again in September 1920, and had to appoint a President. The Archbishop of Canterbury was proposed, the representatives of the different Churches desiring to do honour to a great Churchman who had tried to stand above the battle during the War. The leader of the German delegation, Dr. Spiecker, in a courteous spirit protested against the election as premature. He said that much as the Germans respected Archbishop Davidson, yet he was the chief ecclesiastic of a great hostile power. A representative of the Serbian Church, Father Janic, at once rose to say that all the Orthodox representatives present asked him to declare that they wanted the Archbishop of Canterbury as President, and were unanimous that he was the greatest man they could have. Then, turning to the German delegation, the Serb delegate said: 'And as for you, you ought to be thankful

that the Archbishop of Canterbury should be President. He has been a true friend to you. All through the War, though English, he has taken a more than English view of the War. He is the most internationally minded man in Europe. When I was in London he made two great speeches, all in support of you.[1] You ought to be glad of him.' This speech was received with great applause. The election was carried without dissent, as the Germans did not vote against the Archbishop.

At the end of October, the Archbishop spoke in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, on the Lambeth Conference, and took some delight in glancing at certain members of the congregation, such as William Temple and Dick Sheppard, as he said, 'Half the people in this church' (indicating Sheppard himself with a gesture) 'accuse the Bishops of being asleep, never giving a lead—and now they have given a lead.'

At the beginning of November, he was very unwell, but:

> On Thursday the 11th I was well enough to take part in the Cenotaph unveiling, and the burial of the Unknown Warrior in the Abbey. It was important on all accounts that I should be there. I had had some keen controversy with the Prime Minister and the Cabinet, especially Curzon, about the proceedings at the Cenotaph. They had wished, or the Prime Minister had wished, that the proceedings should be wholly secular, alleging as reason that Mohammedans and Hindus were among those to whose memory it stood. . . . But I prevailed, and we had prayer and 'O God our help,' (Lord's Prayer and Big Ben).[2] Instead of anybody disapproving, there was unanimous expression of thankfulness that we had thus marked our Christian fellowship. The scene in the Abbey, at the grave of the Unknown Warrior, was one of the most stirring in English history, but all this is recounted publicly, and I have no special facts to add.

In November, the Church Assembly, at its second session, passed the first Measure which dealt with the Convocations of Canterbury and York:

> In the November session we passed the measure declaring Convocation's power to reform itself by Canon, and it passed with

[1] Father Janic, the speaker, was probably referring to the Archbishop's speeches in the House of Lords about Reprisals

[2] The bracketed words are a reference to the interesting fact noted in a letter to the Archbishop afterwards. The writer of the letter said that he had been at the top of Big Ben at the time and heard the words of the Lord's Prayer ascending.

amazing smoothness through its preliminary stages, Legislative Committee of the Assembly, Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament, resolutions in both Houses of Parliament, and Royal Assent. All was over before Christmas, and the measure became law. Of course it was an unopposed measure, no one being able legitimately to criticise it, but there might easily have been some awkward hitch in the official arrangements, and the absence of any such obstacle has been an encouragement as to the soundness of our plan.

In commenting on the procedure which followed on the reform of Convocation by itself, the Archbishop made this interesting note:

With regard to Convocation reform, a curious technicality has been, I think, overcome more easily than I expected. Convocation has from time immemorial been dissolved only when Parliament *is dissolved. We have now been told that we may reform Convoca*tion by Canon when we will, but it would be rather a farce to reform it and then leave it sitting in its unreformed condition till the next dissolution. To meet this, I privately got hold of Sir Almeric FitzRoy, and through him Sir Claud Schuster, and the Home Secretary, and the President of the Council, A. J Balfour, and they have consented to advise the Crown to dissolve Convocation as soon as the Canon has been enacted. If this enactment takes place, as I hope it will, in the April session of Convocation (after being discussed and agreed to in the February session of Convocation), the dissolution might take place about the end of April, so that the reformed Convocation could meet in the first week of July as originally intended. All these negotiations have involved a great deal of individual work on my part, and I think I am not wrong in saying that my personal influence with those in authority has been of real value, and that this is appreciated by the large circle which is cognisant of the difficulties and of our apparent conquest of them. Altogether it would be affectation to ignore that people are pleased with my own conducting of the business in the three sessions of the Assembly which have already been held, as well as in the original business of the Enabling Bill. I believe that as leader I have now the confidence of a great many people belonging to the progressive schools, who had been fretful about what they thought my lack of push, activity, and vociferousness in carrying things forward. The vociferousness which they wanted would have been the very thing to wreck either the Enabling Bill in its cradle, or the Convocational reform at the stage which it has at present reached.

In December, the first Conference took place between the Archbishops and Bishops and the Nonconformists on the Lambeth Appeal, in response to formal letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Heads of each Church, sending them copies of the Appeal. The Archbishop noted:

> We cannot estimate what is going to be the help or hindrance we get from the non-episcopal rank and file. My personal belief has always been that our danger would lie in trying to go too fast. We cannot get Reunion by a short cut. Lambeth Conferences lie ten years apart from one another, and the conditions in England and America differ very widely. It will take years to get our principles rightly understood and assimilated, and any attempt to press hurriedly forward is bound to defeat itself. But it is very difficult to persuade eager men and women, whose interest in these subjects is recent and crude, that we must go step by step, and steadily avoid even the appearance of hurry. This delay is always distasteful to the enthusiasts, especially the young enthusiasts, and I have to fulfil the unpleasant rôle of curbing the sort of buoyant and sanguine expectations that the work can be accomplished forthwith offhand, so sound are its principles, so Christian its aim.

At the end of the year, the Archbishop was rather concerned at the way in which such an immense burden fell on his shoulders, almost unshared by any Bishop save the Archbishop of York who had come to Canterbury, as often before, to spend the last days of the old year with him. He spoke very seriously to the Archbishop of York on the whole question. A record of the main matters discussed between the two Archbishops will show the range of the Archbishop of Canterbury's regular programme:

Membership of the Archbishops' Committee on the property and revenues of the Church.
How to make the Canon for the reform of Convocation.
Relations of the National Assembly to Convocation.
Action on the Lambeth Appeal Resolutions.
Action on the Resolutions about the Ministry of women.
The question of a Sub-Committee of Bishops for the Lambeth Appeal.
Lay Readers.
National Assembly business—standing orders.
Parochial Church Councils.
Resolution on Unemployment.
Ecclesiastical Courts.

Committee on Spiritual Healing.
Committee on Liturgies.
Committee on Moral Theology.
Councils of Social Welfare.
Gorell's Divorce Bill.
League of Nations.
Etc.

Both Archbishops enjoyed such talks; and there was an occasional lightening of the atmosphere as well. Thus Archbishop Davidson told Archbishop Lang of Dean Wace's disgust with the Bishop of Chelmsford (Dr. Watts Ditchfield)—whom he (Wace) had pressed for a bishopric—partly because he had included a friendly reference to Anglo-Catholics in his Church Congress speech! Dean Wace, in expressing his disgust, had said to the Archbishop: 'If I were a young man I should join the Wesleyans, but I am too old now!'

A HOLIDAY AT ABERUCHILL

(1920)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK (COSMO GORDON LANG)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY (R. T. D.)

CHAPTER LXV

AN UNSETTLED YEAR

Wellington was victorious, the great conqueror was overthrown, England stood the most triumphant nation of the world. But with an enormous debt, a dissatisfied people, gaining peace without tranquillity, greatness without intrinsic strength, the present time uneasy, the future dark and threatening.

NAPIER, *History of the War in the Peninsula*, Book XXIV, ch. vi.

THE conditions of the country, the Church, and the world in the years immediately following the War were strangely unsettled. 'There can be no question at all', wrote the Archbishop in February 1921, 'that we are passing through a time of immense uncertainty as regards the larger polity of the Church.' The rapid enactment of the Enabling Bill was evidence at least of great vitality, though the direction in which the new Assembly would move was still to be seen. Certainly, so far as its early proceedings were concerned, there was no need for any qualms in the Archbishop's mind as to his ability to keep his hand on the helm; and, thanks to his patient guidance, the new Measure, giving powers to the Parochial Church Councils, emerged, after a week's ceaseless debate, in a coherent and intelligible shape. But Parochial Church Councils themselves might well be unsettling institutions.[1]

I

A personal anxiety which weighed heavily on the Archbishop's mind was caused by the trial of Archdeacon Wakeford and another public discipline case affecting a priest, and the thoughts which they stirred. Were such lapses due to the prevailing nervousness and psychical upset of post-War days, with conse-

[1] The Archbishop, writing February 6, 1921, said. 'I doubt whether any event in the constitutional history of Church and State has ever been wrought out with so little friction, and on so smooth a current as this great change Even now it is difficult to realise that fifteen months ago we were constitutionally in the same position as we had been for centuries, so firmly has the new system fashioned its foothold and made good its powers. I think it is indisputable that if we had failed in December 1919 to get through Parliament what is popularly called the Enabling Bill, we might have waited for it for many a long year with increasing and most harmful loss of enthusiasm, and growth of irritation among the progressive groups. Instead of this we have had a continuous stream of praise and thankful gratulation at the way in which the new system has begun to work.'

quent loosening of fibre and lack of self-control, or was there really a loss of grip on moral orderliness and elemental right or wrong?

All through the year the crisis in Ireland continued, and the Archbishop had his full share in its tragic perplexities. There was the coal strike, with the threatened sympathetic action of the industrial Triple Alliance. There was the appalling suffering caused by the famine in Russia under a Bolshevik régime. There was the grave unrest in the East, the danger to the Christian races in the old Ottoman Empire, as well as the growing Arab protest against the Jewish settlement in Palestine. There was also the problem regarding the condition of the natives in East Africa. In every one of these events or crises the Archbishop perforce had a share, while all the time carrying on his immediate duties in the Diocese and the Province.

II

Early this year the Student Christian Movement was pressing the Bishop of Southwell (Dr. Hoskyns), in whose diocese lay Swanwick, the great centre for interdenominational conferences of students, on the subject of intercommunion. The Bishop asked the Archbishop's advice:

The BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Bishop's Manor, Southwell. Feb. 26/21.

. . . I am now in this letter pressed much further and asked to adopt definitely a plan of Intercommunion.

Remembering the extreme youthfulness, and ignorance of the students as to the faith and order of the Church, and remembering also that the students are rather kicking at all the restraints of Institutional Religion, I shrink from coming to a judgement on my own responsibility.

If this crowd of young students go back to their various schools and colleges with the message that Church Order and Confirmation goes for nothing, what will be the result?

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF SOUTHWELL

4th March 1921.

You are indeed confronted by a practical question of no small importance and difficulty in regard to these good enthusiasts at

Swanwick. We have always to remember with regard to them, when inclined to harsh judgement, that most of them are quite young and inexperienced, and that they rather incite one another into a sort of free lance attitude towards men and things, both sacred and secular. We must not therefore treat them as though it were deliberate conciliar action on their part which reached conclusions which we regard as dangerous. I do not think I differ at all from what you have said. It appears to me that you must take the responsibility of telling them definitely that we have reiterated our intention of awaiting Provincial authority before ourselves making operative the counsels given in the Lambeth Conference, and that any action by an individual Bishop or an individual group of would-be loyal Church people is fraught with peril if it anticipates the ultimate conclusion and thus gives a handle to those who deem us rash and inconsiderate in our operations. The Church of England is not a young body and does not—and ought not to—move with over-rapid steps in effecting changes. So much for the large principle. Then we come to the working out of the details. They ought to see that what they propose may be easy enough for them in their gathering, but if it becomes a precedent would be by no means so easy on other occasions and in other surroundings. I am not myself one of those who want to be meticulously rigid about enquiring into the antecedents or sentiments of those who, as responsible Christian men and women, present themselves for Holy Communion in our churches. I think the responsibility rests with the individual who thus comes, but I am sure you are right in feeling that we go far beyond this if we deliberately say that the non-Anglican members of a great conference, in a formal or quasi-formal way, be invited to come to our Communion, notwithstanding the fact that no decision to that effect has yet been adopted by our Province. The case would of course be still stronger with regard to the attendance of our Church folk deliberately and corporately at a Communion Service conducted by others than our ordained Ministry.[1]

[1] In June 1921, the organ of the Student Movement had an article by Tissington Tatlow, the General Secretary, containing this official ruling 'The General Committee [of the Student Christian Movement] does not feel that to take to itself the functions of a Church and to arrange a united Communion Service at Swanwick would be of any real service to the cause of unity; and it further recognises that to take this step would be to turn its back upon the inter-denominational policy upon which it has built up its work and its relation to the Churches during the last twenty years. . . . The end [intercommunion at Swanwick] is to be achieved not by asking the General Committee of the Student Movement to take action outside its province, but by seeking to move the Churches.

III

At the beginning of March, the Archbishop's counsel was asked privately by the Lord Chamberlain, as often before, with regard to a religious play. He replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* VISCOUNT SANDHURST

3 March 1921.

I have read carefully the little sacred drama which you send me —*The Upper Room.* It is, as the memorandum in your envelope puts it, a devotional exercise rather than a play in the ordinary sense. I do not know what are the conditions under which it is intended to produce it. I note that it is said that the profits are to go to a charity, but is it to be open to the public in the ordinary way for ordinary payment, and is it proposed to allow it not merely in the Philbeach Hall, as named but also in a theatre? And, if the latter, what precautions can possibly be taken as regards the manner of its production? It is so intensely sacred, and once this were licensed for ordinary theatrical exhibition or performance I do not see where any line could, on religious grounds, be ultimately drawn with regard to religious drama unless it were because the writing was irreverent. This is the reverse of irreverent. Some would call it superstitiously devotional. I should not myself use that word, though of course the whole details are drawn out on sacramental lines of the most pronounced kind—Roman rather than Anglican, though there is nothing so far as I can see that is contrary to sound Christian teaching of the sacramental sort. In my view the performance of this in a hall and with precautions against interruption or applause of any sort might be for those who attend it a religious exercise of a profitable kind. But is it for the Lord Chamberlain to license such religious exercise in King's Theatre, Hammersmith, on Good Friday? About this I do not know, for I am ignorant as to the limits of your authority and the manner of its exercise. What I can definitely say is that the drama is solemnly devotional and Christian and certainly could not be objected to on the ground of lowering the dignity of the sacred story of the Passion. It has also adequate reticence. For example, though Our Lord's voice is once heard He never appears.

My difficulty in giving advice is that I do not quite know what limitations you have power to make as to the manner of its presentation or the rough and ready way in which it might be handled. At this moment presentations of Mystery Plays are taking place in Church Halls in more than one part of London—

notably, in the Church House, where *Everyman* is being performed and money is being paid for admission. But that is being done by religious people, mainly clergy, on quite definitely religious lines. Once guarantee this, and I see no harm in such presentations, even to the extent of allowing *The Upper Room*, which I gather has already been performed. Given adequate guarantees, I could not myself object to the performance of this, but can you secure that it is not mixed up with other things in some such way, for example, as a performance of the ballet of *The Foolish Virgins* which is now being presented in London Music Halls? If this were degraded in that manner it would be terrible indeed.

The Lord Chamberlain decided to issue his licence with the proviso that 'this play shall not be produced anywhere in Great Britain except under such conditions as shall be approved by the Lord Chamberlain'.

On April 7, the Archbishop's seventy-third birthday, Lytton Strachey's *Life of Queen Victoria* was published. The Archbishop talked about it at dinner and was relieved that the book was not sarcastic. Indeed, he said that he would like to review the book if he had time, and show that Queen Victoria was a great person. In judging her, he said, 'you must always remember she never had any companions of her own age to play with, or knock any nonsense out of her'. She had told him once that she was the only person alive probably who had outlived four generations of her contemporaries; meaning the generations represented by Lord Melbourne, Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Gladstone and Lord Beaconsfield. She had, he said, a perfectly marvellous memory. She was not bookish, but she had read good books. He agreed with Strachey that the Prince Consort was very clever, but he did not agree with the prophecy that, had he lived, he might have altered the whole constitutional history of England. Many at Windsor who had known the Prince Consort when he (the Archbishop) had gone there as Dean, had had the feeling that he was growing less popular and was *felix opportunitate mortis*.

IV

There was a coal strike in April, in which the Archbishop sent an identical telegram offering his services to Frank Hodges

(Miners' Federation), Evan Williams (Mining Association), and J. H. Thomas (National Union of Railwaymen), while at the same time making a public appeal for prayer:

Telegram.

Private. April 9. 1921.

If my services can be of any value towards composing the industrial quarrel which is a wound alike to our common Christianity and the prosperity of the country, I am ready to do anything in my power.

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

At the same time he wrote to the Prime Minister (9 April 1921):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. D. LLOYD GEORGE

At a time like this, I am of necessity kept in touch every hour with all sorts and conditions of men, and the fact that they turn towards a religious centre is, I would fain hope, of good omen. May I add my voice to others which must at this moment be making appeal to you that you should not allow technicalities of procedure and of logical fairness to stand in the way of a straight, open, unconditional discussion with those whose temper or whose suspicion seems sometimes to get the better of their patriotism and their commonsense.

Nothing material occurred as a result. When, however, a debate in the Upper House of Convocation led to strong speeches on the part of some of the Bishops, Mr. Bridgeman, Secretary of Mines and well known to the Archbishop, wrote a letter expressing his grave disappointment:

The RT. HON. W. C. BRIDGEMAN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

April 30th, 1921.

Of course no one can complain of Bishops or any one else taking a sentimental view rather than an economic one of a great question like this. But it was singularly unfortunate that at the most critical days of the Conference men of influence should have dashed in with speeches obviously ill-informed on a subject as complicated and difficult as can be found, and created an impression of being partisans rather than mediators.

The Archbishop replied in a letter which he himself described later as 'rather a hurried one', while the Bishop of Winchester, to whom he sent copies of the correspondence, felt 'a little bit given away'. The Archbishop had, however, said in the Upper House, that he was 'not in the least prepared to express an opinion upon the details of the plans of pooling and the rest. . . . Some Bishops to-day have done so. Their knowledge may justify them—mine certainly does not.' He agreed with the Resolution, but he differentiated definitely between the Resolution and the speeches in support of it. The final form of the Resolution (April 27) was as follows:

That this House, believing that moral no less than economic issues are involved in the present dispute in the coal industry—

(1) Welcomes, on the part of the miners, the desire that the strong should help to bear the burdens of the weak, and, on the part of the mine-owners, a frank recognition that the living wage should be regarded as the first charge on the industry, and also their willingness to forgo profits during the present period of stress.

(2) Recognises as the root of the present trouble the neglect to prepare for the critical moment of Decontrol by any constructive changes in the organisation of the industry.

(3) Affirms its conviction that only on the lines suggested in the Resolution 74, passed by the Lambeth Conference, can a lasting settlement be hoped for in this or other industrial dispute: 'An outstanding and pressing duty of the Church is to convince its members of the necessity of nothing less than a fundamental change in the spirit and working of our economic life. This change can only be effected by accepting as the basis of industrial relations the principle of co-operation in service for the common good in place of unrestricted competition for private or sectional advantage. All Christian people ought to take an active part in bringing about this change, by which alone we can hope to remove class dissensions and resolve industrial discords.'

(4) Calls on all members of the Church to do all in their power to spread a spirit of fellowship by personal example, by a consistent advocacy of justice and good faith between man and man, and not least by doing all in their power to relieve the distress caused by the widespread unemployment at the present time.

The letter written to Mr. Bridgeman ran as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. W. C. BRIDGEMAN

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1. May 2, 1921.

I am not surprised to receive your letter. Our session of Convocation last week was a poor one in more ways than one. The attendance was small and the speaking was inadequate and rather onesided and unbalanced—though there was more said of a 'steadying' kind than the newspapers, to whom quiet speeches are bad 'copy', told the world. I have not read carefully the reports which did appear, but they seemed to me on quick reading to be neither clear nor fair.

But I own I was greatly disappointed at the attitude taken—strangely onesidedly—by some of my brethren—and in my own few words I tried to counteract this if I could, and I deprecated our being supposed to be experts in these extraordinarily difficult matters.

A Bishop, who is in touch with a mining population, is apt to be stirred by all that is good in the men who trust him, and the former tradition of Episcopal words and acts in industrial controversies has been so markedly on the other side that the pendulum when it swings is apt to swing far. And, I repeat, the newspapers, in what they reproduce out of a long debate, are apt to give simply what they regard as spicey and arresting. But I share, on the whole, your disappointment.

V

During the coal crisis a visit was paid to Lambeth by the Archbishop of Upsala, Dr. Nathan Söderblom, and his wife. He was full of enthusiasm, and had a great desire that the Christian Church should rise to the opportunities of the time. Once when the Archbishop (at a private meeting in the House of Lords) chaffed him on his conviction that Upsala was the most natural place in the world for Englishmen to visit, Dr. Soderblom replied that he had been much struck with the order of words in the General Confession in the English Book of Common Prayer, where the confession 'We have left undone those things that we ought to have done' preceded the confession that 'we have done those things that we ought not to have done'; and, adding that this order was very true to the New Testament spirit, he said

'Let that be my excuse!' His special wish in visiting Lambeth on this occasion was to engage the Archbishop of Canterbury's support for a World Conference of the Churches on Practical Christianity at Stockholm. The Archbishop named an hour on April 15 for the talk. It was a busy day. After his correspondence in the morning Dr. Davidson had to go to the Law Courts to give judgement with Lord Coleridge in a case of clergy discipline. Later in the day, he and a few others were engaged in an interview with the Lord Chancellor on Ireland; and that very afternoon the threat of a general strike was declared cancelled; so that there was much for the Archbishop to think of. The chaplain, after a conversation with Dr. Söderblom, had prepared a number of subjects as the material for the conversation, and had jotted them down on a half-sheet of paper. Dr. Söderblom came into his study to wait, and while the chaplain was out of the room Dr. Söderblom, wandering about and looking at the desk, saw this half-sheet, sat down, added a subject or two, and numbered them all in quite a new order of his own. Notably he put 'Universal Conference on Life and Work', which was third, up to the first place. When the chaplain returned to the study, Archbishop Söderblom said, 'These are the things which the Archbishop would like to discuss with me? I think this would be a better order.' The chaplain accordingly wrote them out afresh in this order, and on another sheet of paper. Then the bell rang and the chaplain entered the Archbishop's study with the half-sheet. The Archbishop asked, 'Has he seen this?' The chaplain replied: 'Yes, and altered their order and re-arranged them thus.' The Archbishop smiled and said, 'He is a dangerous man.'

The Archbishop of Upsala then entered, and sat by the fireplace in a low chair opposite the desk. It was half-past twelve. Sitting down did not suit his vivacity nearly as much as standing or moving about, with the freedom which that gave for gesture. The Archbishop of Canterbury at once opened the conversation by talking about the Lambeth Conference Appeal—which was the second item on the half-sheet. Dr. Soderblom, always ready to talk freely and interestingly once a subject was started, expatiated on this. From that the passage was easy to the other Scandinavian Churches, including the Church of Esthonia for which Archbishop Söderblom was shortly to consecrate a Bishop. His flow of speech had hardly ceased when Archbishop Davidson

turned him on to questions of Indian Missions. Archbishop Söderblom observed that the minutes were flying, and became a little anxious lest the Universal Conference should fail to get its due attention. But the Archbishop of Canterbury, surprised to find how many things he had to talk about to the Archbishop of Upsala, switched on to the question of the fixed Easter. Dr. Söderblom explained his personal disinclination for a fixed Easter, and then skilfully referred to the raising of this question in the Encyclical Letter from the Patriarchate of Constantinople 'Unto all the Churches'[1] (1920), and suggested that the Oecumenical Council, which would result from the Universal Conference, would be just the body to discuss such a question. The Archbishop of Canterbury smiled, but refused to be drawn. He turned to the German Archaeological Institute at Jerusalem and read a letter from the Governor of Jerusalem. Dr. Soderblom once more ended this discussion by expressing a hope that the Archaeological Institute might prove a home for the Oecumenical Council. The Archbishop again laughed, but went forward to another item on the programme, 'Occupied districts in Germany'. The Archbishop of Upsala was now a little restless, but with excellent courtesy and vigour explained his views of French cruelty and vindictiveness. It had now struck one, and still the relentless Archbishop of Canterbury refused to touch the main subject, and went on to discuss Posen and the future of the German Church there. Dr. Soderblom (who, when Jerusalem had first been mentioned, had tried to stop the discussion, in a way, by saying that he had explained the situation fully to the chaplain) made as though all the main facts were sufficiently stated in documents which he had previously presented to the Archbishop. But the discussion was successfully curtailed and Posen (as Dr. Soderblom had stated before) was an instance of the useful work which an Oecumenical Council could do. So at last the Universal Conference was reached, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, laughing and well aware of the game he had been playing and that he had brought down the first item on the Agenda to be the last for discussion, said 'All roads lead to the Oecumenical Council!'

The Archbishop of Upsala then, in the poor ten minutes left him before lunch, expatiated on the Conference and his hopes

[1] Bell's *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 44.

that it might take place in 1923 at Upsala, or Stockholm, or the Hague, and elaborated on his statistics of religious strength, its relation to British organizations and upon the best methods to be adopted for inviting the Church of England and other Churches to be represented officially. Even so, he did not obtain a clear opinion about the Conference from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was unwilling to give himself away, either for or against, and had previously told his chaplain that he hoped he would not be asked for a definite answer, but if he were asked he would say that he would consult the Archbishop of York.

VI

The Archbishop went to Edinburgh in June, and expounded the Lambeth Appeal to the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church. He was most cordially received in both places. Of his visit to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland he said:

> I took the line of avoiding almost entirely the distinctly controversial questions about re-ordination, or new commission etc., suggested in our Appeal, and dwelling simply on the weight attaching to the Lambeth Conference, and the earnestness with which we made our Appeal, and the impossibility of localizing the matter to the British Isles, or the English-speaking race, forgetful of both Eastern and Western Churches.
>
> After I had spoken, Dr. Wallace Williamson in a very formal way, after saying nice things about me and my speech, launched a kind of ultimatum by giving me then and there, on behalf of the Church of Scotland, a formal invitation to preach in St. Giles, implying, though he did not say it, that upon it would depend their sense of the reality of our desire for better relations. I did not myself think his speech discourteous or markedly unfair, but I find that many others did. Dr. Cooper, I believe, writes indignant letters about it to the Primus and others, and several people when the Assembly was breaking up came up to me in the Lobby and introduced themselves and said 'do not suppose we agree with Williamson. We are much more with you than you suppose. You must not take his position as meaning too much', and so on. I had not regarded it as opposition, and to tell the honest truth I am inclined to think that he can make a very good case against me if, after all I have said, I distinctly refused his invitation. He did not expect an answer then and there, and I have plenty of time to think about it.

Nothing came of the invitation, as it happened, but the Archbishop did not dismiss its acceptance as quite out of the question, for accepting an invitation to St. Giles's pulpit seemed to him something 'quite different from going for a Gospel sermon as though we were in a general way interchanging pulpits'. During the spring the Archbishop did a certain amount of preaching, but not very much. He notes especially a visit to the cadets at Sandhurst to dedicate their Chapel—'A fine gathering with considerable interest and pathos, for the Sandhurst lads gave their lives for their country literally in hundreds and thousands.' Later in June (17th) he dined at Lord Haldane's to meet Einstein. He says:

> I have never seen a more typical scientific lion in appearance—he might have been prepared for that rôle on the stage—a mass of long black hair tossed back, and a general appearance of scientific untidiness, but he was modest and quiet to talk to, and disclaimed a great deal of what is attributed to him.

One of his disclaimers was in reply to the Archbishop's inquiry, 'Lord Haldane tells us that your theory ought to make a great difference to our morals.' Einstein replied, 'Do not believe a word of it. It makes no difference. It is purely abstract—science.' Mrs. Einstein, talking to Mrs. Davidson after dinner, was full of amusement because some lady had expressed her interest in Einstein's theory 'especially in its mystical aspect'. Mrs. Einstein exclaimed: 'Mystical! Mystical! My Husband mystical!' as though it were the greatest possible joke.

There was a happy interlude on a Saturday afternoon when the Archbishop watched a game of polo:

> Yesterday, Saturday the 18th, Edith and I saw for the first time a really great polo match, England v. America. We lunched with Annie Jones at Hurlingham and saw the game in luxury afterwards—complimentary tickets costing £25 had been sent to us by the Committee—Heaven knows why! America triumphed overwhelmingly, largely owing to the wonders of their horseflesh, but partly to what even an ignoramus could see to be superior skill. It is a rare thing in my life to have spent two Saturdays running looking on at games, and that in the middle of a very busy summer.

It was still Ireland, however, that was the most absorbing interest in his mind. His memoranda show him to have been deeply stirred by the King's visit to Belfast and the great good it did,

while he notes with some indignation the extraordinary shifting of ground in the Cabinet, and the conflict between the advocates of force and the advocates of conciliation. Bishop Nicolai Velimirovic, the Serbian Bishop, who was in London at this time, pressed him to pay a visit to Palestine, and take Serbia and Greece on the way, and was very disappointed because the Archbishop expressed the fear that he could not get away from his work to take such a journey. 'But his work', said the Bishop, 'seems primarily to be Ireland, the House of Lords, and other affairs of a public character which could get on without him. The Archbishop should remember that he stands for the eternal.' The criticism is worth setting down, though the Archbishop would himself have strongly maintained that the Eternal God acted in history, and thus have abundantly justified his concern for temporal things.

On July 20, came the news of the sudden death of his childhood's friend, Kate Swinton, at the age of seventy-five at Doune. She had been present at his christening. She had travelled in the old days with him and his father on the Continent, and was a real companion, and her death meant much.

VII

Throughout the autumn the Irish question still clouded everything else, and the sense of strain was intense. The Archbishop himself was tired and unhappy, with many things to add to his anxieties: difficult debates in the Church Assembly about the Parochial Church Councils; meetings of a Royal Chapels Committee to decide upon a successor to Subdean Edgar Sheppard, who had died; the beginnings of an inquiry about Conversations at Malines; telegrams from the Armenian Archbishop of Cilicia and the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople protesting against the Franco-Kemalist agreement and the abandonment of Cilicia and the Christians to the Turk; also deputations from America about the World Conference on Faith and Order; and an important meeting between Nonconformists and the Archbishops and Bishops to clear up ambiguous expressions in the Lambeth Appeal.

At the end of the year, just before the Ordination, he was suddenly taken ill with the old glandular trouble of six years

before. He had already had an attack twice, and each time seriously. The doctors came and he was miserable all day, and the Ordination was taken for him by the Bishop of Dover. He asked Sir Thomas Barlow whether he ought to resign, but there was no question of that, though the illness must not be treated lightly. Later on the Archbishop improved, but he was not really well again till towards the end of January.

CHAPTER LXVI

IRELAND, 1920–1

Whether England doth not really love us and wish well to us, as bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh? And whether it be not our part to cultivate this love and affection all manner of ways? RT. REV. DR. GEORGE BERKELEY, LORD BISHOP OF CLOYNE, *The Querist*, No. 323, 1750.

No one in a position of central responsibility in Great Britain could remain unmoved by the deplorable events taking place across St. George's Channel in 1920–1. It would have been very unlike Archbishop Davidson to have stood aloof. This does not mean that he took sides or wished to make any kind of political intervention. That would equally have been very unlike him. But if, as Archbishop of Canterbury, he conceived it important to understand, as a matter of history happening in his own time, a dispute about a patriarchal election in a foreign Church[1] and the troubles in the Near East, much more would he deem it his duty, as Primate of the National Church, to be in the closest touch with a crisis in Ireland fraught with grave issues for the nation and the empire as a whole. And certainly the quantity of letters which he received, and the appeals which reached Lambeth from all sorts of quarters, showed that there were many intimately involved in the struggle who felt this too.

I

But what, it may be asked, could the Archbishop actually do? First of all he made it his business (as always) to keep himself fully informed. He never missed an opportunity of getting any news he could from people in authority, and people on the spot who visited London. He had, of course, plenty of correspondents and visitors with views of their own, and ideas which they were anxious that the Archbishop should adopt—and he listened patiently, though his own information often enabled him to check (and disprove) what they proposed. Further, where, as he considered, a moral issue was raised, he could make that moral issue plain.

[1] See ch. lxviii.

In May 1920, at a time when he was pretty well absorbed in preparing for the Lambeth Conference, the starting of the Welsh Church on its new voyage, the beginning of the Church Assembly, and Lord Buckmaster's Bill on Divorce, altogether apart from diocesan and foreign affairs, he wrote an important letter to the Prime Minister.

A debate took place in the House of Lords, on May 6, on the terrorism in Ireland, and in its course reference was made to the attitude of the Roman Catholic Bishops. The Bishop of Killaloe had described the conduct of the police as 'a mad riot of raids, arrests and organised assassination', while the Bishop of Cork had adopted a totally different line and said openly 'the killing of policemen is murder'. The Roman hierarchy was a very powerful body in Ireland, with very great responsibilities—so the Archbishop argued in his own mind, and privately with some of the Peers. Could not the Bishops be challenged to declare their mind? This therefore was his letter to Lloyd George:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. D. LLOYD GEORGE

May 9th, 1920

I feel presumptuous in writing to you about a matter on which I have no special knowledge whatever—the fearful perplexities of the Irish problem. My excuse is that while I have no knowledge of Ireland I have a long experience of holding high ecclesiastical office with its great responsibilities. These responsibilities have always seemed to me to involve this, that we ecclesiastics should abstain from political controversy except where some fundamental moral principle is involved. And when we do say anything we ought always to be prepared to be not merely critical, but to have something constructive to contribute.

Now in Ireland there are men—the Irish Roman Catholic hierarchy—occupying a corresponding position with in some sense an even larger responsibility, because of the allegiance they claim, or enforce, among the Irish people in at least three provinces. At this moment the Irish Bishops seem to me to be evading a responsibility, the discharge of which ought to be forced upon them. I am sure that if I were one of them I should feel it so and should be amazed if I were allowed to evade that responsibility. Month after month the Irish hierarchy is quoted in Ireland as giving its support to the anti-English movement, even if it abstains from throwing its shield over outrages. I suppose it is indisputable that masses of the

less educated Irish folk believe that the Bishops and priests are in sympathy with full Sinn Fein aspirations. The published letters and speeches by the Bishops leave them with this impression, and markedly shun any disavowal of the policy of bringing about an independent Irish Republic. Yet it is impossible to believe that most of these great ecclesiastics are so fatuous as really to imagine that that Republic can be attained, or that its promotion would be desirable even if obtainable.

Has not the time come when something should be publicly done by the Government to force these ecclesiastics into the open? I do not suppose that they would easily be so forced, or would consent to give a categorical reply stating in outspoken truth what is their real opinion and desire. But to me it seems clear that they ought to be confronted with a formal request or demand that they state unequivocally what it is they want. If they evade the reply, which is, I suppose, probable, let the evasion be made clear, and be openly and officially commented upon as evidence that they dare not express their real opinion, and that they are not in truth the Sinn Feiners people believe them to be. As I try to put myself in their place, the kind of appeal I should expect to receive from the Government is something like this:

'You hold a great and responsible position in the country; you are responsible to God and man for promoting its religious and moral well-being, and to that end its political stability and peace. We recognise your responsibility and we deliberately desire a statement of your views as a contribution to our deliberations and policy at a very grave hour. Do you, or do you not, back the loudly proclaimed desire and intention to secure an independent Irish republic? We have a right to seek your counsel, for you are recognised by the people as leaders, and you, therefore, share our answerableness, and we have a right to know your views. If you deliberately wish success to the Sinn Fein Republic policy, we want to know it. If you believe that policy to be mistaken, we want to know it, and we consider that the people of Ireland has a right to know it. We gravely ask you for an answer, and we ask it with a sense of responsibility attaching both to the question and to the reply.'

All this could be far more weightily and pointedly put than I have put it. No one would do that so well as you. But I think the thing needs doing before the eyes of all men. I do not mean that the request should be made public before the reply is received, but it should be so written as to be suited for publication whatever the issue. I am quite sure that if I were in the position of the Irish

Roman Catholic Archbishops, I should expect to be thus formally brought into the open. I cannot but believe that to ask the question thus, whether the answer be given or evaded—and I presume it would be evaded—is in every sense right.

I repeat that I feel presumptuously out of place in writing all this, for you and your colleagues must have faced the problem many a time, and I have no Irish knowledge whatever. But I do not like to leave unsaid what is constantly in my mind, and I think that my own ecclesiastical position, with my constant sense of its grave responsibilities, justifies me in at least putting before you what I feel. If this is useless, you have only to throw it aside, but at least I shall have said what I think and suggestions at an hour so fearfully perplexing and anxious may have some value, even if in the form they are put they must be cast aside.

The Archbishop talked over his letter with the Prime Minister at St. Asaph on June 1. It had apparently been circulated to the Cabinet and been considered by them, and the Cabinet had been grateful. But the prevailing view was that the Irish Bishops would get out of the question by saying 'It is not our business'—while one of the most eminent members of the hierarchy was known to be strongly in favour of a Republic.

The Archbishop's watchfulness was undoubtedly of value. People wanted his help, but they also wanted to know what he thought. He kept an even keel. He refused to join Lord Henry Bentinck's 'Peace with Ireland' Committee. Again, when asked by the Editor of the *New York Nation* to give his blessing to an American investigation into atrocities, he took strong exception to the Editor's telegram and pointed out—his reply being published at the time—that the real controversy was not between Ireland and England, but in the main between the two great sections of the Irish people themselves. He refused to intervene in what he conceived the rash and misguided policy of the friends of the Lord Mayor of Cork (McSwiney) who tried to secure a change in the Government's attitude by starving himself to death in Brixton jail. Nevertheless, when ugly stories were published about reprisals by the Black and Tans in the autumn of 1920, he was a good deal disturbed. After checking the accuracy of some of the accounts, he decided to make a firm speech against reprisals in the House of Lords, on November 2, 1920. He spoke guardedly, and denounced the outrages committed against the police and the loyalists as 'unutterably horrible', and used strong

words to express his sympathy with those who had to face the forces of rebellion, and with those whose homes had been darkened by the outrages which had taken place. But the point of his speech was a plain and severe remonstrance against the reprisals inflicted by the Black and Tans against persons and property as facts beyond dispute. He distinguished between reprisals under orderly authority, definitely taken in hand as a conceivable course if conditions became so bad (against which he would not feel it his duty to protest), and the present reprisals which had occurred 'where the disciplined forces of the Crown, appointed to suppress disorder, have themselves, though without definite superior authority and command, given terrible examples of the very kind of disorder which they are sent there to suppress'; and he begged the Government, for the credit of the public life of England, to bring such reprisals to an end.

It was a brave speech, and exposed him to a great deal of criticism from quarters with which he was usually found in agreement. 'The present campaign of murder', said an Irish correspondent, 'must be ended at all costs, and I beseech Your Grace to pause before using your great influence to hamper the Government in their difficult and dangerous task.' The Archbishop's words of condemnation of the Sinn Fein outrages were, as he had frequent occasion to point out, seldom given the same prominence, though they were strong enough when read in the official report.

As Lord Curzon, leader of the House of Lords, privately admitted after his speech, there was no answer to the Archbishop's charge; but the reprisals went on. The Archbishop made a longer and more deliberate speech to the same effect on February 22, 1921. He defended himself against the accusation of political partisanship, and spoke again with even greater severity of the insane wickedness of the murderous gangs which the Government forces had to put down. But he maintained that the question with which he was concerned was a question of ethics in politics. He gave detailed examples of the reprisals. He agreed that the Sinn Fein outrages were ten times worse than the Black and Tan, but 'you cannot justifiably punish wrongdoing by lawlessly doing the like. Not by calling in the Devil will you cast out devils or punish devilry.' The Lord Chancellor (Birkenhead) who replied, after some heated exchanges between himself and

Lord Buckmaster, paid a tribute to the unexceptionable character of the Archbishop's manner of criticizing the Government, and told him afterwards that his speech could do nothing but good. It certainly was not a speech on the popular side, and before delivering it he said it was one of the most difficult he had ever had to make in the House of Lords. But there was good reason to believe it had a valuable influence on public opinion and policy.

II

The weeks which followed saw the Archbishop 'in the thick of many debates and controversies about the horribleness of the Irish situation'. He was in touch with several independent political leaders on the look-out for light, and attended private deputations to the Lord Chancellor. Various suggestions were made for a manifesto on the part of the Churches of England and Scotland, and even for a combined visit to Ireland of himself, Cardinal Bourne, and some others. But the Archbishop did not favour such proposals.

On more than one occasion he was asked to take the chair at a big public meeting on Ireland, with a view, as it was put, to coercing the conscience of Churchmen. To an enthusiastic advocate of this proposal, the Archbishop propounded a series of questions with admirable patience:

Archbishop: What do you want your meeting to do?
Enthusiastic Clergyman: To arouse public opinion
Archbishop: To ——?
E.C.: To arouse public opinion.
Archbishop: Yes, but *what* to?
E.C.: To realize their responsibilities.
Archbishop: To do *what*?
E.C.: Here opinions might differ, but I should like a truce.
Archbishop: To do *what*?

There was no reply. Clearly such enthusiasts as this had not thought the matter out, and the Archbishop said that a great many people wanted to ease their consciences, and therefore made such proposals without any plans at all, or any considered purpose.

He was conscious of the general dissatisfaction with the handling of the situation by the politicians. He did not, however, feel

that it was for him to take part in purely political debate. On June 12, 1921, he wrote in a private memorandum:

> To-day we are again on the eve of discussion in the House of Lords, about which Lord Buxton has been telephoning to me frequently during the last forty-eight hours. They want me to take some part in it, but at present I do not see that I can contribute anything. Much has been said about the speech I delivered in the House of Lords some months ago against government reprisals. This has defined my own position, and I am inclined to think I had better stand aside and not try to contribute to a debate wherein I shall be over-weighted by men who have more practical knowledge of Ireland.

He added:

> I doubt whether there has ever been anything more discreditable in modern politics than the present condition of Ireland, for it is impossible to suppose that wise statesmanship and consistent policy could have got into the really anarchic condition in which they stand.

He was warmly in favour of the King's visit to Belfast, and his memoranda tell a curious story of the way in which the famous appeal for conciliation took final shape. It is curious also to notice, as a sign of the impression his independent attitude had made upon Ireland, that on at least two occasions mysterious messages reached him about or from De Valera. One of the messengers, Mr. Barry Egan, Deputy-Mayor of Cork, introduced by Monsignor W. F. Brown,[1] a well-known Roman Catholic priest, had come over from Dublin to London on June 28 to see the new Viceroy, Lord FitzAlan, but found him ill in bed. 'As he must return instantly to Dublin and wanted to see somebody,' wrote the Archbishop, 'he had thought that I would be the right person!' Mr. Egan wanted the Archbishop's opinion as to what they ought to do about the proposed interview between Lloyd George and De Valera. The Archbishop told him that in his personal judgement the one chance of an interview or conference succeeding would be if the Prime Minister and De Valera entered into it wholly untrammelled, i.e. without conditions laid down beforehand; that each should behave in a trustful and generous manner towards the other. The Archbishop's statement was

[1] Mgr. Brown lived in Vauxhall, and saw the Archbishop occasionally on educational and social questions. He later became Bishop of Pella.

eagerly welcomed by Mr. Egan, who said he would tell De Valera, while the Archbishop promised to let the Prime Minister know, the next day, what had happened. The end of the interview is thus described by Monsignor Brown:

> The Archbishop . . asked Mr. Egan what Irishmen thought of the British troops. The Deputy-Mayor replied that their 'Boys', as he put it, liked the Regulars of the British Army well enough and regarded them as pleasant and somewhat harmless fellows. 'But', he went on, 'the men they admire are the Black and Tans.' This came as a profound surprise to the Archbishop, who exclaimed, 'Oh, really! Why so?' in that pleasant, melodious voice of his. A short and swift reply completely disconcerted him. It was this—'Because they are such devils to fight.' The Archbishop cast a glance at me, as much as to say, what can you make of such people? However, I thought after that it was time for us to come away.

How far the Archbishop's expression of his personal opinion helped is not easy to say—but it may have contributed its own share in hastening the truce which began on July 11, and in promoting the conversations between De Valera and Lloyd George. On July 8, the Archbishop issued the following statement:

> Lambeth, 8th July 1921.
>
> Urgent and acute anxiety about Ireland has many a time in the last few years clouded our days or marred our nights. But never was the anxiety so urgent, so acute, as it is this week. The outlook is not all dark. The streak of dawn is broadening. God give us clearness of vision, largeness of soul, and competence of resolve to seize the hour and to redeem it.
>
> Natural to shew that bitter memories, distant or near, bar the way to reconciliation. Natural, yes. But, I dare to ask, would Christ have it so?
>
> Let those who meet in conference behind closed doors know of a certainty that the English people outside, alert to the new-born possibilities, are eager to let nothing that is removable stand in the way of winning peace. Let the men on either side look with eyes of new and generous trust upon those with whom they are conferring. Such trust, courageous and reciprocal, may, and I believe will, win the day. But those with whom rest the responsibilities of proposal or of action must be able to feel that the people for whom they speak are behind them in generous, resolute, and brave-

hearted hope, and that Christian folk are everywhere upholding them in the best of all ways by quiet and persistent prayer.

I would enjoin all to whom my words may carry any weight to set themselves to such prayer with the assurance that it is not going to be in vain.

III

There were a good many anxieties to be met, and difficulties to be solved, on all sides during the next few months. But at last, on December 6, the Articles of Agreement between the Irish and the British delegations were signed at half-past two in the morning. The Archbishop had a long talk at the Athenaeum with the Provost of Trinity, Archbishop Bernard, who had been summoned by the Prime Minister from Ireland to confer on the position of the Southern Unionists. The Archbishop issued the following message of thanksgiving for the nearer approach of peace:

Lambeth, December 7th, 1921.

Tens of thousands of Christian folk are to-day thanking God for the nearer approach of peace and goodwill among the people of Ireland.

For months past in Church and at home we have steadily invoked for our counsellors perseverance and wisdom and courage. To-day we can add thanksgiving to our prayers. Not to do so would be graceless indeed. Much has still to be examined and tested ere we reach firm ground, and we ask with deliberate thoughtfulness for the spirit of wise counsel and of strength. But to-day the note is one of thanksgiving, and it should ring out publicly and privately as opportunity may be given. For, though the end be not yet, it hath surely pleased God thus far 'to guide our feet into the way of peace'.

The Archbishop's relief was profound, but men's feelings were very tense and often bitter. 'I have read your message', wrote one, 'with the greatest sorrow and disappointment. How can you, Sir, reconcile it with your conscience as the Primate of the English Church, as a man and as a Christian, to ask for a blessing on the most abject and ignominious surrender to organized crime, the condonation of murder, which is involved, the acquiescence in the robbery of the loyal and faithful people of Southern Ireland who have stood by the Empire?' More bitter still was

the following comment, quoted from the *Morning Post*, December 8, 1921:

PRIMATE'S THANKSGIVING

. . . to-day the note is one of thanksgiving (for Peace in Ireland).

RANDALL CANTUAR.

For the success of the Devil's work in Ireland, for the murder of hundreds of Loyalists, for the Betrayal of all the Loyalists remaining, for the sorrows of widows and orphans, for the suffering of the homeless and bereaved, for treachery to God, King and Country,

We thank Thee, O God.

There were many other letters of protest. But, amongst the letters of gratitude which gave him most satisfaction, was one from the prominent Roman Catholic priest who had introduced the messenger from De Valera the previous June:

MONSIGNOR W. F. BROWN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

St. Anne's, Vauxhall, S E. 11. 11 Dec. 1921.

Writing to-day to the Bishop of Killaloe, who will no doubt read my letter to the Irish Hierarchy at the Maynooth Meeting on Tuesday, I have recalled how you spoke out boldly against outrages in Ireland when few voices were raised in defence of the suffering people in the affected districts. Now the Irish question is fashionable, and many who reproached people like your Grace some months ago are only too anxious to be in the fashion and on the side of Royalty. I have never hesitated to point out the value of your timely intervention—at a time when prominent persons in our own Church here were silent about the excesses, and now that Peace has come I gladly congratulate your Grace on the part you played so manfully in the dark hours of irregular warfare.

On December 15 he spoke on the Irish settlement in the House of Lords. One of the peers present, whom the Archbishop had long known, and a loyal Churchman, wrote to express his grief at the Archbishop's attitude and his apparent condoning of the inconsistencies of politicians. He said (December 18):

The EARL OF *** *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

I wondered also, as I listened yesterday to the singing of the 94th Psalm and recalled your Grace's speech on behalf of the settlement, whether it now really is the policy of the Church of England to overlook wrong when right ensues—granted that the Agreement, won as it has been by murder and outrage, is right.

The Archbishop's reply gives, as well as any of his letters or statements at the time, the principles by which he had tried to act:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EARL OF ***

Private. December 26th, 1921.

Illness, for I have been pretty bad, and am still absolutely laid up and prohibited from letter-writing, has delayed my replying to your letter, which reached me a few days ago.

I thank you for writing. It is always a satisfaction to me when friends who feel strongly about my doings or sayings and care to write, do so frankly and without reserve. This is not the first time you have thus acted, and I appreciate it.

At the same time I must say at once that I did not act lightly, and I do not think that I am wrong. In one's 74th year, after some forty years of intimate knowledge of the inside of public affairs, and of the principles governing them, one gains a certain sureness of foothold as to what one ought to do and say at crisis times when large issues have to be faced. This Irish negotiation question has been such an issue. I have never spared my criticism of the vacillation, ineptitude, and mismanagement which each Government has shown, and the last thing I have thought of doing was to say that inconsistencies do not matter. What seemed to me absurd was the tit for tat attitude of the two Front Benches, charging one another with changeableness. But a new condition arose when the King's speech in Belfast inaugurated a new idea—the idea of substituting conference for guns, and making a clear new start. Of course it is inconsistent, and the change was like many great changes made abruptly. I both appreciate and respect the position of those who, like yourself, as I gather, think it was all wrong, and that instead of Downing Street conferences we ought by this time to have machine guns and aeroplanes dealing death in Southern Ireland, as the consistent adherence to the principle of enforcing law and order. I appreciate that view, but I do not share it. Immeasurably difficult as the alternative policy is, it is at least a policy which, if it answers, will lead to peace. The other policy, witness the outcome of Cromwell's régime, might produce enforced quiet, but would be the seed plot of worse strife and hatred for ever. Hence my encouragement of the alternative plan with all its difficulties which grow greater as day follows day. It may completely fail, but at least we shall have tried.

That is my view, and I hold it without any doubt or qualms, nor

do I think it inconsistent with my position, or with the truths I try to teach, that I should say so. That is all.

Again I thank you for writing, and I always welcome such inquiry or criticism.

He wrote a rather longer letter to Lord Salisbury who had sent him an equally strong remonstrance. It was on similar lines and ended thus:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* MARQUESS OF SALISBURY

Private. 10 December, 1921.

...In short, I should like to adopt the first sentence of your letter to me:—'I suppose we have all prayed for peace in Ireland, and when peace is assured we ought to thank God for it. But that is a very different thing from approving the policy of the Government.' You mean, if I understand you, that the time may come when these efforts for peace have proved successful, and that then we should have thanksgivings. But meantime it was obviously necessary that I should say something to guide people who sought guidance.

I hope I have at least explained my position, however unsatisfactory that position may seem to you to be. At least I have not been thoughtless on the subject.

I have been reading with very keen interest the first volume of your father's life: 'England', he says, 'has committed many mistakes as a nation in the course of her history, but the mischief has been more than corrected by the heartiness with which, after each great struggle, victors and vanquished have forgotten their former battles and have combined together to lead the new policy to its best results.'

Of course those words apply to quite other sets of circumstances from those of to-day. It is not here a mere difference of policy, but I think the words have a permanent bearing, which your sister well brings out in the comment she makes as to your father's acceptance of things he had disliked and his subsequent desire to make the best of them.

I have run on longer than I intended, and this letter is dictated rather hurriedly at the close of a heavy day. But I do honestly thank you for writing, and I hope you will always do so when you feel impelled thereto.

CHAPTER LXVII

THE RUSSIAN CHURCH

They that deny a God destroy a man's nobility; for certainly man is kin to the beasts by his body, and, if he be not of kin to God by his spirit, he is a base and ignoble creature. It destroys likewise magnanimity, and the raising of human nature. FRANCIS BACON, *Essay on Atheism.*

THE months which followed the first interchange of messages, December 1917 to January 1918, between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the newly elected Patriarch of Moscow, as described in a previous chapter, were fateful for Russia and the Russian Church. The effect of the Bolshevik Revolution soon made itself felt. One of the first acts of the new Government was to disestablish and disendow the Church. All Church property was nationalized, and all connexion between Church and State brought to an end. In answer to these decrees, the Patriarch appealed to all Christians to oppose the Bolsheviks with might and main, and formally excommunicated the entire Bolshevik Party. The position of the Patriarch, although apparently exposed to every sort of danger during the succeeding months, was nevertheless extraordinarily strong. He denounced the execution of the deposed Tsar as 'a crime without a name'. In October 1918, on the first anniversary of the Revolution, he issued his famous denunciation, which began and ended with the text, 'They that take the sword shall perish by the sword.'

The persecution of the Russian Church developed on a great scale. And immediately piteous appeals for aid were addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The first was from Odessa, and arrived at a time when any communication at all from that town was almost a miracle. It was dated December 30, 1918, and ran as follows:

PLATON, METROPOLITAN OF ODESSA, *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

I fervently beg your Eminence to protect the Orthodox Russian Church. The Revolutionary Government is subjecting it to cruelties by the side of which the persecutions of the Christians

in the first three centuries pale. Many Archbishops, hundreds of priests, have been martyred and shot. The Churches are profaned and pillaged. On December 18, Antony, Metropolitan of Kiev, was arrested without reasons and taken we know not whither. All my efforts to liberate this innocent martyr led to nothing. I implore your Eminence and your body of Bishops to save the Metropolitan from the hands of his persecutors and the Church from the frightful agonies (*angoisses effroyables*) which she is enduring.

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* PLATON, METROPOLITAN OF ODESSA

8 January 1919.

The Church of England sends her deep sympathy to the Russian Orthodox Church in the trials and dangers through which she is passing. The terrible persecutions and martyrdoms detailed by your Eminence awake profound emotions in the hearts of the Christian people in this country. I am doing all I can, and meanwhile assure you of the prayers of our Bishops and people.

Other tragic appeals came from Omsk, Archangel, and Odessa again, all telling of trials and tribulations and imploring the Archbishop to come to their rescue. When he was urged to prevent the withdrawal of British troops, or to assist a famous British Field-Marshal (who appealed to him personally) to raise an army of 5,000 men paid out of private funds to replace those troops, he could only courteously explain the impossibility of such action. When he was asked to secure the release of three Russian Bishops[1] from their strict confinement in a Roman Catholic monastery in Cracow, he could only bring the facts to the notice of the authorities. When he was implored to come to the aid of the suffering by 'organizing for their benefit collections of money, underlinen, boots, and all kinds of wearing apparel', he called a meeting at Lambeth Palace[2] to launch the Imperial War Relief Fund with a view to a combined effort for the relief of distress in the famine-stricken areas, not least in Southern Russia.

[1] Antonius, Metropolitan of Kieff, Eulogius, Archbishop of Volhynia, Nikodimus, Suffragan Bishop. After inquiry the Archbishop informed the members of the Russian colony in Belgrade, who had approached him, that they were released (September 1919)

[2] March 12, 1920.

Then came the great Russian famine. Its main scene was the Volga basin, an area at least of a thousand miles from north to south of which the southern region was the finest wheat-producing country in the world, with some millions of inhabitants, of whom it was calculated that about fifteen or sixteen millions were literally starving to death. The main cause of the famine was the system of requisition adopted by the Soviet Government, which year by year took half the produce of the fields for public service or supposed public service, with the result that year by year the farmer or peasant grew half what he had grown the previous year, expecting to be left with that half. But every year half of that was again taken until the drought came and the crops went to nothing at all.

The famine proved the occasion of a fresh contact between the Patriarch of All Russia and the Archbishop of Canterbury, and provided an excuse for a fresh attack by the Bolsheviks on the Orthodox Church.

Two urgent appeals were issued from Moscow for help from Europe and America. One came from Maxim Gorki addressed to 'All Honest People'. The other was sent by the Patriarch Tikhon to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was dated July 5, 1921, and reached the Archbishop some three weeks later through the Esthonian legation in London:

TIKHON, PATRIARCH OF MOSCOW, *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Moscow, Russia, July 5, 1921.

Most Reverend and Dear Sir,—I call through you to the English people: our country is famishing. The bulk of her people is doomed to starve. The corn-crops are destroyed with drought in those districts which used to victual the whole country. The famine is causing dreadful epidemics. The help on the largest possible scale is urgently required—immediately.

All considerations of other character must be laid aside, as the people are perishing, and all its future is threatened with ruin, for the population leave their homes, farms, and fields, running eastward and crying for bread. Send us bread and medicaments without delay. The retardation would cause calamities unheard hitherto.

I am sending an identical appeal to the people of the United

States of America through the Right Reverend Bishop of New York.

Pray our Lord that His holy ire against us may be appeased.

The Archbishop at once telegraphed to express his profound distress at the famine reports, together with his sense of the immense difficulties attending any measure of adequate relief, and stating his anxiety to promote all such help as might be possible. A Russian Famine Relief Fund was started, and the Archbishop joined in promoting a national appeal. The Archbishop kept himself constantly informed as to the scale of the famine and of the work of relief. He knew the difficulties and did not disguise the fact, sometimes no doubt to the dissatisfaction of the more crusading spirits. He saw Dr. Nansen, who had been appointed High Commissioner by the League of Nations, and Sir Benjamin Robertson, who had been sent out to report by the Russian Famine Relief Fund, with the direct encouragement of the Foreign Office, and kept touch with Miss Ruth Fry of the Friends, and other British and American Famine Relief workers. On February 23, 1922, he spoke at length in the House of Lords, surveying the whole field in a masterly manner, but failing to extract any help from the Government.

In May 1922, a fresh crisis arose. The Patriarch, at the very outbreak of the famine, had expressed his wish to help to the utmost. In the autumn of 1921 he had founded a Church Relief Committee, and collected money for the sufferers; but by order of the Soviets the Committee had been disbanded and the funds handed over to the Government. He had then been asked by the Soviets to order the Churches to give their treasures to the Famine Fund. In reply he agreed in principle to the handing over of unconsecrated objects, e.g. ornamental jewels and such things as were not used for the holy rites. But he pointed out that to hand over consecrated objects to lay persons would be sacrilege. Nor indeed was there any guarantee how the treasures would be used. At the same time he proposed another method by which he would raise the same amount of money as the sale of the Church treasures would bring in, if those treasures were left unharmed. The request was refused. The surrender of the unconsecrated objects, though conceded by the Patriarch, was soon pronounced to be insufficient, and on February 23, 1922, the Soviets issued a decree to the effect that within one month all valuable objects

made of gold or silver or containing precious stones should be removed from ecclesiastical establishments and churches of all religions and presented to a special Famine Fund. It was stipulated that the decree should not apply in the case of objects the removal of which would essentially affect the interests of the cult. The Patriarch published an Epistle to the Faithful declaring that such action with regard to consecrated objects was sacrilege. But the decree was swiftly enforced, and a violent campaign was started in the press accusing the hierarchy of the Church of counter-revolution and treachery towards the starving population of Russia.

The wholesale confiscations were bitterly resented. In many cases there was strong resistance and sometimes bloodshed. The Patriarch was summoned before the Cheka and told to pacify the people, but he replied that he could not consent to the surrender of the treasures against the canons of the Church. He was again summoned and urged to leave the country, ostensibly in order to raise money for famine relief. He refused, saying that he would stay with his people and share their sufferings.[1]

News of these events first reached the Archbishop of Canterbury from a private source. It was natural to ask 'Is there not something which Christians outside can do to help?', and his first response to the melancholy tale was to write a letter to inform and warn the Prime Minister, at that time in daily touch with the Russian delegation at Genoa (May 3, 1922):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. D. LLOYD GEORGE

I am led to understand that the Russian delegates attending at Genoa are likely to represent, or are actually representing, the Church in Russia as being hostile to the endeavour to raise funds by self-sacrificing effort on behalf of the sufferers from famine. It is said that allegations are made to the effect that the Church in Russia is refusing to co-operate, and will neither raise money itself nor allow any part of the Church properties to be sold for meeting these urgent distresses. I am in a position to assure you that these allegations, if they are made, misrepresent the facts very gravely.

[1] It is said on good authority that the entire yield from the sale of the Church treasures was only about £500,000 (1,500,000 dollars)—a very small sum in comparison with the value of the Crown jewels held by the Government for other uses. Many of the treasures simply found their way to museums

He then set out the facts, as described above, and continued:

> It is, I think, of very great importance that those who are dealing with this subject at Genoa or elsewhere, should themselves be aware that these statements as to the Church's unhelpfulness are altogether untrue. It is said that they are simply circulated with a view to damaging the Church in the eyes of the world.

In May, the Patriarch was arrested by the Soviet Government. The following appeal was addressed to the Archbishop by the Metropolitan Eulogius (whose release from prison the Archbishop had helped to secure) now resident at Berlin:

The METROPOLITAN EULOGIUS *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Alexanderheim, Borsegnalde, Berlin.
May 11th, 1922.

To-day's paper brought us the sad news of All Russia's Patriarch Tikhon's arrest by the Moscow Soviet authorities, who will not fail undoubtedly to inflict on him the severest penalty. The only accusation brought against him is his obedience to a sense of duty in refusing to submit to the theft of Church property, of sacred vessels, and relics and all needed for holy services.

In the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ we appeal to you and to all the Episcopalian members of the Church of England to lift your voice in protest of this act of unheard of violence and illegality, directed against the highest representative of the Russian clergy. We implore you to use your influence to alleviate as much as possible Patriarch Tikhon's undeserved chastisement

On May 25, 1922, the Archbishop raised the question in the House of Lords; he described what the Patriarch had done and wished to do for the relief of the famine-stricken, and spoke of his arrest, in such circumstances, as a very grave outrage in Christendom. At the same time he decided to address a protest direct to the Soviet Government in Moscow. The Vatican had just concluded an agreement at Genoa about its own mission in Russia. Would the Pope join in the protest? The Archbishop telegraphed to the British Minister at the Vatican on May 26, and the reply came at once that the Holy See had already made representations and was prepared to repeat them. The Archbishop also communicated with the Archbishop of York, the two Scottish

Moderators, and the Heads of the Free Churches. On May 31, he sent the following telegram to Lenin:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *(and others) to* PRESIDENT LENIN

President of the Council of the People's Commissars,
Kremlin, Moscow.

Lambeth Palace,
31st May, 1922.

In the name of the Christian Communions which we represent we desire to protest most earnestly against the attack on the Russian Church in the person of its Patriarch Tikhon. The public mind and conscience of Christendom, and indeed of the whole civilized world, cannot tolerate silently so great a wrong.

RANDALL CANTUAR: (Archbishop of Canterbury).

COSMO EBOR. (Archbishop of York).

JOHN SMITH (Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland).

DONALD FRASER (Moderator of the General Assembly of the United Free Church of Scotland).

JOHN CHOWN (President of the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland).

THOMAS YATES (Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales).

HERBERT R. MUMFORD (President of the British Provincial Board of the Moravian Church).

IVOR J. ROBERTSON (Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England).

SAMUEL HORTON (President of the Primitive Methodist Conference).

W. TREFFRY (President of the United Methodist Conference).

J. ALFRED SHARP (President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference).

The protest made a profound impression. In Russia itself, so the Archbishop heard, its joint character surprised the Bolshevik chiefs. 'It appears', said his informant, 'that the Bolsheviks regard the Anglican Church as hopelessly counter-revolutionary, but they expected more sympathy from the Nonconformist bodies . . . and were quite unprepared for the joint note.' The

Bolsheviks, at any rate, decided to reply, and the following answer was sent:

The RUSSIAN SOVIET GOVERNMENT *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

128, New Bond-street, W. 1, June 6, 1922.

Mr. Krassin, the Official Agent of the Russian Soviet Government in Great Britain, presents his compliments to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and, in accordance with instructions received from his Government, begs to enclose a copy of the reply (in Russian and English text) to the protest addressed by his Grace to the Soviet Government on June 1:

'The protest addressed to the Soviet Government by a number of Churchmen of Great Britain in connection with the proceedings instituted against Patriarch Tikhon calls for the following elucidation:

'1. In spite of the statement contained in the protest there has been no attack on the Church. Only proceedings have been instituted against individual representatives of the Church, including its former Patriarch, in connection with the resistance organised by them against measures of the Soviet authorities, which measures were taken in order to save the lives of tens of millions of human beings, including children.

'2. In the conflict between Patriarch Tikhon and the Soviet Powers, the vast majority of the clergy sides with the Soviet Power and the labouring masses it represents. Only an insignificant number of the clergy—those who were the most privileged and demoralised through their connection with the Tsarist nobility and with capital—form the group of the Patriarch Tikhon. Public opinion in Russia takes note that the protesting English Churchmen express their solidarity not with the starving labouring masses of Russia, nor even with the majority of the clergy, but with an insignificant number of Churchmen who have always been working hand in hand with the Tsars, with the bureaucracy, and with the nobility, and who have now entered into an open opposition to the power of the workers and peasants.

'3. Public opinion in Russia also notes that at the most inhuman period of the blockade, in which blockade the British Government took part, the authors of the protest did not raise their voices against the strangling of Russian workers, peasants, and children. The people of Russia have not heard that the signatories of the appeal protested against the attempts to strangle with the noose of usury the labouring masses of Russia.

'4. The Soviet Power, as well as the labouring masses, consider

the above protest of the hierarchy of the various churches of Great Britain to be dictated by a narrow caste solidarity because it is entirely directed against the real interests of the people, and against the elementary demands of humanity.'

774, June 3, 1922, Moscow, Kremlin, Administration manager of the Council of People's Commissaries. SMOLANINOFF.

The Archbishop sent an immediate rejoinder, with the suggestion that a small delegation from the Churches should proceed to Moscow to investigate:

The REV. G. K. A. BELL *to* MR. KRASSIN

Lambeth Palace, S.E., June 7, 1922.

In reply to your communication of June 6 on behalf of the Russian Soviet Government, the Archbishop of Canterbury cannot withdraw any of the statements already made by him in the House of Lords on May 25, statements which were based on first-hand information from Russia. The first-hand information in the Archbishop's possession particularly emphasises the fact that the Patriarch of the Russian Church has repeatedly offered the help of the Church for the relief of the famine, and that his offers have been consistently refused by the Soviet Government. But, in view of the explicit démenti issued by the Soviet Government, the Archbishop feels it incumbent upon him to request that permission be given to a small body of representatives of the various Churches in this country to go to Russia to examine the situation on the spot in order to avoid future misunderstandings.

This message, the Archbishop heard some months afterwards, made a sensation in Russia. It was printed in the Bolshevik press. The Bolsheviks were very angry at the excitement caused, while members of the Church were greatly encouraged. There were all sorts of rumours to the effect that the Archbishop of Canterbury had arrived in Russia, that he had been seen by many people, and again that he had arrived, but in disguise. After a month's delay the following communication from the Assistant Commissar for Foreign Affairs, M. Karakhan, was forwarded to Lambeth, on July 8, 1922:

MR. KLISHKO, ASSISTANT OFFICIAL AGENT, *to the* REV. G. K. A. BELL

128 New Bond Street, London, W. 1, July 8, 1922.

I beg to enclose herewith copy of the communication from the Assistant Commissar for Foreign Affairs, M. Karakhan, in

reply to your letter of June 7 on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

'July 1, 1922.

'In reply to your communication of June 7 on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury, I beg to inform you that my Government does not see any grounds for insisting upon the withdrawal of the statements made by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords on May 25, since these statements clearly emanate from sources which, in the eyes of the labouring masses of Russia and the whole world, do not merit any confidence. They merely serve to illustrate the class solidarity of the 'princes' of the various Churches, which solidarity is known to be directed against the labouring masses. The suggestion made by the Archbishop of Canterbury to send to Russia a body of 'representatives of the various churches' in order to investigate the situation on the spot constitutes a claim even less justifiable than would be a suggestion made by the Soviet Government to send to England a small commission to investigate to what extent the labouring masses are exploited materially and spiritually by the hierarchy of the various English Churches in order to maintain the domination of the exploiting classes.'

The following memorandum from the Archbishop ended the correspondence:

The Rev. G. K. A. Bell *to* Mr. Klishko

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 1. July 10, 1922.

I beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of July 8. I have submitted its enclosure to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and I am directed to send you the enclosed memorandum in reply.

'The Archbishop of Canterbury has considered carefully the communication transmitted to him in reply to his request made on June 7 that a small body of representatives of the various Churches responsible for the remonstrance of May 31 might be permitted by the Soviet Government to visit Russia. The purpose of such delegation would be to ascertain the particulars of the reported action by the Soviet Government which gave rise to the remonstrance. The reply now received refusing this request, does not, as the Archbishop notes, challenge the statement made as to the arrest and prosecution of leading clergy of the Russian Church, nor does it elucidate the obvious contradiction between the detailed account of these arrests and prosecutions given at first

hand to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the account given on behalf of the Soviet Government.

The allegation that the representatives of the Church of England and of the other Christian denominations who signed the protest were actuated by political or class considerations is devoid of foundation. They were actuated simply by elementary considerations of humanity and of Christian feeling.

The Archbishop deplores the refusal of the Soviet Government to allow this information to be obtained. Very many people in Great Britain are anxious to promote the friendliest relation between the Russian people at large and the peoples of the English-speaking countries, and the letters which the Archbishop received from America show a similar desire. The present action of the Soviet Government is calculated to retard or prevent the realisation of such a hope. If the announcement published during the last few days respecting the death sentence passed upon religious leaders in Russia proves to be well founded, the effect will be one of indignation and horror among civilised people of all classes.

Lambeth Palace, July 10, 1922.'

The Patriarch remained a prisoner, and was now at the Donskoi Monastery; while a group of clergy under a certain Metropolitan Antonin, and known as 'the Living Church', with the help of the Soviet Government usurped the administration, and made their head-quarters at the Patriarchal Palace.

Meantime other prominent clergy were put on trial, and among them Benjamin, Metropolitan of Petrograd, and the Bishop of Kronstadt. Benjamin was the successor of Pitirim and of a very different kind from that friend of Rasputin. The charges brought against him were that he had resisted the confiscation of Church treasures and was guilty of counter-revolutionary conspiracy, apparently with the Metropolitan Eulogius and the Metropolitan Antony of Kieff, who had in a moment of extraordinary rashness, at the so-called All-Russian Assembly at Karlowitz, in December 1921, proclaimed the re-establishment of the monarchy and the restoration of the Romanoff dynasty in Russia, an act which the Patriarch, on hearing the news, immediately peremptorily denounced. Benjamin denied the charges. He said: 'I was elected by the people. The people depose me. I bless the people. I thank God for everything. But I do not consider myself guilty. My policy has always been one of mutual forgiveness and love. I will take your sentence quietly. I am not afraid

of death.' The death sentence was passed. The Archbishop's help was eagerly sought, and appeals came from many quarters outside Russia. But the Archbishop could only make representations to the Foreign Office which was in entire agreement with himself as to the horror of such executions. He wrote also to the Labour leader, Mr. George Lansbury, himself a Churchman and personally known to the Archbishop, and found that he and his friends were likewise doing everything in their power to prevent the death penalty from being imposed. But all was in vain. Nevertheless the trial of the Patriarch was still delayed.

The next blow to be struck at the Church, upon which the Archbishop was approached, fell in March 1923. His help was now implored for the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Petrograd, Monsignor Cieplak, and certain Roman Catholic priests, also accused of counter-revolutionary activity and opposition to the confiscation of Church ornaments. On the same day, March 14, 1923, the First Secretary of the Polish Legation called at Lambeth to ask for the Archbishop of Canterbury's help; and the following telegram came from Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines:

CARDINAL MERCIER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Malines, 14 March, 1923.

Have received by telegram Monsignor Cieplak Catholic Metropolitan of Petrograd and thirteen priests arrested and threatened with immediate death. Am appealing to Curzon. Can you support?

It was thought that the condemnation of Monsignor Cieplak was intended to lead up to a great anti-Christian demonstration at Easter, and so to the trial of the Patriarch. The Archbishop of Canterbury immediately made his sympathy known, and on March 20, 1923, in the House of Lords, asked for information from the Government both as to the arrest of Archbishop Cieplak and as to the present position of the Patriarch Tikhon. By the Pope's desire, in making his speech, he informed the House that His Holiness had himself just made an urgent appeal on behalf of the Patriarch, when appealing for the Roman Catholic Archbishop and priests. Lord Curzon said, in reply:

No one, as I know very well from long experience of the interventions of the Most Reverend Primate, takes greater trouble than he does to acquaint himself with every possible source of information

> before he addresses your Lordships, and sometimes in answering him I find that he has greater information than the Government have at their disposal. I am not certain that this is not the case in the present instance.

But nothing could be done. The trial proceeded, and Archbishop Cieplak and Constantine Boutkevitch were condemned to death on March 26. The sentence on the Archbishop was commuted to one of ten years' solitary confinement. The death sentence on Monsignor Boutkevitch was confirmed.

The war against religion was now at its height. It was not only the lives of religious leaders that were at stake, though they were ready to be martyrs. It was not only Christianity which was the object of the attack, but religion of any kind. Clause 121 of the new Criminal Code ran as follows:

> The teaching of religious beliefs in State or private educational establishments and schools to children of tender age and minors, is punishable by forced labour for a period not exceeding one year.'

In the trial of the Roman Catholic clergy, March 1923, this clause was interpreted as forbidding religious instruction at all to children in groups; nor did the Jews speak too strongly when, in a protest of September 11, 1922, the Joint Foreign Committee of the Board of Deputies of the British Jews and the Anglo-Jewish Association thus described these laws so far as their religion was concerned:

> They imperil the very existence of the Jewish Church, and they condemn the rising generation of Jews not merely to religious indifferentism but, as they are convinced, to moral depravity.

It was significant that the Chief Rabbi should let the Archbishop of Canterbury know, on April 4, 1923, that he would be 'ready to co-operate' in any measure which the heads of the Christian Churches might deem it necessary to take for the vindication of religion and religious principles in face of the persecuting atheism of the Government of Soviet Russia.

The Archbishop of Canterbury decided that the hour had come for the most weighty protest that religious leaders in England could then devise. On April 13, 1923, the following declaration appeared:

> To all men and women of goodwill,
>
> The last few weeks have witnessed a portent which has filled all generous-hearted men and women with horror. The ruthless war-

fare which the Soviet Government of Russia has long carried on against all forms of religious belief has come to a head. During the period of the Soviet rule, hundreds of thousands of religious people, and Ministers of Religion of all ranks and creeds, have been subjected to a savage persecution, the express object of which has been to root religion out of the land. The central facts for which religion stands have been systematically outraged and insulted. The most sacred of religious festivals have been made the occasion for blasphemous travesty, and at this moment the attack upon religion itself finds fresh illustration in the trial for their lives of the chief leaders of religion in Russia.

The Bolsheviks themselves have not disguised the purpose which they have in view. In their own journal only three weeks ago they confessed both their aim and their difficulty. To quote their words: 'We must carry on our agitation against religion just as systematically as we do in political questions, but with even more determination. . . . Although we have declared war on the denizens of Heaven, it is by no means easy to sweep them from the households of the workmen.' (See *The Times*, March 29.)

It is for the sake of those workmen and of the whole people of Russia, and for the preservation in their hearts of faith in God, and the maintenance of religious liberty that we appeal. We represent many religious communions and many political opinions, but we are united in the indignation and horror with which we regard the present policy of systematic persecution of religion in all its forms. Such a policy cannot be tolerated in silence by those who value religion or liberty. Our protest will, we are confident, evoke a response everywhere on the part of those who have at heart the well-being of the world.

RANDALL CANTUAR:
COSMO EBOR:
FRANCIS, CARDINAL BOURNE.
JOHN SMITH, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland.
J. D. JONES (Congregationalist), Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England.
J. H. SHAKESPEARE (Baptist), ex-Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England.
W. LEWIS ROBERTSON (Presbyterian),
W. H. ARMSTRONG (Wesleyan),
Secretaries of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England.
F. C. SPURR (Baptist), President of the National Free Church Council.

THOS. NIGHTINGALE (United Methodist), Secretary of the National Free Church Council.
J. SCOTT LIDGETT (Wesleyan), Hon. Secretary of the National Free Church Council.
JOHN CLIFFORD, ex-President of the Baptist World Alliance.
A. E. GARVIE, ex-Chairman of the Congregational Union.
R. F. HORTON, Minister of Lyndhurst-road, Hampstead, Congregational Church.
J. H. JOWETT, formerly Minister, Westminster Chapel.
W. BRAMWELL BOOTH, General of the Salvation Army.
J. H. HERTZ, Chief Rabbi.

The effect was electric. There were, of course, attacks on the protest on political grounds, with the suggestion that it was another move in the anti-Russian campaign intended to pave the way for the denunciation of the trade agreement between Britain and Russia. Some play was also made with the fact that *The Times's* quotation given in the protest, by a sub-editorial slip, attributed to a single issue of *Pravda* the two sentences divided by the separating dots, which actually appeared in separate numbers of *Pravda* for March 18 and March 16, as the Archbishop's Chaplain pointed out in a published reply to Mr. H. N. Brailsford in the *Daily Herald*. There were also critics in England who disliked any protest on the grounds that, as one of them wrote in *The Nation and the Athenaeum*, April 21, 1923:

> Through all the long dark years of bloody tyranny which preceded the Revolution, the Church in Russia lent its countenance to the unspeakable horrors of wholesale deportation and private execution of persons suspected of holding enlightened political opinions. . . . Thanks largely to the Church, 90 per cent. of the population in Russia can neither read nor write; and the priesthood are reaping to-day the fruits of their lack of foresight in having neglected to educate those who were one day to become their masters.

The following personal letter from Mr. Asquith takes the same view:

The RIGHT HON. H. H. ASQUITH *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Personal. 22nd April, 1923.

One of the reasons why I have felt estopped (as the lawyers say) from taking part in the protests against the flagrant iniquities of the Bolshevist government in these matters, is that I see no answer to the question 'Where was the conscience of the Churches in

England, when for the lifetime of two generations the Church in Russia was a mere annexe to the bureaucracy, and not only connived at, but inspired and inflamed campaigns, and indeed orgies, of persecution, proscription and assassination, against both the Roman Catholics and the Jews?' Few Churches have in this regard a blacker record than the Orthodox Church in Russia, or less reason for sympathy when, in the revolution of time, they find they have to reap what they have sown.

Such criticisms of the pre-revolutionary Orthodox Church cannot be simply brushed aside; but they lose much of their value when it is remembered, as it must be remembered, that the Jews and the Old Believers and the Baptists and the Roman Catholics were all involved in the systematic anti-religious policy of the Soviet Government. Nor must Archbishop Davidson's personal intervention, both public and private, in earlier days, be forgotten.[1]

The Government at Moscow still maintained its negative attitude. In one of the series of notes between the Soviet Government and the British Government, upon the relations between them, the Soviet Government felt constrained to declare (May 13, 1923):

> Although the question of status of Churches in Soviet Republics does not come in slightest degree into region of mutual relations of these Republics with Great Britain, none the less, in the interests of correctly informing public opinion, Russian Government considers it necessary in most categorical manner to deny baseless charge that it is persecuting any religion of any sort. Soviet justice falls only on such of clergy as utilise their position as servitors in one of the Churches for political activity directed against internal or external safety of Soviet republics.[2]

And the Supreme Church Council under Bishop Antonine and other clergy of the 'Living Church', who had broken with the Patriarch and claimed to be the Russian Orthodox Church, in a telegram to the Archbishop on May 14, made the following statement:

The SUPREME CHURCH COUNCIL UNDER THE METROPOLITAN ANTONINE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Moscow, May 14, 1923.

Your Eminence, the Supreme Church Council of the Russian Orthodox Church acquainting itself with the memorandum of the

[1] See pp. 484–6, 746. [2] Russia, No 3 (1923). Cmd 1874. H M. Stationery Office.

Government of Great Britain handed on the 8th of May of this year to the Soviet Russian Government in that part of it which concerns the position of religion in Russia, and perceiving in it a threat directed against the children of our Fatherland, considers that it is its Christian duty, in the Name of the love and teachings of Our Master and Lord Jesus Christ, to give enlightenment as to the actual state of the things.

The memorandum of your Government is in essence a hidden patronage of the manifested enemies of our country, an attempt against the peaceful life of our people.

In concluding its labours the Sacred Assembly[1] of the Russian Orthodox Church of the year 1923 recognized the contemporary position of the Church in the Soviet Republic as fully satisfactory, differing advantageously from its servile position in the period of the autocracy of the Tsars, wherefore the references of your Government are entirely without foundation The Supreme Church Council with a feeling of profound spiritual satisfaction considers it necessary to bring it to the knowledge of Your Eminence that religious life at the present time enjoys such freedom as it has never had under any of the former Governments of our Fatherland.

It should already be known to Your Eminence that the Sacred Assembly expressed its decisive condemnation of the ex-Patriarch Tikhon and together with him of the counter-revolution beyond the borders.

With regard to the condemnation by the secular authorities of ecclesiastics for contraventions of the existing laws of the Soviet Republic the moral responsibility for their fate and unhappy situation is wholly their own and that of the secret instigators of their criminal deeds.

We are convinced that if the aforesaid persons had committed their criminal deeds on English territory in England also heavy punishment would have been inflicted upon them.

The Russian Orthodox Church true to the everlasting Counsels of the evangel ceaselessly prays and enjoins upon its children peaceful and brotherly unity with all peoples. But in the case of an attempt on the honour and dignity of their country it has given and will give its blessing to those who stand in its defence and sacrifice themselves for the salvation and freedom of their state.

The telegram was signed by Antonine, as Metropolitan of Moscow and President of the Supreme Church Council; the Vice-President, Vladimir Krasnitzky; Peter, as Metropolitan of all Siberia; Alexander Vvedensky, as Archbishop of Krutitzi;

[1] The Sacred Assembly had deposed and unfrocked the Patriarch

Evdokim, as Metropolitan of Odessa; and six others, four archpriests, one archdeacon, and a layman, A. Novikoff, administrator of the Supreme Church Council.

The Archbishop made no answer to this telegram.

Then suddenly, on June 27, the Patriarch Tikhon was released, after signing the following recantation:

DECLARATION OF PATRIARCH TIKHON

In appealing with the present declaration to the Supreme Court of the R.S.F.S.R., I hold it to be my duty to my conscience as a Priest to state the following:—

Having been brought up in monarchist society and having been up to the time of my arrest under the influence of anti-Soviet persons, I was indeed hostilely disposed towards the Soviet power and my hostility at times passed from a passive state to one of acts, such as my proclamation regarding the Bolsheviks in 1918, the anathema I pronounced against the Soviet power in the same year, and, finally, my appeal against the decree regarding the confiscation of church treasures in 1922. All of my anti-Soviet acts, with a few inaccuracies, are laid out in the indictment of the Supreme Court. Recognising the justice of the decision of the court to take proceedings against me for anti-Soviet activity under the clause of the Criminal Code mentioned in the indictment, I repent of these actions against the State, and request the Supreme Court to remove the measures of repression taken against me, that is, to set me at liberty.

And I hereby declare to the Tribunal that I, from now on, am no enemy to the Soviet power. I finally and decisively dissociate myself both from foreign and from internal monarchist-white guard counter-revolution.

PATRIARCH TIKHON.

June 16th, 1923.

The surprise with which this event was received was profound. On leaving prison, the Patriarch, who had never resigned, resumed full authority. The great majority of the Orthodox rallied round him. The leaders of the 'Living Church' collapsed, and the acts of the recent Sacred Assembly which had purported to depose him were annulled as illegal. The document of recantation, it is true, caused mixed feelings. To some it seemed an act of madness or shame. But others claimed that it was the only way of saving the Church, just as the Patriarch Hermogen[1] had made his peace with the Poles to save the Church in the seven-

[1] Patriarch of Moscow, 1606–12.

teenth century. On the latter view the declaration was a bridge to enable the Soviet Government to abandon its policy of hostility, and also a means of uniting the members of the Orthodox Church once more. The Patriarch himself said later that he was not now struggling against the Soviets but against the 'Living Church':

> I have never sought to overthrow the Government. I am not a counter-revolutionary, for all that some of my appeals have an anti-Soviet character. The power of the Soviet Government has greatly increased in Russia; and it has undergone various developments. We, the members of the old Clergy, are not now struggling against the Soviets but against the 'Living Church' . . . I am persuaded that having studied my case the Government has convinced itself that I am no counter-revolutionary. It was suggested that I should make a public declaration of the fact and I wrote a letter to say so.[1]

The document itself was no doubt in part the cause as well as the occasion of the Patriarch's release. But the release was also due to the great volume of foreign protest which the recent executions had created, and to the belief that if the trial of the Patriarch were to proceed and the supreme penalty to be imposed, the Soviet régime would be still further discredited abroad. It was also due, and perhaps in no small degree, to the strength of the British protests and the powerful and sustained advocacy of Archbishop Davidson.

The Archbishop kept himself abreast of the later developments and followed the news from Russia with deep interest, not unmixed with anxiety, as letters intimating other dangers reached him from different quarters, sometimes from Russia, sometimes from Russian Bishops in different parts of Europe.

Twice again he was brought into personal touch with the Patriarch. On one occasion he received an Ikon from the Patriarch through Bishop Bury, Bishop of Northern and Central Europe, when visiting Moscow—an Ikon which he acknowledged in the following letter:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* HIS HOLINESS TIKHON, PATRIARCH OF ALL RUSSIA

12th December, 1923.

I have received through Bishop Bury the gift which Your Holiness has been good enough to send to me. I value it very

[1] Interview published in *Manchester Guardian*, September 28, 1923.

highly. Such a gift coming from yourself is of deep historic interest and will continue as a reminder to us all of the pathetic story of what you have suffered in health during these anxious and difficult years.

I do not enter upon the public affairs of your Church or of our own because you and I have throughout abstained from corresponding on these very difficult matters. We know, however, that your perils and trials have been great, and it would be a joy to us to think that we have been enabled by the representations which we made to alleviate in any way the long strain and the frequent suffering.

We unite our prayers with those of Your Holiness that God in His mercy may vouchsafe to our two Churches the light of His Presence to guide our feet into the way of peace.

We shall continue to watch eagerly for tidings of your welfare and to pray to Our Heavenly Father on your behalf.

The last occasion was at the Patriarch's death, on April 8, 1925, after some months of illness. The only tribute sent by a religious body outside Russia for the funeral was a wreath placed by the coffin of the Patriarch, bearing the name, and witnessing to the sympathy, of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

CHAPTER LXVIII

THE ARCHBISHOP AND CONSTANTINOPLE

'And who,' quoth the Patriarch of Constantinople, the supreme head and primate of the Greek Church of Asia, 'who is the Archbishop of Canterbury?'
'What?' said I, a little astonished at the question.
'Who,' said he, 'is this Archbishop?'
'Why, the Archbishop of Canterbury.'
'Archbishop of *what*?' said the Patriarch.
'*Canterbury*,' said I.
'Oh,' said the Patriarch. 'Ah yes! and who is he?'

R. CURZON, *Monasteries in the Near East*, ch xxii.

THE dialogue placed at the head of this chapter significantly shows the greatness of the distance travelled in 100 years in the mutual relations of the Primate of All England and the Oecumenical Patriarch of the Eastern Orthodox Church. In 1837, on the eve of Queen Victoria's coronation, when a scion of the House of Curzon presented a letter of introduction from Archbishop Howley to the Patriarch Gregory, that worthy prelate betrayed a complete ignorance of the very existence of such a person as the Archbishop of Canterbury. And even though, as the Honourable Robert Curzon who relates this experience confesses, the Patriarch of that day may have been a man of straw—still it was a little daunting to discover that 'the Patriarch of the Greek Church, the successor of Gregory Nazienzen, John Chrysostom, and the heresiarch Nestorius', seemed to be quite unaware that there was such a thing as a Church of England.

It is curious to reflect how, especially in the years which immediately followed the War, and at a moment when the foreign policy of the British Empire was largely under the care of another member of the same family of Curzon, not only was the office of the Archbishop of Canterbury universally honoured, but successive occupants of the Patriarchal See of Constantinople, as well as Armenian Patriarchs, Assyrian Patriarchs, Syrian Archbishops, and many Eastern prelates besides from Serbia, Rumania, and elsewhere, came expressly to Lambeth Palace to invoke his help.

There were many reasons why this should be the case. Not

least, of course, is the fact that the British nation had a paramount political influence in the counsels of the Allies, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury was conceived to possess a very great official influence of his own, as Primate of the National Church. But there were other reasons besides. For without a doubt all through the past half-century mutual knowledge and interest had grown between the two Churches. Long before Queen Victoria's accession there had been occasional contacts, and since that date the communications had been steadily increasing. But it was the War itself, or rather the long-drawn process of negotiating peace between the Allies and the Turks in the five years which followed the War, which made the whole difference to the strengthening of the links between the Eastern and the Anglican Churches, coupled with the general trust in the character and wisdom of Randall, by Divine Providence, Archbishop of Canterbury, during this critical time.

We have already recounted the first visit to Lambeth of Meletios, the Metropolitan of Athens, in November 1918,[1] and the disappointment which attended the move for the restoration to the Orthodox Communion of the Church of St. Sophia in Constantinople. The years which followed were to witness failures of a still more serious kind, all of them reflected in the mass of the Archbishop's correspondence. Indeed, throughout this whole period the misfortunes of the Near East occupied a quite extraordinary place in his letters and in his interest, and form the subject of many representations to successive Ministers and their departments in Whitehall. The lamentable delay in the completion of the Turkish Peace Settlement was responsible for much of the trouble. But it was only itself the result of more lamentable causes—the absorption of the Powers, great and small, with their nationalist policies, the disagreement of the Allies, and the failure of the United States of America to take its share in the protection of the Christian populations.

With the purely military or the purely political aspects of the general problem the Archbishop had no concern. But the issues of religion were often mixed with other large questions, and though, as we shall see, his help was often claimed for the constitutional questions which affected the future of the Orthodox Church, it was chiefly sought and most eagerly given when

[1] See p. 941.

their very survival, the very existence of Christian people, was at stake.

Amongst the communications received in the early stages was a letter from Dorotheos, the locum tenens of the Oecumenical Patriarchate, who came to Paris in connexion with the Peace Conference. His letter sufficiently declared the general sense of all those others who made their appeal to Lambeth, reminding him (May 28, 1919) of the massacres and crimes which the Turks had committed, declaring, 'There can be only one safeguard for us; it is the dislodgement of the Sultan from Constantinople' and begging 'our sister church in England' to join her efforts to theirs. The Archbishop replied in friendly terms, encouraging Dorotheos to press the gravity of the issue upon the members of the Peace Conference. But the attention of the Delegates at Paris was unhappily difficult to secure—so engrossed were they with the more urgent issues of the Treaty of Versailles. And meantime, delay helped the Turks, and deepened the anxiety of those who had suffered under their yoke as subject races—especially the Armenians and the Assyrians, whose cause the Archbishop in turn pressed most earnestly upon Lord Curzon in the following August, with special reference to the withdrawal of British troops from the Caucasus. Lord Curzon replied that the British were doing their best, but that the fault really lay with America, who could not make up her mind whether she wanted to look after Armenia or not. On December 17, 1919, the Archbishop raised the whole question of the sufferings of the Christian populations, in the House of Lords, and called attention to the promises of His Majesty's Government that they should be set free from the dominion of the Turk. In his speech he gave a clear and damning account of the atrocities perpetrated during the War on the helpless races, as recorded in Lord Bryce's official Report. But while Lord Curzon admitted the responsibility of the Allies, and spoke of his disappointment with regard to American aid in the permanent building up of a great Armenian State, no definite and clear-cut policy emerged.

The Archbishop also, like Lord Curzon, was deeply distressed by the failure of America. He had many American friends, and he was not a little provoked by what he considered the lack of perception of the need of practical action on America's part, which their utterances showed.

The following exchange of telegrams makes this clear:

The BISHOP OF NEW YORK[1] *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

New York. Feb. 26, 1920.

One hundred Bishops of the American Church join me in the following message:

We are grateful for your leadership in crusade against proposed retention of Turks in Constantinople and spoliation of Armenia. Any compromise with Turks will be condonation of crime and will outrage conscience of Christendom. We believe Armenia landlocked and robbed of her fairest portions cannot achieve real independence or self-support. We respectfully but energetically protest against proposed measures and appeal to people of Great Britain to prevent the perpetuation of a fresh act of injustice against Martyr Armenia. American people have always placed implicit faith in the pledges of Great Britain. We cannot believe Great Britain will disappoint us by failing to do full justice to Armenia.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF NEW YORK

2 March, 1920.

Am glad to assure American Bishops of my continued and cordial sympathy in measures to secure safety, independence and freedom of worship to all Christian races hitherto subjected to Turkey. Question of best means to attain this object is receiving most careful consideration of British Government in concert with their Allies. We have counted on America's co-operation in this matter, and hope we may feel assured that she will bear her part in protection of oppressed Eastern nationalities.

The Archbishop's own public championship of the cause of oppressed Christians aroused deep gratitude in Constantinople and elsewhere. The acting Orthodox Patriarch telegraphed to tell him how deeply the bleeding hearts of enslaved Christians had been stirred by the voice he had raised for their liberation from bondage. The Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople, Zaven, came to see him at Lambeth. And telegrams and letters poured in, when a new massacre began in Cilicia, in March 1920, and a new Anatolian war broke out in the autumn of the same year. The Archbishop felt the tragedy of the situation acutely. He spoke in the House of Lords on March 11. He wrote to the Foreign Office. He pressed his views in private on members of the Cabinet. But he was baffled by the apparent impossibility

[1] Charles Sumner Burch.

of effective action. Three months later Dorotheos, the locum tenens of the Oecumenical Patriarchate, came a second time to Paris, and from Paris to London. He was the first occupant of the Patriarchal See of Constantinople to come to the West since the Patriarch Joseph attended the Council of Florence in 1439. He was a sick man when he arrived, old and terribly depressed by the condition of Christians under the Turk. And he came to invoke the Archbishop's aid in a most touching way and to thank him for his unfailing sympathy. He twice visited Lambeth, and on the second occasion (March 10, 1921) formally presented the Archbishop with a gift from the Holy Synod of Constantinople, as an earnest of the brotherly feeling of the Orthodox Church for the Anglican. It was an *enkolpion*, i.e. an ecclesiastical emblem of great beauty bearing the crowned or double-headed eagle of the Patriarchate, which had been originally made for Patriarch Joachim III and had been worn by five successive Patriarchs in virtue of their office. The next day Dorotheos had an audience with the King; and a day or two later saw Lord Curzon at the Foreign Office. But the visit ended in tragedy. The strain proved too great. He fell suddenly ill, and on March 18, 1921, died in London—paying, so many of the Orthodox believed, the same price for his visit to the West as the Patriarch Joseph who had died in Florence in 1439.

The Archbishop attended the funeral service in the Greek Church in Moscow Road, and (to quote his own words):

> For the first time in history the Archbishop of Canterbury officiated by reading the Gospel in English at funeral rites in the Greek Church in Bayswater.

The situation went from bad to worse during the next twelve months; and all the time telegrams and letters poured into Lambeth, from Smyrna, Cilicia, and elsewhere. The Archbishop replied with sympathy, and at the same time made it plain that in denouncing the cruelty of Turkish rule he was not attacking the Faith of Islam. In the course of a long letter to Lord Curzon on November 23, 1921, on the proposal of the French Government to withdraw its troops from Cilicia he said:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* MARQUESS CURZON

I am quite certain that there is a steadily growing sense of resentment against the very idea of our acquiescing in what is

apparently French policy, the abandonment of these Christian populations to the very foes who have been most ruthless hitherto in their cruelty, mis-government, and massacres.

Lord Curzon replied that he also was greatly distressed, and would spare no effort for the safety of these unhappy people.

In the beginning of 1922, the Archbishop received one of the most extraordinary ecclesiastical appeals which can ever have come to an Archbishop of Canterbury. It concerned the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the centre of the Orthodox world. By virtue of his office the Patriarch was both the head of a religious community and a civil official. And apart from his local ecclesiastical jurisdiction, his throne was honoured by a hundred and fifty million Orthodox believers.

The last Patriarch, Germanos V (1913–18), had resigned just before the Armistice. The election of a successor had been postponed owing to the hopes of the Greek Church that a Treaty would be signed between Turkey and the Allies which would define the boundaries and also the rights of both Turk and Greek. But, as three years passed and no Treaty emerged, the desire grew that the vacant throne should be filled. There was opposition from Turkey to such a proposal. But there was also opposition from a section of the Greeks. The Greeks of Constantinople were strongly pro-Ally and Venizelist. The Greeks of Athens, however, at the end of 1921, were strongly anti-Venizelist, and unfriendly to the Allies, and Meletios, the former Metropolitan, who had been expelled, was an exile in New York, where he was known as an ardent Venizelist. Nevertheless, despite all obstacles, the Greeks in Constantinople resolved that the election should go forward. It is unnecessary here to recount the complicated details and all the comings and goings of Bishops on this side or that. The choice fell on Meletios, who immediately telegraphed his acceptance from New York. But the validity of the election was challenged by the faction which sided with the anti-Venizelists at Athens: and especially on the ground that seven leading Bishops had withdrawn at the last moment. The election of Meletios was also cabled to the Archbishop—then on his sick-bed at Canterbury—together with an intimation that Meletios wished to come to England. It was indeed an extraordinary thing that it was to the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Patriarch-designate of Constantinople desired to state the

Canonical and regular character of his election. But such was the fact. It was equally extraordinary that just about the same time that Meletios arrived in England, Chrysanthos of Trebizond, the representative of the dissenting Bishops, also arrived, for the very purpose of stating in the same quarter the reasons why the election was uncanonical and therefore void.

The Archbishop, being ill, deputed Bishop Gore, as Chairman of the Archbishops' Eastern Churches Committee, to pay his respects to each Archbishop in turn. The Archbishop's own natural reluctance to intervene was confirmed by the cautious advice of the Foreign Office. And yet he enjoyed the singularity of the event. To Bishop Gore he wrote:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* BISHOP GORE

January 6, 1922.

. . . It is the unexpected that happens in modern history. Do you realise that Meletios, elected Patriarch of Constantinople, and Chrysanthos, Metropolitan of Trebizond, head of the anti-Meletios party in the Holy Synod, are both in London in order to seek the support of the Archbishop of Canterbury to one side or other of the rival groups, pro-Meletios or pro-Chrysanthos? Meantime the Archbishop whom they seek as patron or arbiter is laid up and cannot see either.

While most anxious not to intervene in a situation 'capable of raising political as well as ecclesiastical considerations', the Archbishop would be sorry to miss the experience of seeing and hearing, could that experience be one without too great peril. Therefore his letter ended:

If, having seen Meletios and Chrysanthos, you thought it necessary or highly desirable, I could no doubt arrange to see Meletios and Chrysanthos, even if it were in bed. But in no case should I think it right to say anything betokening partisanship in so delicate a situation.

Both Meletios and Chrysanthos were staying in London, one at the Ritz and the other at the Curzon hotel. When it was explained to Meletios that the Archbishop's illness was genuine and not diplomatic, though deeply disappointed he told his story at length, that it might be reported to the Archbishop. Meletios' main difficulty was how to get to Constantinople, for the Greek Government would give him no facilities through their territory,

and the Turks would equally resist. Would a British gun-boat be available to convey him? Could the Archbishop help him to see the King or the Prime Minister and Lord Curzon? Could the British High Commissioner at Constantinople be urged to realize the high public importance of the matter?

All this, as well as Meletios's account of the election, was passed on to the Archbishop. And an account from the opposite point of view was also passed on after another interview with the Metropolitan of Trebizond the same day.

Meletios was, however, particularly desirous to see the Archbishop himself, and his Grace received the following telegram which in later days he sometimes recollected with a smile:

The PATRIARCH MELETIOS *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

London, W. January 9.

Am happy to receive your Grace's brotherly greeting but feel deeply sorry to hear you lie sick at bed. Am mentally standing beside your bed praying for rapid recovery of health so valuable for work of Gospel. I wish to say Jesus Christ maketh thee whole, coming in person near your bed.

Ten days later the Archbishop was sufficiently recovered to receive Meletios in person at a house which had been lent him for convalescence at St. Margaret's Bay. He came on January 19, and in the highest spirits; for, the day before, he had seen Lloyd George, to whom Venizelos had cabled urgently from California pressing him to do everything he could for the new Patriarch. The Archbishop's own account of the interview is as follows:

I had invited him with caution, meaning to be very reticent, and merely let him talk about the controversy. I had already written strongly to him to the effect that I must stand entirely outside it, and express no opinions. I found myself, however, relieved of political responsibility (about which the Foreign Office had been very emphatic—see the letters) by the fact that, on the day before coming to see me, Meletios had spent a long time with Mr. Lloyd George, who had emphatically assured him of friendliness, and invoked his aid to get the Venizelist cause promoted to the utmost of his power. After this I felt myself free to converse without restraint on the question, though, of course, I expressed no sort of opinion about the technical validity of Meletios' election. He, Meletios, and his friends, had brought papers with them in addition to those they had already sent to me, giving statistical

figures and comparisons with previous elections to the effect that Meletios' election had been as fully supported numerically as previous Patriarchs, and that his opponents had absolutely no case against it. . . . I showed to Meletios the utmost friendliness, and maintained the same affectionate relation which we had adopted when he was in England before. . . . He spoke very interestingly about his election, professing to be genuinely surprised that he should have been elected, especially when he was absent in America, and attributed it to two causes—first that he had been a sufferer for the cause of freedom, and of all that Venizelos represented during the war, and had thus a claim on recognition as a sort of martyr; and secondly, because the wrongs of the Greeks who were friendly to the Allies, were widely and deeply felt, and that he was known to represent with Venizelos the cause of those who had thus suffered. This had made his election popular, and would continue to do so. He appeared to entertain no doubt that if once he could get to Constantinople and assume the throne to which he had been duly elected, he would be able to carry on the work of the Patriarchate in the ordinary way, with general, though not universal support. He said emphatically to me that one of his first duties as Patriarch would be to promote in every possible manner friendliness with the Anglican Church, and to recognise our position. He did not actually speak of the validity of our Orders, but I understood him to imply it. I ought to add that exactly the same argument is being used by Chrysanthos of Trebizond, though he has not used it to me. . . . I discount this assurance on both sides. I think it rather significant of the sort of way in which these ecclesiastics mix up policy and principle in their declarations and procedure.

According to Meletios, Lloyd George had poured out his enthusiasm for the cause of Venizelos. He had declared that the return of the Royalists to Athens was the worst misfortune for that part of the world since the fall of Constantinople in 1453. Meletios believed that Lloyd George was likely to send him in an English gunboat from Marseilles to Constantinople, which would get rid of all passport difficulties. . . .

He was with us at St. Margaret's Bay for three hours, and talked for a great deal of the time. Should he be formally established as Patriarch, there must be a very great gain in our having secured so completely a fraternal and friendly relationship as now subsists between us.

The Archbishop of Canterbury also saw the Metropolitan of Trebizond, on January 26, for an hour, and listened to his

suggestion that a special Synod of Orthodox Bishops should be held at Jerusalem (where there was a British administration) to determine the question of the election. But he made it plain that he could not in any way intervene; and as to the propriety or sufficiency of the voting at the time of the election the Archbishop said:

> It is quite clear that these are such technical points that even if those belonging to the Church of England were qualified to express an opinion, it is undesirable that they should do so. I have asked these questions because I desired to understand, and I think that I do now understand.

To the Archbishop it was a matter of history, happening in our own time, which he desired to understand—that was all, though there was an added interest in the fact that at the very moment the Cardinals at Rome were about to elect a Pope, in the place of Benedict XIV, who had died on January 22. The Metropolitan said that they did not want the Church of England to intervene, but their two Churches were so close to one another that they wished the Archbishop to be fully informed. The Archbishop agreed. He said that the interest of the Anglican Church in the question of the Patriarchate was of a much closer kind than it could be in the election of the Pope. They were too far apart from Rome—but they were not so far apart from the Eastern Church. And the Metropolitan ended with the assurance that, whatever their internal controversies, all were unanimous in their feelings for the Anglican Church. When peace came, they would do all on their part to make the connexion closer.

A few days later the difficulties in the way of Meletios' journey to Constantinople were removed. He sailed up the Golden Horn in a French launch, and was immediately enthroned as Meletios IV, on the very same day that Cardinal Achille Ratti was elected Pope as Pius XI. The following telegrams were exchanged:

The PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Constantinople. 11th February, 1922.

In public ecclesiastical ceremony enthroned since yesterday on Holy Apostolical and Patriarchal Throne of Constantinople am sending from it brotherly in Christ the Chief Pastor embrace to your Grace the Head of Anglican Church in confirmation of most

excellent relations existing by divine favour between the two churches and of positive hopes of their further by heavenly aid advancement to a complete sacred communion of faith and grace am gladly remembering marks of true love which I obtained from your Grace while passing through England and am seizing the opportunity to assure you that the crew of my church also shares my feeling of deepest gratitude.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

I thank Your Holiness for courteous intimation of your enthronement. I rejoice in the happy relations already existing, and pray that they may lead to even closer fellowship between the Anglican Communion and the whole Eastern Orthodox Communion. And may the peace of God be secured and maintained.

In the following March, the Archbishop had important interviews with both Armenian and Kemalist delegates, and did not hesitate to confront the latter with the Bryce Report on Armenian atrocities of 1915, which was lying on the table, by way of quietly showing them 'the monstrous inconsistency between his view of the matter and the account therein given'. It was just before the meeting of the Supreme Council in Paris.

The Archbishop again spoke in the House of Lords on March 30, expressing a certain uneasiness about some of the particulars in the Paris proposals. A month later in Convocation (May 2), he secured the adoption of a resolution pressing upon the Government 'the vital importance in the interests of civilization of giving full effect, in the international arrangements now under consideration, to the promises which have repeatedly been made as to the protection of Christian minorities within the Turkish Empire'. He wrote also both to Mr. Lloyd George and to M. Poincaré pressing the claims of the Armenians.

In October, after the occupation and burning of Smyrna by the Turks, M. Venizelos asked to see the Archbishop and spent an hour in his study at Lambeth on October 17, 1922:

His object in coming to see me was to pour out his soul about the magnitude of the present Greek distress. He thinks that neither in England nor in America is the scale of it all recognised Many hundreds of thousands (he gave me the figures, but I cannot remember them) are absolutely homeless in their expulsion or flight from Asia Minor or from Eastern Thrace, and the fearful

problem is: How can Greece, a little poor country with no room to spare, find a place of refuge for a million people, and, when it is found, support them there? It needs gigantic help, and no other Powers than England or America can be looked to for much practical aid. France will do scarcely anything. Italy will do nothing. Scandinavia may do a little, but the real help must come from England and America. In America they are beginning to realise the situation. Make them realise it, if you can, in England.

Venizelos spoke with great emotion, raising his voice while he talked, so that it seemed to the chaplain in the next room that the Archbishop was very quiet and silent, while Venizelos was storming. The Archbishop's memorandum continues:

Dr. Nansen, in whom I have the most absolute confidence as an administrative genius with the unique power of managing these huge things, has got the matter in hand. But he must have the backing of the Christian Powers who are willing to help and he must be known to have it. All this Venizelos reiterated again and again, his voice growing louder and louder. He asked me if there was anything I wished to know from him. I said I should like to ask first: What are we entitled to say about Greek outrages on Turks? He replied 'You may say without the slightest fear of contradiction that in Thrace and in Greece there is no such thing. Some particular group in some village may have done a violent act, but I challenge fullest enquiry into the treatment of the Turkish population under Greek rule. I am certain no wrong-doing can be found. Let any emissary be sent to examine the facts and he will find that I am absolutely right. See what General Harington says in *The Times* of to-day'. 'I am not speaking', he added, 'of what happened during the Greek Retreat in Asia Minor. I do believe that villages were there set on fire by the retreating Greeks. It was deplorable and unjustifiable, but I do not deny it. All I object to is the describing of it as corresponding to the Turkish outrages upon Christians. These incidents were the lawless excess of a terrified and retreating army or groups of it. The Turkish massacres of Christians were a deliberate policy definitely avowed. The Turks have declared that there are to be no Christians in Asia Minor. They have formally stated through the Foreign Minister that no Christians will be allowed to return to Asia Minor in any circumstances. If your Government, as is possible, doubts whether this is their distinct policy, let them ask the question and the Turks will be bound to answer—We do not mean to let Christians return. This being so, place must be found somewhere for

those, say, two million people who can no longer find homes anywhere in Asia Minor or in Eastern Thrace.

Venizelos went on:

'Do not let,' he exclaimed louder and louder, 'Do not let political circumstances come into the thing at all. Here are a million or a million and a half of people absolutely destitute and homeless. They are barred from forming homes for themselves in any part of the Turkish possessions. We have got to find first homes, and then maintenance, for them somewhere. We cannot do it. You must carry the burden. It is a purely humanitarian question. . . . I assured Venizelos that I would not forget what he had said, and that every influence I possessed would be used in the direction of obtaining such help as is possible, but I felt bound to remind him of the immense difficulties. . . .

The Archbishop did all he could to encourage public generosity and consistently supported the All British Appeal launched by the Lord Mayor of London, and kept in close touch with the agents of relief and reconstruction.

The same month, October 1922, saw the end of the Coalition Government under Mr. Lloyd George, and the appointment of Mr. Bonar Law as Prime Minister. With the change, a campaign was started in certain quarters, mainly on grounds of economy, to set the British Government free of its commitments in the Near East. It was a dangerous moment. The Archbishop deemed it wise to inform Mr. Bonar Law of his own views and those of his brother Bishops, before the agitation went farther:

The Archbishop of Canterbury *to the* Rt. Hon. A. Bonar Law

October 24, 1922.

I am painfully conscious of the inconvenience to yourself, I may almost say audacity, on my part of writing to you at this moment upon public affairs affecting National policy, but I feel bound to do so with reference to one point which indirectly I suppose may affect the plans or programme which you are presumably going to adumbrate forthwith. I refer to the Near Eastern question with reference specially to the position of the Christian populations. Circumstances have led me, as you can easily understand, to be in close touch with those who represent the great Orthodox Church of the East and the Armenian Church, and in addition I have for years been in close touch with the Assyrian Church. . . . At present comparatively few people in this country realise the

extent, and I may say the solemnity, of the promises we have made. But they are bound to know about it soon, and in view of the extraordinary difficulty of what you have to say you ought to be aware of the strength of religious opinion which will be behind you and supporting you if you make it clear that whatever else happens our pledged word cannot be broken or ignored. Such breach would be regarded by tens of thousands of religious people when informed of the facts as nothing short of infamous.

I could easily say more or give you ample details, but I have already written enough for the moment. My only desire has been that feeling what we do we should say it now and not in any circumstances be told afterwards—You ought to have spoken in time.

Mr. Bonar Law replied as follows:

The Rt. Hon. A. Bonar Law *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

10, Downing Street, Whitehall, S.W. 1.
31st October 1922.

I thank you for your letter of the 24th October, which I have read, I need not say, with the utmost care. It is a subject on which as I know you have already had some communication with Lord Curzon. At present in the very act of undertaking my new responsibilities I cannot say more than that the most earnest attention will be given to the views which you put before me You will also, I am sure, realise that in this matter the British Government can never be entirely free agents but any successful work would be impossible unless we could carry our Allies with us.

The Lausanne Conference to negotiate peace with Turkey began on November 20, 1922, under the presidency of Lord Curzon. The Turkish delegation demanded with great stubbornness that the Oecumenical Patriarchate itself should be removed from Constantinople; and made the conclusion of the convention for the exchange of populations conditional on such removal. But with the disappearance of the Patriarchate the end of Constantinople as in any sense a Christian city would be near at hand. The following telegram reached the Archbishop from Meletios:

The Patriarch of Constantinople *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

Constantinople, 20 December 1922.

The first conqueror cast the most holy apostolic oecumenical throne out of the Church of St. Sophia. The second conqueror is

now attempting to drive the throne out of the very borders of Constantinople, and is seeking to make the representatives of the Christian Powers also partners of this crime.

Join with us, O brother beloved, and with all the Orthodox Bishops, together with your own brethren, both in prayer to God and in protest to the Conference for the averting of the wrong which is being wrought against the whole Orthodox Church.

The Archbishop sent the telegram to Lord Curzon at Lausanne, and in his letter accompanying it he pointed out the new danger of the creation of a Turkish Orthodox Church through the machinations of a certain Papa Eftim, who had begun to be active on behalf of the Kemalists. Others also wrote imploring intervention.

After weighing his words well and choosing the moment, the Archbishop decided to send the following telegram:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE

December 22, 1922.

I have throughout continued to press upon the Conference at Lausanne our earnest hope and desire that no breach should take place in the maintenance of the historic Oecumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople. The continuity of the Patriarchate in Constantinople is profoundly important to the whole Christian Church.

This telegram when made public produced a profound effect and gave a powerful weight to the representations then being made by Lord Curzon at Lausanne. A great volume of public opinion found expression, and Lord Curzon himself took a very strong line from the start. On December 26, a compromise was suggested by a French delegate and supported by a British, that the Oecumenical Patriarchate should be allowed to remain in Constantinople but 'should exercise no political or spiritual jurisdiction in Turkey'. Such a proposal would have been fatal to the whole idea of the Patriarchate, and the Archbishop wrote a strong protest to Lord Curzon (December 29, 1922):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* MARQUESS CURZON

I can hardly suppose that this means that the great Orthodox population in Constantinople would have another ecclesiastical head independent of the nominal Patriarch. If that were so, the

peril and wrong would be grave indeed. We might then have what they call the Papa Eftim Church, which would mean the merest travesty of regular Christian authority, but even if that danger be avoided by the Patriarch's retaining jurisdiction in Constantinople itself, what about the other Dioceses—say, in Macedonia and elsewhere?

Lord Curzon replied reassuringly, and by his directions the British delegate made the following declaration on January 2, 1923:

DECLARATION *by the* BRITISH DELEGATE

Having acquainted Lord Curzon with what passed at the last meeting, I have received his Lordship's express instructions to state once more that he cannot see his way to acquiesce in any proposal for the removal of the Oecumenical Patriarch from Constantinople. Lord Curzon considers that whatever may be the solution of the question of the civil and the political rights of the Greek community it would be unjust to infringe the purely spiritual rights and jurisdiction which belonged to the Oecumenical Patriarch as Primate of the Orthodox Churches, and as head of the Greek Orthodox Church in Turkey.

The Greek delegate read a similar statement.

The Turkish delegates bowed to the ultimatum. On January 10, Ismet Pasha 'took note before the Commission of the solemn declarations and assurances which had just been delivered by the Allied and Greek delegations, whereby the Patriarchate was no longer to take any part whatever in affairs of a political or administrative character, and was to confine itself within the limits of purely religious matters', and withdrew the Turkish demand for its removal. Lord Curzon and the Archbishop had won.

Telegrams of congratulation and gratitude reached Lambeth from many Eastern Bishops. The following was the message from Meletios:

The PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

January 13, 1923.

It is announced to us from Lausanne that the demand for the expulsion of the Oecumenical Patriarchate has been defeated. Giving thanks to God the fountain of good we acknowledge also

the debt which we owe to your Grace for the help which you afforded us in the establishing of justice. Receive our warm thanks.

The Treaty of Lausanne was at last signed, on July 24, 1923. But though the Oecumenical Patriarchate was saved, it was recognized that Meletios could not remain. M. Venizelos himself urged him to resign as the only sure way of improving the position of the Greeks in Constantinople and Turkey. Even before the evacuation of the Allied troops, he was roughly handled. On July 10, he left Constantinople and went to Mount Athos, and in November his formal abdication was announced.[1]

[1] 'By abdicating Mgr. Meletios IV has followed the example of a large number of his predecessors on the Oecumenical Throne since Sultan Mohamed Fatih took Constantinople in 1453 and re-established the Orthodox character of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Since then the Oecumenical Patriarchate has been vacated during the centuries in the following manner.

Century.—	*15th.*	*16th.*	*17th*	*18th.*	*19th.*	*20th.*
Violent death . . .	.	1	3	.	2	..
Deposition . .	10	13	39	24	18	1
Abdication . .	2	1	12	4	6	2
Natural death . . .	2	8	1	5	4	1

Thus the Turks have on 105 occasions driven Patriarchs from their Throne; there have been 27 abdications, often involuntary, six Patriarchs have suffered violent death by hanging, poisoning, or drowning, and 21 have died natural deaths while in office.' (*The Times*, Nov. 10, 1923.)

CHAPTER LXIX

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

The Greek Patriarch, the better to express his desire of communion with our old Church of England, by mee declared unto him, gave me his Bull or Patriarchal Seal, in a Blank (which is their way of credence), besides many other respects.

A letter written by the REV. DR. BASIRE *to* SIR RICHARD BROWN, *relating his Travel and Endeavour to propagate the knowledge of the Doctrine and Discipline established in the Britannick Church among the Greeks, Arabians, &c., 1661.*

DURING all the years which had passed since Randall Davidson first went as resident chaplain to Lambeth, there had been a steady development in the relationship between the Church of England and the Orthodox Church. Bishops John Wordsworth and William Collins, in particular, together with Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, had prepared the Church of England for the next advance. And good work had been done at the Lambeth Conferences of 1897 and 1908. But nothing that had happened hitherto could compare with the immense move forward which had been brought about by the event of the War. So the Archbishop declared in the speech which he made to the Full Synod of Canterbury Convocation, February 16, 1923. In 1919, the Eastern Churches Committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Bishop Gore. In 1920, a delegation came from Constantinople to confer with the Committee of the sixth Lambeth Conference. In 1921, a careful study on Anglican Ordinations by Professor Komnenos, one of the delegates, saw the light. In the same year there also appeared a semi-official Anglican statement on 'Suggested Terms of Intercommunion',[1] drawn up at the request of the Eastern Churches Committee. In May 1922 the Patriarch of Constantinople, Meletios, nominated Archbishop Germanos to be Metropolitan of Thyateira and his representative, or *apokrisiarios*, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, resident in London, as a special sign of 'our desire for a firmer complete communion of the Orthodox and English Churches which the Lord is plainly leading to union with each other'. In August 1922, the famous Declaration on the Validity of Anglican Orders was officially communicated by the Patriarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

[1] See Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p. 77.

I

The story of the circumstances in which the Declaration was made has its own interest. The hope of such a Declaration had been entertained for some while by a few ardent Anglican friends of the Orthodox Church, of whom the chief was the Rev. J. A. Douglas, author of *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox* (1921). It was well known to them that the Orthodox Church would be more ready to acknowledge the validity of Anglican Orders if they could be sure that a considerable body of Anglicans held a doctrine of Ordination approximating to that of the Orthodox. On Mr. Douglas's initiative, therefore, a Declaration of Faith was prepared and widely signed, dealing with that and other topics from a strong Anglo-Catholic standpoint. It was intended to present it to the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Declaration at once became the centre of a controversy. It was signed, amongst others, by Bishop Gore, Chairman of the Eastern Churches Committee—a fact which called forth a strong remonstrance from Dr. A. C. Headlam, a main author of the much more conservative 'Suggested Terms of Intercommunion'. It was condemned by some as entirely incompatible with the statement of doctrine representing the points of agreement reached at a Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace between Nonconformists and Anglicans which was almost simultaneously issued.[1] Its reference to the Thirty-nine Articles was denounced by others as unjust and untruthful,[2] and when the Bishop of Durham preached against it in Westminster Abbey, from the text 'Let love be without hypocrisy', the Orthodox advocates of Reunion in Constantinople wrote to their English friends that the Declaration was dead so far as presenting it to the Patriarch was concerned.[3] It nevertheless reached the Patriarch, and was not without effect.

No doubt the knowledge that the doctrines contained in the

[1] 'Church Unity, May 1922'. See Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, p 143.

[2] 'We account the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion as a document of secondary importance concerned with local controversies of the sixteenth century, and to be interpreted in accordance with the faith of that Universal Church of which the English Church is but a part'

[3] The Declaration, reprinted in Bell's *Documents*, p. 90, originally had 56 signatures in May, 1922, which was increased to 3,715 before the list was complete. It was prepared by a Committee of the English Church Union, and approved by the President and Council of that Body.

proposed Declaration were held by many members of the Anglican Church had its weight with the Holy Synod. It was actually a pastoral need that brought matters to a head. As a result of the theological study of Professor Komnenos and others before and since the Lambeth Conference, the conclusion had been reached at Constantinople, with a view to its communication to the other Orthodox Churches, that Anglican Orders were valid. The importance of such a conclusion in view of the possible regularization of Anglican ministrations is obvious. The publication of the Declaration was in fact determined on the occasion of a visit to Constantinople by an American priest, the Rev. W. C. Emhardt, who was travelling in the Near East with a mission from the American Episcopal Church to take up the case of Orthodox subjects who found themselves in different parts of the United States, far removed from any Orthodox Bishop or Priest. The urgency of the need was emphasized, and in the end the Holy Synod adopted the conclusion, which the Patriarch communicated, in the following letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

The PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

July 28, 1922.

Most Reverend Archbishop of Canterbury and Chief Hierarch of all England, Brother, beloved and yearned for in Christ our God, Lord Randall, greetings; your Reverence well beloved by us, fraternally in the Lord, we address you with gladness.

Our special committee dealing with the Union of the Churches has drawn our attention and that of our Holy Synod to the question of the validity of Anglican ordinations from the Orthodox point of view, for that it would be profitable in regard to the whole question of union that the opinion of the Holy Orthodox Church should be known upon this matter.

Accordingly the Holy Synod on this opportunity taking under our presidency the matter under consideration, and, having examined it from every point of view, has concluded that, as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons, possesses the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic, and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recog-

nition of the 'Charisma' of the priesthood derived from Apostolic Succession.

Indeed, on the one hand, it is plain that there is as yet no matter here of a decree by the whole Orthodox Church. For it is necessary that the rest of the Orthodox Churches should be found to be of the same opinion (in the matter) as the Most Holy Church of Constantinople.

But even so it is an event not without significance that the Synod of one, and that the Primatial Throne of the Orthodox Churches, when taking the matter into consideration, has come to this conclusion.

Therefore with great joy we communicate the matter to Your beloved Grace as the Chief Hierarch of the whole Anglican Church, being sure that your Grace will be equally favourably disposed towards this conclusion, as recognizing in it a step forward in that work of general union which is dear to God.

May the Heavenly Father grant unto us to be of the same mind, through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for ever and ever.

It was a notable act, and caused much satisfaction amongst large numbers of Churchmen. The Archbishop of Canterbury accepted it with courtesy, but took care to show, in any allusion or letter he wrote about it, that it was no matter of surprise, nor was he specially concerned to rejoice because other Churches were led to acknowledge what had always been true. As he wrote to Bishop McInnes, with reference to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who had expressed his agreement with the Patriarch of Constantinople:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP IN JERUSALEM

24 March, 1923.

We are glad to receive any information as to what the Patriarchate has decided, but we do not ask for it in such a manner as to suggest that there is any hesitation on our part, or that we are dependent on the opinions which are expressed respecting our position and Orders.

There was on the Archbishop's side no invitation of any expression of opinion from any Orthodox Prelate. He had never requested Meletios or anybody else to express an opinion on the matter, and his policy with regard to the East was identical with his policy in regard to Rome many years before, when he had

counselled Archbishop Benson to refrain from asking the Pope whether or no Rome recognized Anglican Orders.[1]

The Archbishop communicated the Declaration to Convocation in full Synod on February 16, 1923. He there again made it plain that, while he welcomed the Declaration, he did not exaggerate its importance. In particular he was careful to point out the limitations involved. Before it could become an oecumenical act, binding all the Orthodox Churches, the formal acceptance of Anglican Ordinations, he said, would have to be accepted by all severally, or approved in a General Council. It did not in itself lead to intercommunion. Its importance lay in preparing the way for future advance; though of course it was an admission of real importance for the future relations of the two Churches, as having been made by the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.[2]

II

The Archbishop's care in relation to the general attitude of the Eastern Orthodox Communion to the Anglican Communion is abundantly clear. He was not less careful when dealing with particular problems, or particular requests. Two examples will suffice.

In 1924, a Rumanian priest, M. Popescu, was condemned by the authorities of the Rumanian Church for heresy. He had in fact been converted to a more evangelical view of religion, and the chief charge brought against him related to the omission of a sentence in the Liturgy which seemed to involve the thought of salvation being dependent upon the Blessed Virgin Mary. For this he had been deprived of his church in Bucharest and excommunicated. As he could not get any other building in which to preach, and many desired to hear him preach the simple gospel of salvation through faith in a personal Saviour, the agent of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews (an Anglican mission), the Rev. J. H. Adeney, lent him his

[1] See p. 229 f

[2] The Patriarchate of Jerusalem and the Church of Cyprus expressed their agreement with the Patriarch of Constantinople, in February and March, 1923, and the Patriarchate of Alexandria in 1931; but no opinion has been expressed (1935) by the remaining Patriarchates of Antioch and Russia, or the remaining autocephalous Churches of Greece, Jugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland, or by the Church of Bulgaria.

Hall and he preached there. This at once gave rise to a difficulty, as appearing to show that the Church of England was willing to harbour and encourage a schismatic priest whom the Orthodox Church had expelled. The Bishop of Gibraltar (Dr. Greig), who was eager for closer relations between the Rumanian and the Anglican Churches, felt the problem keenly, and disapproved of Mr. Adeney's action. In writing to the Archbishop he expressed his disapproval. He pointed out how disastrous it would be if no notice were taken of Mr. Adeney's patronage of Popescu, as the present position involved a clashing with, and upsetting of, the aims and settled policy of the Church of England towards the Orthodox East. He added in his memorandum of November 1, 1924:

The BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

November 1, 1924.

I ought perhaps to add that I am not judging, still less condemning, Popescu. I am prepared to believe that he is a God-fearing Christian man, and that envy and mere ignorant dislike of any change have much the biggest part in his suspension. I daresay, though I do not know, that this is true. But the rights or wrongs of his case are not relevant. The broad fact is that we have a wonderful chance during the next few years of helping forward a real religious revival in the National Church of Rumania by strengthening and supporting it.

The Archbishop wrote in reply:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF GIBRALTAR

Old Palace, Canterbury. 13th November, 1924.

Private.

I have read with close attention your Memorandum of November 1st about the Rumanian Position with respect especially to Adeney and Popescu. The matter appears to me to be one in which very great care is necessary. I hope to see the Secretary of the Jews' Society a few days hence, when I can be in London. I shall certainly want to get all the facts that he can give me.

At present I confess that I am anxious for a clearer knowledge than I now have of the ground upon which Popescu was suspended or placed under discipline. I understand you to say that this point is irrelevant to the present question. But is it irrelevant? Gore, with whom I have had some conversation, has an idea that

Popescu's condemnation was because he declined to address the Blessed Virgin as Saviour, while he was ready to use the lesser forms of veneration. If that be so he, Gore, feels rather strongly the need of care on our part lest we identify ourselves too readily with the denunciation of Popescu. We should be in a strange position if it were to come about that he is really standing for what is more or less fundamental in our view of true teaching on this subject and has consequently been excommunicated. I wonder whether you could write to the Metropolitan asking, without saying why, for a statement as to the nature of Popescu's offence? What was the doctrine which he taught or the fault which he committed?

Of course I entirely share your view that we must take care not to let the Jews' Society, or its agent, involve us as a Church in difficulties. But on the other hand we must be very sure of our ground in the matter.

The Archbishop took endless pains, saw the Secretary of the London Jews' Society, as well as Bishop Gore, the Bishop of Gibraltar, and Mr. Adeney himself. He agreed that it might probably be right to bring about the ending of Popescu's sermons in a building belonging to an Anglican society, however admirable and even uncontroversial the sermons. But he added (November 29, 1924):

The Archbishop of Canterbury *to the* Bishop of Gibraltar

I do think, and Bishop Gore is very strong about this, that when a man is excommunicated and they tell us so, we ought to be told exactly what is the offence he has committed. I do not think the Metropolitan can resent that question being asked if it is done in courteous terms—not with a view to our saying that Popescu is to go on with his preaching, but with a view to our acting with our eyes open to all the facts.

In the end the Archbishop counselled Mr. Adeney, and the counsel commended itself both to Mr. Adeney and to the Bishop of Gibraltar, that the Hall might still be used by M. Popescu while he was taking steps to build another Hall as soon as possible, on condition that M. Popescu should not, in his teaching, attack the Rumanian Church as such, or try to win people from it, and also that if it should be found in England that mischief was being done, and the relations of the Church of England to the other Churches were gravely compromised, he would have to ask Popescu to terminate his use of the Hall.

III

The second example arises from the requests which sometimes reached the Archbishop from different countries that he should consecrate a Bishop.[1] An interesting one came from Albania in 1922.

The Orthodox Christians of the South desired an autonomous Church like other Balkan peoples, and the desire had been agreed to by the Albanian Government. The head of the Orthodox Albanians in the South was Monsignor Noli. It was proposed that he should be consecrated by the Russian Patriarch at Moscow, but he would gladly take consecration at the hands of the Church of England. The matter was pressed upon the Archbishop by Mr. Aubrey Herbert and Lord Robert Cecil. The Archbishop however saw difficulties of a rather important kind, and he was supported in feeling these difficulties by some members of the Lambeth Conference Consultative Body, who happened to be at Lambeth in July. He expressed his inability to take the step proposed. The idea put forward was simply that 'Theophan Noli should be consecrated as an Anglican Bishop in the ordinary form and with the ordinary permission from the Crown, just as if he were going to be a Bishop ministering to an Anglican Community in Albania!' The Archbishop wrote an official reply as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* LORD ROBERT CECIL

25th July, 1922.

I have given very careful attention to the letter you wrote to me about the possibility of my consecrating in England a Bishop for the Albanian Church. Mr. Aubrey Herbert has also written

[1] In this connexion it may be of interest to note a not dissimilar reply from the Archbishop to a certain Russian Bishop, rather far away from Russian influence, that he might be made a Bishop of the Anglican Communion. The Archbishop's reply, on February 23, 1920, was as follows 'I have given careful consideration to your request for admission into the membership of the Church of England. I fear, however, that Your Lordship is under a misconception as to the position and function of the English Church. We make no claim to a universal mission. We do not maintain a Bishop or Missionary of our Communion anywhere except (1) to look after our own people· (2) for the conversion of the non-Christian world: (3) where we are, as at Jerusalem or among the Assyrians, acting in agreement with the local ecclesiastical authorities.

'Under these circumstances, I fear, therefore, that it is not possible for the Church of England to accept Your Lordship as a Bishop or Missionary of the Anglican Communion. . . .'

to me making the same request. I consulted several of our leading Bishops who are familiar with the ecclesiastical laws and usages in these matters and I find them all to be in agreement with me in thinking that we should complicate rather than simplify matters were we to grant the request which you have transmitted. I should not be acting legally were I in England to consecrate a Bishop otherwise than according to the Anglican Rite and with the Anglican Oath of Allegiance taken either to the Archbishop of Canterbury or to some other Metropolitan of our Church. This would be impossible in the case of an Albanian Bishop; and glad as I should be to do anything helpful to the Albanian Church, for whose members I entertain profound respect and warm sympathy, I am sure that I should not be advancing the real interests either of the Church at large, or of the local Church in Albania, were I to do something which would create an entirely new precedent and one which would certainly cause wide comment, and perhaps offence, among the Bishops of other Churches in Eastern Europe in addition to the more direct difficulties I have pointed out. It is disappointing to me to be obliged to write thus, but I feel sure that I am right, and I venture to think that the facts as to our laws, usages, and restrictions were perhaps not adequately realised by those on whose behalf you kindly put the matter before me.

Perhaps you will be good enough to take the necessary steps for communicating this to those who approached you in the matter. They have not written direct to myself, feeling most wisely that their cause would be safe in your hands.

IV

There was a remarkable demonstration of the growing *rapprochement* between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches when the 1,600th anniversary of the Council of Nicaea was celebrated at Westminster Abbey on June 29, 1925. Had the conditions either of Russia or of Constantinople allowed, there would, in all probability, have been a great celebration, on Orthodox soil, of the holding of the first Oecumenical Council of 325, to which delegates of all the Orthodox Churches would have been summoned in the most solemn way. But such a pan-Orthodox assembly was impossible in the political circumstances of 1925. The idea was therefore conceived of a special celebration in London. The necessary soundings were taken in different Orthodox centres by the Rev. J. A. Douglas, who once again played a prominent part in the drawing together of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches.

Official invitations were dispatched by the Bishop of London to the authorities of each of the ten autocephalous Churches, nearly all of which sent delegations. The most notable delegates were the Patriarchs Photios of Alexandria and Damianos of Jerusalem, besides the Russian Metropolitans (outside Russia) Eulogius, and Antony of Kieff; and there were also representatives of the Rumanian and the Greek Churches. The Service of Commemoration took place in Westminster Abbey on St. Peter's Day. In addition to the Orthodox representatives twenty Anglican Archbishops and Bishops were present as well as Mar Shimun, the young Assyrian Patriarch, an Armenian representative, and an eminent representative of the Lutheran Church in Dr. Soderblöm, the Archbishop of Upsala. The Archbishop of Canterbury preached the sermon. He called attention to the changes wrought in London and Nicaea in 1,600 years: the former then 'a little Roman-British citadel protecting the roadway on the north bank of the Thames, with, for Westminster, a broad stretch of sandy shore with a few Roman villas and some fishermen's huts among the osier-beds, and an outlook across the wooded slopes into the forest of Middlesex'; while the latter had been chosen for the place of the Nicene Council in 325 'for its dignity, its salubrity, its accessibleness, and the appropriateness of its name, the "City of Victory", connected in our minds with Constantine's title and vision and watchword.' Alas, Nicaea was in 1925 a 'deserted and poverty-stricken hamlet in a swamp'! The Archbishop spoke of the issues which the first Oecumenical Council had had to face, and then of the fellowship of the Church represented by that gathering:

> 'It is no ordinary congregation which is gathered in this hallowed place, surrounded by the memorials of those who, in storm and sunshine, have in their varied ways taken the lead in making history—the history of a people which has stood and stands for truth and freedom in the ordered public life of a Christian country. Yes. *Circumspice.* These chairs and stalls have many unaccustomed occupants. Some of them are the lineal successors of the very men who met in conclave at Nicaea from the dioceses and cities of the East sixteen centuries ago. They are here to join with our own their prayers, their thanksgivings, their creedal testimony of loyalty to our living Lord It is well that they should be here. It touches us profoundly that, when we resolved to commemorate the far-off Council to which we owe, in one of its several varieties of phrase,

the actual Creed or symbol which forms the basis of our own, they should have expressed a desire to join with us here to pray, to stand with us here to join in our solemn declaration of Faith in Him.'

At the end of his sermon, the Nicene Creed having already been recited in English in its Western form, Archbishop Davidson asked the Patriarch of Alexandria to recite the Creed in Greek according to the Orthodox use, without the *filioque* clause. That day's celebration, as the Archbishop said, when the Service was over, was rendered unique by the presence in England for the first time in history of the two ruling Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem. It was unique, not only in the history of the Anglican Communion, but in the story of the whole Church of Christ.

CHAPTER LXX

THE ARCHBISHOP AND THE FREE CHURCHES

I am deeplier afflicted for the disagreements of Christians than I was when I was a younger Christian. Except the case of the infidel world, nothing is so sad and grievous to my thoughts, as the case of the divided Churches

RICHARD BAXTER, *Reliquiae Baxterianae.*

IN the first few years which followed the War, a new desire for the Reunion of Christendom was kindled in many Christian Communions and seemed to quicken the hearts of Christian leaders. The Appeal to All Christian People was everywhere regarded as most significant evidence of the longing for unity which inspired the Anglican Church. And, as was natural, it made a deep impression upon many members of the non-Episcopal Churches in Great Britain.

I

We turn therefore to the Evangelical Free Churches of England.[1] The Appeal to All Christian People was issued in August 1920. There was an immediate and friendly response on the side of the Free Churches. In September 1920, a Provisional Statement was published under the joint authority of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England and of the National Free Church Council. A private and informal conversation took place at Lambeth Palace on December 8, 1920, between the two Archbishops with six diocesan bishops and a special committee of Free Churchmen. In the following spring an important Report, *The Free Churches and the Lambeth Appeal*, was published under the joint authority of the same two Free Church Councils. It was transmitted to the authorities of the Free Churches. The Archbishop of Canterbury on receiving the Report suggested both central and local conferences between representatives of Episcopal and non-Episcopal Communions upon the Appeal and its possibilities. The suggestion was

[1] For the relevant documents of the Joint Conference see Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity* (1920–30).

welcomed by the Federal Council. The Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, the Congregationalists, and the Moravians, expressed their sympathy with the general spirit of the Appeal at their annual assemblies. But more information was required before a further advance could be made. Accordingly the Federal Council, with the approval of the different Free Churches, appointed twenty-five leading Free Churchmen with a view to conferring with the two Archbishops and with other members of the Church of England whom they might appoint. So on November 30, 1921, these Free Church delegates came to Lambeth to confer on the Appeal with the two Archbishops and nine diocesan bishops, their purpose being not to negotiate but to explore. A tenth Bishop and two priests were added later.

More than three hundred years had passed since the first Nonconformists had broken away from the Church of England. The causes of each separation from that Church were very mixed, partly political and social as well as religious. And it was not to be expected that they could be swiftly removed. Certainly Archbishop Davidson himself was under no illusion in that matter. A very real peril lay, he said, in overspeed. Yet none was more convinced than he of the necessity of making a beginning. The Appeal was the ground for such a beginning, and systematic conference between Bishops and Free Churchmen was beyond doubt an admirable way of making the start. The holding, therefore, of the Joint Conferences which began in 1921 and were suspended in 1925 after twenty-two meetings, was a very important event in the history of Christianity in England. And although groups of interested theologians had met for such discussion at intervals before, in an informal way, this was an altogether new event, the like of which had not been seen since the break-down of the Savoy Conference of twelve Bishops and twelve Presbyterians in 1661, which was followed the next year by the ejection of two thousand Puritan clergy as a result of the passing of the Act of Uniformity. Nor was its significance diminished by the Archbishop's declaration, when the Joint Conferences began, that he would strive for the movement now commenced so long as the breath was in his body.

The main work of the Joint Conferences was done in a Sub-Committee of which the Archbishop of York was Chairman. It was carefully composed so as to represent on the Anglican side

the different schools within the Church of England, and on the Free Church side the strong Church principles of the Presbyterian Church, the Baptists' and Congregationalists' distrust of Creeds and dislike of ecclesiasticism, the Methodists with their traditional feeling for order and their use of Lay Evangelists. The Free Church members were also at one in their dislike of sacerdotalism and establishment. The outstanding personality all through was the Archbishop of York, whose conciliatory spirit came as a surprise to some who had supposed him to be the most rigid of orthodox ecclesiastics; while on the Free Church side the main part was taken by Dr. P. Carnegie Simpson (Presbyterian), Dr. Scott Lidgett (Wesleyan), and Dr. Garvie (Congregationalist). Archbishop Davidson all through was a sympathetic observer, attending the sub-committees occasionally, but leaving the general direction to his brother of York.

II

At the very first session, November 30, 1921, after a striking tribute to the generous spirit of the Lambeth Appeal, the two points emerged for which Free Churchmen contended all through as of chief importance: (1) the claim that the non-episcopal communions to which the delegates belonged should be recognized as 'Churches' and as themselves corporate parts of the Church of Christ; (2) the refusal of the Free Church ministers to submit to 're-Ordination'. But there also emerged the outstanding points by which the Bishops held: (1) the need of organic unity on the basis of episcopacy; (2) the impossibility of acquiescing in the continuation of 'Churches' as independent organized bodies, out of communion with one another within the Catholic Church; and (3) the necessity of making distinctions between 'existing Churches' as to their Church standing, i.e. according to their acceptance or not of certain postulates, the community of faith, Sacrament, order, which were of the first importance.

It was therefore resolved that the first thing for the Joint Conference to do was to draw up Points of Agreement and on that basis tackle the issues on which they were opposed The result was remarkable. At the end of a year, a Report was adopted consisting of three parts with eight or ten brief propositions each, and dealing with the nature of the Church, the Ministry, and the place of the Creed in a united Church. The agreement was

surprising, and it was recognized far and wide that the principles to which Free Church leaders in common with the Bishops had set their signatures represented a great advance on anything hitherto conceived as likely to be jointly accepted in respect of the three fundamental subjects. But the proposals on which most interest was focused related to the Ministry. The Joint Conference accepted the episcopate (without implying the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character) 'for the united Church of the future' as the means of giving the authority of the whole body to its ministers; and 'similarly'—a great stress was laid by the Free Churchmen on this word, placed at the beginning of the crucial proposition:

> Similarly, in view of the place which the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful had in the constitution of the early Church, and the preservation of these elements of presbyteral and congregational order in large sections of Christendom, we agree that they should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church.

The successful association of the very things for which Presbyterians and Congregationalists stood with Episcopacy, was important. Some of the members of the Federal Council on receiving the Report were certainly doubtful about some of its features, and when the Council met there was a motion to let the whole thing lie on the table. But this point, and the harmonious character of the proceedings thus far, secured a mandate to continue the conversations. At the same time certain questions were set out by the Federal Council to which a reply was sought. It was also urged that discussion should be accompanied by acts of unity between the Churches in Conference.

III

So far, however, the discussion had been theoretical in character. It was concerned with the Church and its ministry, especially from the point of view of the Church of the future. The Report laid out a number of postulates which were capable of inclusion in a Constitution for uniting Communions. Amongst other things, that Constitution would provide for a definite place for the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the laity, as well as episcopal ordination for all new ministers. But there

was a vital practical problem which also raised questions of principle. What was to be the place of the Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Congregationalist, and other ministers who had not been episcopally ordained, after the date of union, in the united Church? The period in view was, it is true, a transitional period, but there would be thousands of ministers affected. What was to happen to them? Would they officiate in the new united Church without further ceremony? Would they receive an additional commission? Or would they be ordained, or 're-ordained'? That was the practical problem, and the character of the answer depended in part at least on the view taken of non-episcopal ministers as such. So the Bishops were asked to expound their view of the status of the existing Free Church Ministry.

Had the Archbishop of Canterbury been asked to give the answer by himself alone, it is doubtful whether he would have replied in any very categorical form. A story is told by Dr. Berry,[1] Secretary of the Congregational Union, that he once asked His Grace, 'Do you not think that union is coming along the lines rather of mutual recognition than of re-ordination?' The Archbishop had replied, turning to him with a look he would never forget, 'Berry, I am an old man, and old men do not prophesy!' The actual answer finally given by the Anglican representatives and accepted by Archbishop Davidson was framed by the Archbishop of York. It made an admission which was warmly welcomed by Free Churchmen, but it did not cover the whole ground. In the process of reaching that answer a good many difficulties had to be overcome, and there were moments of acute strain when it looked as though a complete impasse had been reached. The old and the new Bishops of Gloucester, for example, took almost opposite lines. Dr. Gibson (the old) was emphatic for episcopal ordination for all ministers officiating fully in the United Church. Dr. Headlam (the new) wished for mutual recognition of ministers and Sacraments but with the proviso that

[1] Dr S M Berry was at the time minister of Carr's Lane Church, Birmingham. Bishop Hamilton Baynes, then at the Cathedral Church, discussed with him the possibility of union between the Church of England and the Free Churches 'on the basis of their ministries being mutually recommissioned or reordained' And a particular project was put forward by Bishop Baynes for his own recommissioning for service in Carr's Lane Church, and the recommissioning or reordination of Dr. Berry for any service in the Cathedral. The matter was referred to Archbishop Davidson, who said he did not think that union was coming in that way

only episcopally ordained ministers should officiate in Churches accustomed to an episcopal ministry. Against this some of the Anglicans suggested that a solution might be found if it could be agreed that ministers episcopally ordained were 'Priests' while non-episcopal ministers were 'Prophets'—a suggestion that was rejected with decision by the Free Churchmen. On the other hand, it was agreed that only those ministers who were ordained to a ministry that was Christ's, i.e. universal, not sectional, and for lifelong service and in a regular way for a regular purpose, need be considered for the present discussion.

IV

In the end the crucial statement was first verbally made by the Archbishop of York, on April 25, 1923:

> We must regard these ministries as ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments within the Universal Church of Christ which is His Body.

This statement was welcomed with profound appreciation by Dr. Carnegie Simpson and Dr. Scott Lidgett. Subsequently, after not a few struggles behind the scenes in which Archbishop Davidson effectively influenced the minority of Dr. Gibson and Dr. Chase, it was embodied in the following form in the Report to the Federal Council.

> We consider that we are entitled, by manifest tokens of Divine blessing which these ministries possess, and also by the spirit and the terms of the Lambeth Appeal about them, to go further, and to say that we regard them as being within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church.

The acknowledgement was rightly felt to go a definite step beyond the words of the Lambeth Appeal. That had spoken of 'the spiritual reality of non-episcopal ministries' and owned them as effective means of Grace, but now the Archbishops and ten Bishops declared:

> It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.

The memorandum containing the acknowledgement made a profound impression on the Free Church members, and as one of them said (Dr. A. S. Peake): 'I cannot see how the Anglicans can go further'; while Dr. Simpson, speaking in 1926 to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England, described it as 'the most notable thing which Lambeth has said to any non-episcopal Church since the time of, say, Bancroft or Laud'. The admission was confessedly great, but at the very moment he made it, April 25, 1923, the Archbishop of York had added that the question how these different ministries were to be admitted in the united Church was another question. And the memorandum on the status of the existing Free Church Ministry also made it perfectly plain that ministries, even when regarded as real, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective, and that the Anglican Church must require episcopal Ordination for the Ministers of its congregations.

V

The Federal Council further, while welcoming the crucial declaration, quoted above, expressed its regret that the Bishops still required, in the case of Free Church ministers desiring to exercise a full ministry within the Anglican Church, the same plan as that followed in the case of persons claiming no kind of ministry, viz. Episcopal Ordination. The vital question had therefore now to be faced: Must all existing Free Church Ministers be Episcopally Ordained if they are to become full Ministers of the United Church? The reply took a couple of years to make. It may be summarized thus.

The question is not one of spiritual efficacy—that is conceded to the non-Episcopal ministers—but of due authority. Episcopal Ordination is the means of bestowing the authority of the whole body to the Ministry, and the Anglican Church has a special trust with regard to it. The Free Church delegates have accepted the principle for all future ministers. To the question whether there would be any way of modifying the application of that principle in the case of existing ministers, the Bishops very tentatively made two suggestions:

(1) They suggested in lieu of Ordination a solemn authorization by the laying-on-of-hands by a Bishop, with the invocation of the Holy Spirit in some such form as this: 'Take thou Authority,

now committed unto thee by the Imposition of our hands, for the Office and work of a Priest (or presbyter). 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.' But they made this suggestion with hesitation on account of the ambiguity lurking within it. Was it in fact a conferring of order or only of jurisdiction? And they made it plain that while they did not rule this method out they preferred:

(2) The plan of Ordination *sub conditione*. According to this method Episcopal Ordination would be given to all such Ministers, but the act of such Ordination would be prefaced by such words as 'If thou art not already Ordained'—expressing the fact that a doubt did exist on one side, and by Ordaining the Minister 'if not already Ordained', removing that doubt from the Ordainer's mind while not committing the person conditionally Ordained to accepting that doubt.

VI

Here the conversations stayed.[1] The proposal of Ordination *sub conditione* was condemned by the Federal Council as unconvincing and unpromising, and both the Bishops and the Free Churchmen felt that for the moment it was impossible to get further. By common consent therefore the deliberations were suspended in order that full opportunity might be given to the Churches concerned to try and understand the issues at stake, and the agreement as well as the disagreement which had been revealed. The Annual Assemblies of the Churches themselves, on the suspension of the Conferences, took much the same line as the Federal Council; and some of them definitely emphasized their opposition to any form of re-Ordination or Ordination. Only one Church dismissed the whole proposal contained in the Appeal. This was the Baptist Union, which in 1926 stated positively that 'union of such a kind as the Bishops have contemplated is not possible for us'.

There were many who were disappointed that a pause had to be made Not so the Archbishop. He knew the need of deliberation and of the education of the rank and file. He also knew the gains that had been made. The leaders of the Churches had got

[1] The Lambeth Conference 1930 led to further joint conferences, still proceeding (1935).

to know one another and understand their respective points of view. Through their being brought together at Lambeth, in social intercourse, in study, and in worship in the Chapel, on so many occasions, a spirit of amity had grown, a spirit all important to the progress of Christian unity; and besides this, a quite unexpected amount of agreement was reached on the fundamental doctrines of the Faith. It was to this friendship, and to the working out of this agreement, that Archbishop Davidson made so signal a contribution himself that it is no exaggeration to say that no Archbishop has ever been so respected and revered by the whole Nonconformist world. For in truth no Archbishop of Canterbury had the opportunity to do so much as he, but none having such an opportunity could have used it to greater effect.

VII

A remarkable instance of Dr. Davidson's personal interest in Reunion with the Free Churches, was his visit to the Conference of the Wesleyan Methodists at Bristol, on July 21, 1923. The connexion between the Church of England and the Methodists was closer than that with any other of the Free Churches, and their reception of the Lambeth Appeal had been more than usually cordial. Besides which, the Archbishop had some very good friends among the Methodist leaders, notably the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, D.D., Warden of Bermondsey Settlement, and the Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman. When he entered the Hall, the Conference received him upstanding, and the President (the Rev. T. Ferrier Hulme) in a happy address spoke of the occasion as the first in the whole series of 180 Annual Conferences at which the successors of St. Augustine and Wesley had stood side by side. The Archbishop delivered his address, reading it, very quietly and impressively, to a most attentive audience who were pleased that he did not play down to them in any way. His subject was Christian Reunion, and he reminded them of how they, as Christian ministers and Christian laymen, were 'just now standing together at a juncture in human history, so vast in its import, so measureless in its possibilities'. And after describing the work of the English theologians in the nineteenth century, stirred by the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, he spoke of the sheer necessity that they should draw together and stay together now as 'joint inheritors of what has been wrought and taught for 200

years since John Wesley took his place in the ranks of the Church's ministry'. He did not discuss the details of how a new comradeship among Christians could come about—or its range or its credentials: he only pressed its necessity. And in another informal speech a little later in the day, he quoted the advice of a Scotch uncle that 'if you want your roads to last they must be made slowly'. There were many comments in the press, and one of the most interesting was that made by Mr. Arthur Porritt, the Editor of the *Christian World*, in an American journal:

> The Archbishop's speech delighted the Conference. One might almost say that Dr. Randall Davidson is the first Archbishop of Canterbury for whom the English Nonconformists have a real affection. . . . It can assuredly be said that more Nonconformists have found a welcome at Lambeth Palace in the last twenty years than in the preceding two hundred years. . . . Not tolerance but good will has been ushered into ecclesiastical relationships during Dr. Davidson's régime at Canterbury. (*The Congregationalist*, U.S.A., August 30, 1923.)

In May 1928, the Archbishop paid a similar visit to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of England, the Moderator of which that year was Dr. Carnegie Simpson. In his reply to the Moderator's welcome, he spoke of his 'eager desire to recognize, both publicly and privately, how comparatively transitory are the feuds which, in earlier days, used to sunder the branches of the Church of Christ in this country, and how eternal and unbreakable are the bonds which unite us when viewed in the light of God's revelation in history, and as before the judgement of the higher world'.

THE ARCHBISHOP and MRS DAVIDSON
(1920)

CHAPTER LXXI

RELIGION AND THE SCHOOLS

On the plausible . pretext of the multitude and variety of religions, and for the suppression of bigotry and negative persecution, national education is to be finally sundered from all religion, but speedily and decisively emancipated from the superintendence of the national clergy Education is to be reformed, and defined as synonymous with instruction

S T COLERIDGE, *On the Constitution of Church and State*, ch. VII.

AMONG the many fields in which the moderating influence of Archbishop Davidson was at work in the years after the War was that of the religious question in the schools. The whole situation had changed since the days of Mr. Birrell's Education Bill. There was a far more cordial feeling between the representatives of the different Churches, and this grew still stronger in the course of the conversations on Christian Unity which followed the Appeal to All Christian People issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. And besides this, there was an increasing sense of the widespread ignorance of the Christian religion among the younger generation, as revealed in the evidence from the Army. Various informal conferences took place at Lambeth Palace and elsewhere, in which the different interests were represented. But the outstanding contribution was made in what came to be known as the Fisher Proposals. It is to them and their sequel that we will therefore turn.

I

The Education Act of 1918 left the religious difficulty untouched, but not therefore forgotten. Mr. H A. L. Fisher, the Minister responsible for the Act, was one of those most anxious to solve it He therefore wrote to invite the Archbishop of Canterbury, on one side, and Dr. Scott Lidgett representing the Free Churches, each to nominate six persons who could take part in a conference at the Board of Education under his presidency. In the course of his letter he said:

The RT. HON H. A. L. FISHER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

19th June, 1919.

I am aware that discussions have taken place between representatives of different parties with a great deal of friendly feeling

and a sincere desire to meet difficulties, and though those discussions have not led to any definite conclusions, it has been suggested to me that I might render good service to the cause of national education by intervening at this juncture.

I have a most earnest desire to contribute, if I possibly can, to the solution of the denominational problem in English education; and I feel that until that problem is solved the public system of education will be embarrassed and will not attain that full and harmonious development which the Education Act of 1918 was designed to promote. I am quite aware that my intervention, even in the most modest form, involves certain risks and may give rise to misunderstanding, and if it is not successful may possibly check that approximation between the two sides which appears to me so hopeful. I feel, however, that I should be failing in my duty if I did not take those risks . . .

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. H. A. L. FISHER

21st June, 1919.

I thank you for your important letter of June 19th, suggesting a private conference at the Education Office under your presidency, to be attended by six Churchmen and six Nonconformists. The difficulties of the subject are very great, and anticipations of a ready solution of the questions at issue may be doomed to disappointment. But I am quite sure that the effort ought to be made, and I welcome your kind proposal. . . .

The promotion of such a Conference, though private, was recognized to be of first-rate importance, indeed it was a new thing in educational procedure, and it made a special appeal to the Archbishop because he felt that much the best hope of settling a controversy, with such a history behind it, lay precisely in independent action by the President of the Board, who could bring the parties together and persuade them to agree.

The first meeting was held on July 31, 1919. It was attended by stalwarts from the old debates, like the Bishop of Manchester[1] and Dr. Clifford, and also included Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. Selbie, Mr. Holland, and Mr. Riley. There were no Roman Catholics, and the Archbishop noted their absence with regret. Mr. Fisher expressed the desire that the Conference should tackle

[1] Dr. E. A. Knox.

at once the two very difficult questions of the new Central Schools and the Single School Area. The Archbishop, however, urged that before getting down to these details it was vital to see where all stood on the larger and more fundamental questions. As these fundamentals determined the general policy of the Church in later discussions in other assemblies, it is well to give them in the exact formula adopted on this occasion by the Archbishop:

> I would say the fundamentals of our position are these: we regard religious teaching as an essential element in right education; next we regard it as essential that that religious teaching, if it is to be worth having, should be given by competent men, and given genuinely by men who do it both because they are properly qualified and because they can do it conscientiously. Thirdly it is in our view almost axiomatic that if religious teaching is to be effective it cannot rest content with indefiniteness, but must have some specific statement of doctrine, especially as the children grow a little older.

The Archbishop's contention was accepted, and the Conference generally determined to see—and in the course of five meetings did see—what could be done to move towards a national system in which those three essential principles were secured. In the end a general agreement was reached on proposals for a national system of education which did in fact conserve all three of the Archbishop's conditions. These proposals involved the ending of the existing dual system[1] and the placing of the appointment and dismissal of all teachers in the hands of the local education authorities. But they also included statutory provision for

[1] 'The dual system as we have it under the present Education Law has two primary bases, which involve fundamental differences of outlook. These fundamental differences are expressed in certain sections of the Consolidated Education Act, 1921, which give respectively the rules for the conduct of provided and non-provided schools Put shortly, the position is this: In the provided schools religious instruction is not an essential. To a greater or less extent it may, or may not, form part of the school course To a greater or less extent it may be looked after or neglected. In the non-provided schools, on the other hand, religious instruction is an integral and necessary part of the school curriculum. The only *positive* and binding statutory provision made by the Education Acts with respect to religious instruction or observance in elementary schools is that which requires, as one of the conditions of annual grants, that the religious instruction in voluntary schools shall be in accordance with the provisions of the School Trust Deeds.' (From a *Memorandum on the Problem of the Abolition of Dual Control in Elementary Education*, issued on the joint authority of the Education Committee of the National Assembly of the Church of England and the Standing Committee of the National Society, Oct. 5, 1922.)

religious instruction in all elementary schools, which instruction might be, as in Scotland, either denominational or general. They included also a condition that the teachers giving that instruction must be suitable from the point of view both of sincerity and competence to give it, and willing, thus involving a provision of adequate facilities in the Training College system for making teachers competent. It was recognized that some schools would prefer to stand out of the national system under whatever conditions, but the Archbishop insisted that all denominations should be dealt with alike in this, and that the Roman Catholics, for example, should not have preferential treatment. Unfortunately, before the last session was concluded, Dr Clifford had withdrawn, as he could not support denominational instruction in a Council School, and the Roman Catholics, who had been separately consulted, refused their approval on the ground, apparently, that the definite instruction given by Roman Catholic teachers in Roman Catholic schools could not be exchanged for such precarious arrangements as local authorities might be willing to provide or sanction, and that the proposed control of religious instruction was inadequate and illusory.

The Archbishop felt that he had gone a long way himself, but was prepared to stand by the proposals, and urged their publication. He wrote (February 18, 1920):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. H. A. L. FISHER

Of course arguments in favour of delaying publication are quite easy on the part of those who have conferences to hold publicly or privately, and who are a little timid about the way their old followers may view their action. No one has more reason to apprehend criticism in this matter than I have. . . . I knew, when I consented to come with my friends to your Council Room, that I had irrevocably committed myself to a strong line of action. You would be the last man to place me in the position of having to confess failure and lie open to the charge of having bungled the whole matter. You have, in what you have said, shewn that you appreciate the length to which we Churchmen *have now committed ourselves*, and, of course, we have done this simply on the basis of the Memorandum being published *as the proposal of the President of the Board of Education*, after such communications as he thought right with parties chiefly concerned. . . .

Accordingly Mr. Fisher published the proposals in outline, in a speech at the Kingsway Hall, March 27, 1920, intended for L.C.C. teachers, but as the L.C.C. teachers refused to listen, owing to a quarrel on an entirely different matter, the speech had to be circulated to the Press. In the course of his speech Mr. Fisher expressed his belief that 'a purely secular system of instruction in public Elementary Schools would not, at present at all events, be in accordance with the national wishes, and that the broadest way of dealing with the problem which has suggested itself to me is to put denominational and undenominational religious instruction on an equal footing in the public system of elementary education'; and he set out the following four principles of an agreed settlement, which he would be prepared, if there were such general agreement, to submit for the consideration of the Government:

(1) That the appointment, promotion, and dismissal of all teachers in public elementary schools should be in the hands of the local education authority, and that no teacher in an ordinary public elementary school should be obliged to give religious instruction unless specially appointed for that purpose only, or be in a better or worse position by reason of giving or not giving religious instruction.

(2) That the local education authority should have the free use of the premises of existing non-provided schools for any educational purpose for which they are competent to provide, and that the local education authority should be under the obligation to maintain the premises and have the right to alter them for school purposes.

(3) That the local education authority should be under an obligation to make adequate provision in all public elementary schools for religious observance and instruction, differentiated so far as practicable in relation to religious tenets, to be given in school hours by teachers suitable and willing to give it, subject to a conscience clause and provision for withdrawal for religious observance or instruction elsewhere.

(4) That no privilege of 'standing out' of the system should be conceded to one denomination which is not open to other denominations.

The proposals were widely discussed at the time. On the whole they were welcomed by Churchmen, and they had the advantage of warning Churchmen against the danger of their putting

forward schemes for local agreement of a much less satisfactory character. The National Society, at its Annual Meeting in June 1920, unanimously passed a favourable resolution. Nonconformists were divided, but the old war-cries were sounded somewhat ominously by Dr. Clifford and a few others. To the teachers, the idea of a national service, which the Fisher proposals with regard to appointment and 'no tests for teachers' involved, was naturally attractive. But the Government were unwilling to embark upon anything in the nature of controversial legislation; and this was sufficient to prevent any new Government Measure.

II

In the following year, a Private Member's Bill embodying the Fisher proposals was introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Thomas Davies, M.P., and in addition two other schemes were published known as 'the Welsh Scheme'[1] and the Leslie Scheme,[2] which were much less satisfactory than Mr. Fisher's proposals on the side of denominational instruction. There was also an important move made on behalf of the Congregational Union, for a conference 'for the purpose of considering how the present dual system of elementary schools may be modified so as to secure economy, efficiency, and religious equality in elementary education, and an equitable system for the promotion of teachers'. The Archbishop of Canterbury, with the unanimous approval of the National Society's Consultative Committee, accepted the Congregational Union's invitation, and at a preliminary meeting, on December 9, 1921, between the parties to the Conference, laid down three essential principles as regards religious instruction. These principles were adopted by the meeting, and the reference to the Conference then became the following:

> To consider how the present dual system of elementary schools may be modified so as to secure economy, efficiency, and religious equality in elementary education and an equitable system for the promotion of teachers, with observance of the three following principles:—
>
> (1) That in all schools supported or subsidised by the State

[1] Formulated by a Joint Committee of thirty-three representatives appointed by the Governing Body of the Church in Wales and by the Council of Evangelical Churches in Wales. [2] Formulated by Mr. Alderman Leslie of Liverpool.

religious instruction should form an integral part of the education given, and that religious observance and instruction should have a place in the regular curriculum, and be available, subject to conscience clause, for all children. The proper authority should be in a position to ascertain from time to time that such instruction is regularly and efficiently given.

(2) That religious teaching, if it is to be worth having, must be given by men and women who are qualified to give it and can give it conscientiously.

(3) That religious teaching must not be of a vague or indefinite character, but must mean for Christian children the definite teaching of the elements of the Christian Faith.

In explaining the situation to the National Assembly, the following February (February 9, 1922), the Archbishop stated why he pressed these three principles so firmly:

I did not find anybody in that room who said that they doubted any one of those three principles: the need of religion as part of education; the need that the instruction shall be given genuinely and competently if it is given at all; and that it shall not be a vague or windy or washy thing, but that it shall be the grounding of children in the elements of the Christian faith. Of course, each of these principles leads off into a great many questions upon which those who talk of this matter always want to dwell. I want to get back to those three principles, and to ask those who want to get a unified system applied throughout England at the expense of the sacrifice, as many would regard it, of our present Church Schools, whether they are prepared to stand by those three principles? If not, which of them do they challenge? Do they challenge the need of religion? Do they challenge the principle that it must be given genuinely and competently? Do they challenge what we mean by it—namely, the grounding of the children in the elements of the Christian faith? Then, having got those principles, I would throw upon others, rather than only on ourselves, the responsibility of formulating a way of getting out of the difficulty, if our way of trying to get out of it is not regarded as quite meeting the case. That, I am quite sure, is the right method of doing it.

The Conference, however—known as the Memorial Hall Conference—failed to reach agreement. Three different schemes were presented. The Anglicans presented their scheme, on the authority of the Education Committee of the National Assembly,

and of the Standing Committee of the National Society; a scheme in which 'the Church of England has thus officially proclaimed its readiness to accept a settlement on the lines of Mr. Fisher's proposals'. But the Anglican scheme was rejected by the other members of a special sub-committee who produced majority and minority proposals of their own, generally based on the Welsh concordat; a scheme which implicitly recognized the existence of a demand for instruction in the principles of particular denominations, but in practice limited the satisfaction of any such demand to those neighbourhoods where voluntary schools happened to exist, and to those particular school buildings which were owned by the various denominational bodies.

III

So far—with the warm encouragement of the Archbishop—the educational spokesmen in the Church of England had been steady in their desire to negotiate with the representatives of the Free Churches, and the teachers, and the local educational authorities, for securing by agreement a single national organization of elementary schools in the place of the present dual arrangement of 'provided' and 'non-provided' schools. But once again the hope of agreement was dashed to the ground by the action of these same stalwart champions of the dual system who, the Archbishop felt, were so blindly devoted to the maintenance of Church schools at all costs as to forget that the majority of the total number of children attend Council schools, and that it is an increasing majority—and to fail to notice the danger, as he put it more than once, of 'drifting into secular education by a side wind'.

At the Annual Meeting of the National Society on May 30, 1923, the Archbishop made a full speech. He had the satisfaction of hearing the case for which he contended put by a strong High Churchman, Sir Frederick Holiday, who moved the official Resolution, in the following words:

> As I look back over the fifty-three years since the Education Act of 1870, during the whole of which period I have been closely and intimately associated with every phase of the subject, two questions are constantly coming into my mind.
>
> The first question is: Will it have to be said that in this matter the Church of England knew not the time of her visitation?

As each crisis arose and passed in 1896, 1902, 1906, 1918, and 1920 without any settlement of the religious question, the Church schools have drifted on, receiving from time to time additional help from public funds to which they were fully entitled, but fewer in number and weaker *qua* Church schools.

And the second question is: Will an exclusive consideration for these schools, without any due regard for the needs of the millions of children who are outside them, bring upon them the judgment: 'He that will save his life shall lose it'?

The Resolution, of which full notice had been given, was immediately moved, reaffirming the National Society's adhesion to the three essential principles laid down by the Archbishop in December 1921, and expressing its willingness to consider any proposals designed to carry those principles into effect. But then came an amendment which, as it was put afterwards, torpedoed the official policy. *No notice had been given* The Archbishop himself knew nothing of it until he came into the room. It was moved by Prebendary Thicknesse, and ran as follows:

That the National Society considers that it is urgently necessary that the authorities of the Church should be respectfully invited to abandon the policy of negotiation for the surrender of Church schools, and to aid the Society by putting forth a strong appeal to all Church people to maintain Church schools and training colleges in a condition of the greatest possible efficiency, while pressing for the definite teaching of the elements of the Christian faith to Christian children in all schools.

Whatever may be thought of the wisdom of the policy advocated, its phraseology was manifestly objectionable. But to the Archbishop's keen disappointment it was carried by 47 votes to 37.

So ended another chapter in the story of religion and the schools.

CHAPTER LXXII

TOWARDS DOCTRINAL AGREEMENT

In my youth I was quickly past my fundamentals, and was running up into a multitude of controversies, and greatly delighted with metaphysical and scholastic writings . . but the older I grew the smaller stress I laid upon these controversies and curiosities (though still my intellect abhorreth confusion) as finding far greater uncertainties in them than I at first discerned, and finding less usefulness comparatively, even where there is the greatest certainty. And now it is the fundamental doctrines of the catechism, which I highliest value, and daily think of, and find most useful to myself and others. RICHARD BAXTER, *Reliquiae Baxterianae.*

ONE of the most important questions before the Church during Dr. Davidson's primacy was the question of unity in belief. There were many points of doctrine on which members of the Church of England were sharply divided. There was also a considerable controversy, more vehement at some times than at others, regarding the essentials of the Christian faith. The disputes between Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals were hardly edifying. But the conflict, often bitter, between Modernist and Conservative was of a much more disturbing character. It was bad for the internal life of the Church of England. It was not less harmful for the efforts which the Church of England was making for a *rapprochement* with other Christian communions. Ought not such a Church, it was not unnaturally urged, to take special pains to know its own mind and to be at unity within itself? It is to the initiation of a very serious attempt to face this issue that the present chapter will be devoted.

I

The Archbishop, as we have already made plain in previous pages, was determined to maintain the comprehensiveness of the Church of England in matters relating to the Creeds as well as in other departments of its life. He received many appeals, addressed sometimes to him, sometimes to the Bishops as a body, that he should denounce particular writings or opinions as heretical. On three separate occasions at least, before the War, Declarations or Resolutions dealing with Modernism were in fact authoritatively published. On May 10, 1905, the Upper

House of Canterbury Convocation passed a Resolution reaffirming the Faith presented in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. In August 1908, the Lambeth Conference issued two Resolutions on the Faith and Modern Thought, and devoted a considerable passage in the Encyclical Letter of the Bishops to the same theme. On April 29, 1914, in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation, the two critical Resolutions on Orthodoxy were carried in a form which just secured the agreement from different angles alike of Dr. Davidson and Dr. Gore. And towards the end of the War, in the winter of 1917–18, another fierce controversy had arisen through the nomination of Dr. Henson to the Bishopric of Hereford, which required all the Archbishop's efforts to bring to a happy conclusion.

The Resolutions just cited were in the main reassertions of the essential place of the historic facts stated by the Creeds in the structure of the Church's faith; and the utterances of 1908 and 1914 also recognized the need of considerateness, and of not unduly limiting freedom of thought and inquiry. But here they had stopped—although the Lambeth Conference Encyclical Letter called marked attention to the 'need of a far greater effort on the part of the Church to deal with the intellectual side of religion and life'. Such a persistent Reaffirmation, however, was hardly sufficient for the perplexities of the time. A much more definite and sustained theological effort was demanded.

II

It was here that a new turn of an important kind was given to the controversies so long continued. Archbishop Davidson, though in Church policy a firm opponent of all rigorism, was not himself a theologian. He was deeply interested in history and biography, but hardly in philosophy or doctrine, and it must be admitted that his own failure, as he always regarded it, in the academic field, had tended to make him somewhat shy in his attitude to the universities, and to lead to an unfortunate lack of vital contact between Lambeth on the one side and Oxford and Cambridge on the other, throughout his primacy.

The real initiative towards a sustained endeavour to find a basis of doctrinal agreement came from a group of younger

theologians, notably Mr. Will Spens, Fellow (and later Master) of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, who approached the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Burge) after the first Anglo-Catholic Congress in 1920. A series of meetings was held, and Dr. Burge and his younger colleagues propounded a scheme for a new Doctrinal Commission to be composed of theological representatives of the Anglo-Catholic and the Liberal and the Evangelical schools, which should undertake a sincere and thorough examination of the teaching of the Church of England, in mutual conference over a considerable period. It was realized from the first that the inquiry would be protracted. But it was hoped that as a result of the long labours, in spite of the difference which existed in important matters, a fundamental agreement might be revealed which would give so clear and convincing an answer to the question 'For what does the Church of England stand?' that the present controversies would be closed, and those in authority could allow scope for differences of practice, teaching, and worship—based on principle—which at present they were thought to allow simply because they felt themselves helpless. And it was essential to the proposal that any such Doctrinal Commission should not be regarded as a mere personal venture on the part of some individuals of different schools of thought to reach a private agreement, but should be authoritatively given a corporate responsibility for reaching a common mind.

Those who urged the appointment of such a commission laid their principal emphasis on the need and importance of an effort for agreement. This rather than later procedure was the dominant interest. But it is hardly too much to say that at the back of the scheme lay a desire for something fresh in the way of exercising authority in matters of faith. It was hoped, certainly by some of its promoters, that the members of the Commission, thus authoritatively appointed, after taking long enough time to enter fully into each other's point of view and so reach a common mind, would express that common mind fully, coherently and explicitly, in the form of a book. When the book appeared, the Bishops might, if they found themselves able, make some kind of pronouncement to the effect that the doctrine therein contained was, in their view, generally agreeable to the word of God and expressive of the general mind of the Church of England, but must not be taken as binding individuals. This body of doctrine would

then (it was suggested) stand as a general norm of Anglican teaching, with a general episcopal approval. Appeal could be made to it by all clergy who desired, while it would also serve to check and test the teaching of those clergy who were so fond of individual initiative that they were apt to claim the Church's sanction for what were in fact their private and quite unauthorized views. No one would be silenced or made liable to heresy hunts, but no one would be able to claim the authority of the Church of England for what was opposed and contradictory to this statement of doctrine thus generally agreed and approved.

The proposal thus sketched was first brought to the Archbishop's notice by Dr. Burge, in August 1921. He reported the conversations which had been going on during the previous twelve months; and sent the Archbishop a preliminary draft of the letter which it was proposed to send. This letter expressed the belief that men of all parties were growing weary of disputes, and were anxious to find a basis of agreement with other elements in the English Church. It also stated the conviction of the signatories that an investigation of past principles by men of all parties would prove that all but a comparatively small number of extremists of each school could eventually reach agreement, both on the essentials of the Christian faith and on the points of controversy which had bitterly divided them in the past. It was, the proposed letter said, becoming increasingly clear that the only adequate safeguard against far more serious disruption lay not in the fact of the Establishment, but in securing genuine unity of belief. It further pleaded that the statement of the Church's faith should be given and received, not as a series of ambiguous formulae, but as a positive statement of faith. The signatories finally asked that a Doctrinal Commission should be appointed and solemnly commended by authority to the prayers of the Church, that it should be allowed ten or twenty years for its labours, and that it should be largely composed of younger men in the Church, of wide sympathies, trusted by their respective parties and representing all parties in the Church of England, however extreme in whatever direction, which were willing to seek a common basis of agreement.

The Archbishop's first reaction was somewhat critical and unwelcoming. He expressed his surprise that the question of Establishment should be regarded as so important an element

in the present acceptance of, or pretension to, 'unity, such as it is':

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF OXFORD

September, 1921.

I believe rather that our Church, established or disestablished, has a position and status in the religious thought of the world which is wholly independent of Establishment (witness U.S.A. or S. Africa), and where *differentia* from Rome turns largely upon its comprehensiveness or its realisation of the Vincentian '*in dubiis libertas*' which no doubt means an enlargement—as compared with Rome—of what is meant by '*dubia*'. To Rome and men of the make which Rome encourages and fosters, the '*necessaria*' are more numerous by far than they are with us.

The Archbishop's main objection, if pressed, would have cut at the root of the whole proposal:

Can the task really be entrusted formally, and with the prayers of the whole Church, to a group of men, however fresh in spirit and power and learning, who are to be asked to speak directly or indirectly *ex cathedra*? Dare we give them, whoever they be, such a trust? And would not their utterance really be lacking in the sort of claim to authority which was given rightly or wrongly to Conciliar utterances?

Would it not really be more true to fact and more desirable in itself that they should—like the writers of the Tracts or of *Lux Mundi* or *Foundations*—stand on their own merits as scholars, thinkers, teachers, representative of the faith of to-day, and not be given a rather doubtful and fallacious authority by being called a Commission, or by being started on their task by the prayers (and the ? confidence) of the Church as a whole and the promised *imprimatur* of its official spokesmen?

All this sounds terribly critical and unwelcoming towards your proposal. I do not at all mean it to have a discouraging effect on your mind, for I share your view that such an endeavour as you suggest is both possible and desirable. But I think it should be quite unofficial, and should carry just the weight which legitimately belongs to it, without the adventitious and I think inappropriate and even anachronistic aid of a sort of official *imprimatur*.

If you have by you the Chronicle of Convocation, and would turn to the debates in the Lower House of Canterbury, in or about 1885 or 1886, on the proposed addenda to the Catechism, you would find what was said by men of that day. Gregory and Bright

on one side, and Dean Vaughan and his friends, including my humble self, on the other; and it all bears, I think, on your proposal, not as a discouragement of the endeavour, but as criticism of the *modus operandi*.[1]

Bishop Burge replied at some length. He answered the central criticism by pointing out that *Lux Mundi* and *Foundations* were both books compiled by like-minded men, the writers of the former volume, in particular, being fully conscious that they were of one mind, and added:

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

September 24, 1921.

Now the method of approach which this Committee desire is something different: it is not a question with them of a group of 'like-minded' men, interested in investigating the subject of the supposed comprehensiveness of the C. of E., and giving the Church and others the benefit of their investigations: they want to see the Church, through its authorities, deliberately setting itself to decide, in the light of the controversies and criticisms, which distract and dishearten so many of its members, and in the light of its own development, where it now stands—and I think the Committee would say that in this way and this way alone would you be able to make the position and the policy of those in authority, what at present it is *not*, intelligible and consistent and convincing.

III

More correspondence followed, and there were further conferences under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Oxford. But in the meantime a good deal of point had been given to the need of a Doctrinal Commission which should investigate the essentials of the Christian Faith in the way proposed, by a Conference of Modern Churchmen held at Cambridge, in August 1921, the

[1] The debate was in February 1889. Dr. Davidson, as Dean of Windsor, was very fond of showing the difficulties of adding to the Church Catechism by quoting the Questions and Answers describing the Church (especially the Anglican Church) as drawn up in 1833 by 'the advance-guard of High Churchmen'. And he stated that this Catechism was 'almost the only document which received in its details the personal supervision of all' the principal Tractarian leaders

Q. What do you mean by 'the Church'?

A. The Society belonging to the Lord Christ.

Q. What branches of the Church continue both in the doctrine and the fellowship?

A. Those called Protestant Episcopal in England, Ireland, Scotland.

papers read being subsequently published in *The Modern Churchman*, September 1921. Various statements of a highly controversial character were made at that Conference by leading spokesmen of the Modernist school, Dr. Major, Dr. Rashdall, and others, on the general subject of 'Christ and the Creeds'. These statements led to a violent discussion, in the Press and elsewhere, and Canterbury Convocation was formally approached by the President and Council of the English Church Union (the leading Anglo-Catholic organization), asking for authoritative condemnation of much of the teaching expounded at the Conference, as 'entirely subversive of the Christian Faith and the Christian Religion'. The Archbishop, in reference to the Petition presented by the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Gibson) in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation, February 15, 1922, made a remark which was somewhat resented by the friends of the English Church Union. He said:

> To judge from some of the things which have been said and written, it might be supposed that there was a great phalanx of heresiarchs set in battle array against the doctrine of the Church Catholic, and that we were called upon to rally the Church in defence of the Christian Faith. I am hardly over-stating the kind of, I will not say, phrases but the kind of representations made as to what is now happening. In my belief the whole of that is grossly exaggerated.

The following correspondence passed:

BISHOP GORE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Private. 6, Margaret St., W. 1. February 17, 22.

I feel constrained to tell you that your speech in Convocation in reference to the E.C.U. petition etc. is to some of us a grievous affliction. I venture to say that this sort of chaff, or apparently light-hearted disparagement of the gravity of the situation tends to drive us wild. It is not a wise way of dealing with us.

I did not sign the petition, because I thought it was perhaps improper for a former member of the House, who might still have been a member if he had willed, to present petitions to it. Also I want to concentrate on the work of presenting the truth independently of authority or ecclesiastical reference. But I feel as if your speech had made it impossible.

I am at a loss to understand what you mean. Has not this Modernist Group in fact shown its hand? You wish to try and persuade me that their position (as Sanday assured us) only

touched facts (miracles) and not doctrines. Now it is quite plain that the most fundamental doctrines of the faith of S. Paul and S. John and the Church are being repudiated from somewhat different points of view by Major, Rashdall and others. It appears to me that if under these circumstances the Bishops do not at the least rebuke them by a solemn reaffirmation of the basis on which the Church of England stands and the message which the ministers of the Church are commissioned to deliver, it will have assented to the idea that Major and Rashdall's teaching is legitimate—a 'school of thought' within the Church of England. They *are* heresiarchs, and very fundamentally so, and very formidable. So I think. I don't know what to do. But I think something must be done to make the Bishops alive to the situation. I never felt 'official optimism' so sickening.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* BISHOP GORE

Private. 18th February 1922.

I thank you cordially for your letter. It always distresses me to find that I have said or done something which afflicts you, and I am afraid the occasions have been a good many. The last thing I wanted to do in this case was to scoff in any way at the uneasiness which is felt, but I do honestly think that the matter has been exaggerated to a degree that you perhaps scarcely realise. I have had letters calling on me to see that these traducers of Our Divine Lord are instantly deprived, and desiring that public meetings should be held for declaring the truth of the Creed, and so on. Of course these are eccentricities, but I genuinely believe that we meet the difficulty best by taking the thing calmly, and, as you know, the Bishop of Gloucester is going to bring it up at the next group of sessions and make some suggestions corresponding probably more or less with what you would be likely to desire. Personally I think the real action we ought to take is exactly the action which you, and others like you, are taking in setting forth the truth in positive form and with the weight of your authority. Your last book is precisely of the sort to which we ought now to call attention, and the fact that it has gone through, as Murray tells me, some fourteen thousand copies (I think I am not mistaken) is really the best assurance that we can have that people are getting the medicine or the food which the conditions of the hour require. I shall be very glad now to get a chance of talking the thing over with you, and you may rely upon it that I am not going to belittle the difficulties of those who are distressed, even though I think their apprehensions are a little out of proportion. I do not know

Mr. Major personally, but it does seem to me that (to put it colloquially) he takes himself a little too seriously, and rather puts on the dress of a leader, which he is not. The testimony to his personal earnestness and devotion and his studious abstention from pressing his views upon those who attend his Lectures is abundant. Headlam's testimony to him is rather remarkable. Does not Headlam, in his article in the *Church Quarterly*, take what you regard as a reasonable view of the situation? But do let us get a talk about it ere long.

In the following May, when the Petition was fully discussed, the Archbishop spoke again in the same sense. His own note of the proceedings runs thus:

The Convocation debates in the first week of May were of the highest importance on the subject of Modernism. In that matter I took, behind the scenes, a leading part. The Resolution passed by Convocation was in itself largely my own work, for the really important part of it was the recognition of the need of free inquiry, and this was wholly due to me.

He made a full speech on May 2, before putting the Resolution, which was carried unanimously as follows:

This House declares its conviction that adhesion to the teaching of the Catholic Church as set forth in the 'Nicene' Creed—and in particular concerning the eternal pre-existence of the Son of God, His true Godhead, and His Incarnation—is essential to the life of the Church, and calls attention to the fact that the Church commissions as its Ministers those only who have solemnly expressed such adhesion.

Further, this House recognises the gain which arises from enquiry, at once fearless and reverent, into the meaning and expression of the Faith, and welcomes every aid which the thoughtful student finds in the results of sound historical and literary criticism, and of modern scientific investigation of the problems of human psychology; and it deprecates the mere blunt denunciation of contributions made by earnest men in their endeavour to bring new light to bear upon these difficult and anxious problems. At the same time it sees a grave and obvious danger in the publication of debateable suggestions as if they were ascertained truths, and emphasises the need of caution in this whole matter, especially on the part of responsible teachers in the Church.

The above Resolution is a further instance of that persistent

Reaffirmation which it was one of the objects of the proposal for a Doctrinal Commission to avoid. But the coincidence of this whole discussion on the Cambridge Conference, with the other discussion on the Doctrinal Commission was probably an assistance to the latter. And it is noteworthy that the Archbishop himself in speaking at the end of the debate and recalling earlier battles and disputes used such sentences as these:

> I believe that the harm which has arisen from some of the controversies in the last 50 years has been largely because of the lack of anything in the nature of mutual conference among the people ranged on particular sides.

and (with reference to a statement by Bishop Samuel Wilberforce):

> When we look back upon that now, do we not see that matters would almost certainly have been dealt with differently, had there been conference and discussion between men who varied in their way of looking at the question, and in their way of presenting it? Does not the quotation of that 'authoritative' utterance, preceded by no Conference, show us the good that may be gained from the sort of discussion that we are considering?

and again:

> One more example. Recall the pathetic divergence between Dr. Liddon and the authors of *Lux Mundi*, especially Dr. Charles Gore. No one can read the extraordinarily touching chapter of the close of Dr. Liddon's life, or refer to two of his final sermons, one on 'The Value of the Old Testament' delivered at Oxford, and one the title of which I forget, preached in St. Paul's Cathedral, without feeling that somehow or other, had the people dealing with the two sides of the question had conference together in the presence of others, the result would have been a gain. Dr. Liddon spoke of Dr. Gore's 'capitulation at the feet of the young Rationalistic Professors'. One cannot help thinking that if there had been conference that sort of thing would never have been said.

IV

The official letter to the Archbishop, suggesting the appointment of a Commission on Christian Doctrine, was presented in January 1922. It was signed by nine Diocesan Bishops, by

seventeen clergy, Anglo-Catholic, Evangelical, and Modernist, and by one layman (Mr. Spens).

Memorial to the ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

January 1922.

Your Grace,

After discussing the subject at a series of Meetings, we desire to suggest to your Grace the appointment of a Commission to endeavour to find a basis of doctrinal agreement on matters which are the subject of controversy between different sections of the Church of England.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the methods of controversy traditional in ecclesiastical matters show no prospect of yielding any fruitful results. They rather tend to perpetuate the existence of hostility and suspicion, and to divert to the sphere of controversy energies which should be devoted to the edification of the faithful and to the conversion of unbelievers both at home and abroad. Moreover, the perpetuation of controversy weakens the loyalty of individuals and their sense of obligation to the Church of which they are members, and it renders the Church as a whole powerless to give her proper witness in the political and social difficulties of the present time. Consequently many men of all parties are growing weary of disputes and are anxious to find a basis of agreement with other elements in the English Church. In view of the great efforts that are being made to secure reunion with other Christian bodies it seems only reasonable that such efforts should find their necessary complement within the Church of England; indeed, reunion with other bodies without a more real unity among ourselves will at best only increase the existing confusion.

We do not disguise from ourselves the possibility that the attempt to find a basis of doctrinal agreement might reveal the existence of differences of so irremovable a character as to render impossible anything but a purely artificial and external unity based on the fact of the Establishment rather than on agreement in belief. There are, indeed, critics of the Church of England who say that, in fact, our differences are fundamental. We believe, however, agreement might be reached both on the essentials of the Christian faith, and on the more important of those points of controversy which have bitterly divided us in the past. We believe that an enquiry animated by nothing but the desire to arrive at the truth would ultimately reveal that the matters on which agreement was impossible were those on which differences of opinion are obviously legitimate and even, within certain limits, desirable. Possibly some few, as the result of such an agreement, might secede voluntarily

to other bodies, though our whole purpose is not to promote but to preclude secession. But it is becoming increasingly clear that the only adequate safeguard against far more serious disruption lies not in the fact of the Establishment, but in securing a genuine unity of belief. We are convinced that in spite of her failings the Church of England stands for a certain vital aspect of Christianity, and that it should prove possible for the vast majority of her members to agree upon an unambiguous statement of her doctrines to which they could give general adherence. On the other hand, we desire to make clear that we would wish such a statement to be regarded not as a new test but as an expression of the Church's official teaching.

Whether or no the human mind is capable of attaining absolute truth, we should be disloyal to our faith if we denied that if men sincerely and prayerfully seek truth they will approach nearer to it and therefore to each other. Such a failure of faith would create a dangerous atmosphere of distrust at a time when fundamental doctrines are being brought into question.

Again, it is of almost primary importance to solve the actual pastoral problem which is presented by directly contradictory teaching in different parishes in respect of doctrines which are closely bound up with the devotional life of all Christians. Such contradictions often affect disastrously the religious life of individuals. They constitute also a graver obstacle than is ordinarily recognized to the evangelization of the nation.

People differ on particular questions because they differ as to the grounds of belief; it is through re-examination of these grounds that differences will be reconciled and agreement will be reached. Such re-examination appears to us also to be required for this other reason: our apologetic as well as our doctrinal teaching is inconsistent, and is therefore far less effective than it ought to be. We are now face to face with serious tendencies of modern thought and teaching which assail not only Christian doctrine but also Christian morality. Our apologetic therefore needs to be consistent and convincing.

We believe that a sincere attempt to surmount our differences will be fruitful of much good; that it might secure a substantial unity of doctrine in matters of importance, while neither imposing a cut-and-dried system nor creating new tests, nor ignoring the fact that different temperaments need different methods of devotion. We urge therefore that a commission should be appointed for this purpose.

At the same time, we are convinced that certain conditions are, humanly speaking, essential if any good result is to be attained by

such a step; and we have in mind especially three suggestion which appear to us so important that we venture to put them before your Grace. In the first place, the work should be undertaken with a very great sense of responsibility and should be solemnly commended by authority to the prayers of the Church. Secondly, it should be recognized from the first that any such commission can only adequately achieve its purpose by systematic work extending over a *long* period: in short, that the work should be regarded as no less onerous and no less important than, for example, the production of the R.V. of the New Testament. On the other hand,we think it would be essential that an interim report should be presented in a year or two, in order that the committee should not be continued unless a substantial measure of success seemed likely to be secured.

We believe also that the choice of men to serve on the Commission should be determined mainly by four considerations:

(i) They must be thoroughly representative of all those parties in the Church, however extreme in whatever direction, which are willing to seek a basis of agreement.

(ii) They must be men of wide sympathies and tolerant temper, who will be able and anxious to understand each other's position.

(iii) They must be men of constructive minds. Men may have all the qualities mentioned above and yet lack the imaginative power to create a synthesis.

(iv) In order that continuity of work and thought may be secured, a large proportion of them should be comparatively young men, say under forty-five.

We desire to be always,
Your Grace's obedient and faithful servants,

H. M. Oxon:	M. E. Atlay.	O. Quick.
G. Bristol.	G. H. Clayton.	C. E. Raven.
J. E. Chelmsford.	A. S. Duncan-Jones.	T. G. Rogers.
H. L. Chester.	M. G. Glazebrook.	E. G. Selwyn.
M. L. Hereford.	H. L. Goudge.	C. J. Shebbeare.
J. Lichfield.	A. W. Greenup.	W. Spens.
W. Manchester.	G. F. Irwin.	L. S. Thornton.
T. Petriburg:	W. Knox.	F. Underhill.
M. St. Alban:	J. K. Mozley.	H. A. Wilson.

The Archbishop, after consulting some of the Bishops and others, replied with friendliness but also with caution. He asked for more particulars, and was unwilling to give a *carte blanche*. Above

all, any statement which such a Commission might produce must not be a new test of orthodoxy, as another Thirty-nine Articles:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF OXFORD

15th February, 1922.

I do not see my way to doing exactly what your letter asks. I am profoundly conscious of the truth of your contention as to the confusion, the harmfulness, and the probable needlessness of a great deal of present-day controversy within the Church. The second paragraph of your letter has my full concurrence. I believe accordingly that endeavours may usefully be made to obtain by conferences 'a basis of doctrinal agreement on matters which are the subject of controversy between different sections of the Church of England'.

My difficulty arises when you go on to advocate the procedure which, in your judgement, might now be usefully adopted. You ask me to appoint a Commission consisting in large proportion of comparatively young men, 'thoroughly representative of all those parties in the Church, however extreme in whatever direction, which are willing to seek a basis of agreement', in order that, with a view to 'securing a genuine unity of belief', they may draw up 'an unambiguous statement of the doctrines [of the Church of England] to which they could give general adherence'; this statement 'to be regarded . . . as an expression of the Church's official teaching'.

The gravity and far-reaching character of this proposal are such as to make me wonder whether it does not say more than you actually mean. If it were laid upon me to appoint with such instruction or 'reference' a Commission to be 'solemnly commended by authority to the prayers of the Church' for a task which, in your judgment, would certainly occupy several years, I honestly confess that I do not know to what body of picked men, a large proportion of them under forty-five years of age, I could properly assign it, or what character or authority would belong to such 'expression of the Church's official teaching' when ultimately produced.

I should like to have a clearer indication of the sort of questions —theological, ecclesiastical, or practical—to which you think such a Commission might find useful answer, and in what sort of shape you suggest that such answer should be formulated. I should also like to have some indication as to the number of men, roughly speaking, whom you have in mind for the constitution of such a

Commission, and as to its relation, if any, to the existing Synodical and Constitutional bodies of the Church of England.

The Bishop and his fellow memorialists answered:

The BISHOP OF OXFORD *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

May 4, 1922.

In reply to your Grace, we would wish to make clear that we do not contemplate, and have never contemplated, authority being given to a commission to frame either a statement of doctrine which would be binding on the Church or the clergy, or even a statement of doctrine which would *ipso facto* be held to be the official teaching of the Church. In regard to the first of these possibilities, we have emphatically no desire to see new tests imposed. We believe that doctrinal agreement has a legitimate claim to be regarded as authoritative precisely in the degree in which it is a free agreement. In regard to the second possibility, any such procedure would be obviously inconsistent with due regard for the function of the Episcopate. It is for the Bishops to consider how far further action might be desirable in regard to any agreed conclusions which such a commission might reach.

What we are immediately concerned to secure is not this or that expression of closer agreement between different points of view when once this has been reached, but a step which will emphasize the importance of closer agreement and which will initiate a more systematic effort to find bases for such agreement. We have repudiated any desire to see the enforcement by authority of a series of doctrinal conclusions. But we would wish to quote and to make our own a sentence which occurs in the course of a vigorous protest against such a use of authority. In his published reply to Cardinal Mercier, Father Tyrrell wrote as follows:—

> I am not blind to the fact that variety without unity may be almost as great an evil as unity without variety; that where general agreement is not the goal of all individual effort, and where diversity is accepted as final and satisfactory, there can be no progress, but only an aimless analysis and disintegration.

With many of Father Tyrrell's conclusions and arguments we should disagree; but apart from the question of which of the two evils he mentions is the greater, we find it impossible to frame a better statement of our attitude to doctrinal unity. Both an enforced uniformity, and acquiescence, indefinitely continued, in grave doctrinal differences, which closely affect the religious life of

every member of the Church, seem to us to be serious dangers to the well-being of the Church.

We are convinced that the problem is not merely to discover an agreement which already exists. On a number of important questions there is disagreement which is as real as it is disastrous. We would submit to your Grace, with all the emphasis within our power, that our present disagreements can only be overcome in any degree by a laborious and systematic effort to reconcile different points of view in a clearer apprehension of those truths of which the different points of view give a partial presentation. We are jealous for liberty of thought, but we are no less desirous that every effort should be made to reconcile disagreements by a closer approach to truth, that this goal should be steadily set before the Church by those in authority, and that those in authority should themselves initiate a more systematic effort, in this direction. Valuable and necessary as are informal conferences, in our judgement there is also required a more systematic, laborious and continued effort than can thus be secured. We are anxious to see the Bishops themselves initiate such an effort, because their action would bring before the Church the importance of finding and appreciating the real agreement that lies behind divergencies, and of diminishing as far as possible these divergencies, and would thus do much to create the right atmosphere for the enquiry; but we also desire official action, because such an effort would be so onerous, as well as so important, that men could only fairly be asked to co-operate in it in response to an authoritative appeal.

The letter concluded by suggesting a method of selecting the members of the Commission and Terms of Reference, and stated finally:

That the Report of the Commission should not be an authoritative statement, but would, we hope, be laid before the Bishops for them to consider what further action (if any) should be taken.

After further correspondence about procedure, the Archbishop of Canterbury sent the following letter to the Bishop of Oxford appointing the Commission and giving the names of the members:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF OXFORD

Lambeth Palace, S.E. December 28, 1922.

In pursuance of my letter of September 8 and of your subsequent letter of November 29, I write on behalf of the Archbishop of York and myself to say that it is our wish to nominate those whose names

I append hereto to act as a Commission with the following Reference—

> To consider the nature and grounds of Christian Doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences.

We note and approve your proposal that the Report of the Commission should not be an authoritative statement, but that it should, when prepared, be laid before the Bishops for them to consider what further action (if any) should be taken.

List of those suggested as Members of the Commission on Christian Doctrine.

The Bishop of Oxford.	Professor W. Moberly.[2]
The Bishop of Manchester.	The Rev. J. K. Mozley.
The Dean of Bristol.[1]	The Rev. Canon O. C. Quick.
The Rev. F. R. Barry.	The Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson.
The Rev. Preb. E. J. Bicknell.	The Rev. E. G. Selwyn.
The Rev. J. M. Creed.	The Rev. C. J. Shebbeare.
The Rev. Canon J. R. Darbyshire.	W. Spens, Esq.
The Rev. C. W. Emmet.	The Rev. Canon V. F. Storr.
The Rev. H. B. Gooding.	The Rev. Canon B. H. Streeter.
The Rev. L. W. Grensted.	Professor A. E. Taylor.
The Rev. W. L. Knox.	The Rev. L. S. Thornton.
The Rev. Prof. W. R. Matthews.	Professor C. C. J. Webb.

The Rev. Canon H. Albert Wilson.

It will be noted that the names represent all schools of thought, and include a large number of distinguished theologians. The first Meeting was held at University College, Oxford, in September 1923. The Bishop of Oxford served as Chairman until his resignation and death in 1925, when the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Temple)[3] took his place.

[1] Dr. E. A. Burroughs, afterwards Bishop of Ripon.
[2] This name was not in the original letter, but was added in the published list.
[3] Afterwards Archbishop of York. The Commission is still sitting (1935).

CHAPTER LXXIII

THE ARCHBISHOP AT SEVENTY-FIVE

Biography, the most interesting perhaps of every species of composition, loses all its interest with me, when the shades and lights of the principal character are not accurately and faithfully detailed; nor have I much patience with such exaggerated daubing as Mr. Hayley has bestowed upon poor Cowper. I can no more sympathize with a mere eulogist than I can with a ranting hero upon the stage.

LOCKHART, *Life of Scott*, ch. xi.

IN 1923 Randall Davidson completed the twentieth year of his primacy and the seventy-fifth year of his age. The double anniversary itself evoked a great warmth of feeling on all sides. His hold on the public mind had steadily grown. He was better known than he had ever been before; and his simplicity as well as his shrewdness won him a large popular regard, while his chairmanship of the Church Assembly for the past three years had made him, at the end of his life, both a familar and a venerated figure amongst Churchmen all over England. In other Churches, too, he was regarded with deep respect, and even affection, as letters from a Cardinal, a Patriarch, and Free Church leaders abundantly testified. Indeed it is very remarkable to observe the growth of his influence as Archbishop of Canterbury.

I

When he became Primate, he was regarded at best as an ecclesiastical statesman, at worst as an opportunist and a courtier. The world at large simply did not know very much about him. In the first few years, he still seemed to the man in the street a prelate with a broad mind, but much more interested in the conduct of public affairs and political or semi-political controversies than in the intimate life of the Church. And a large portion of the memoranda covering the years before the War do in fact show his extraordinary interest, almost at times his absorption, in successive political crises. They also show the considerable personal part which he played behind the scenes as well as sometimes with decisive effect in his place in Parliament. The great business of administration, of course, went on all the time—and very efficient administration—but without any such striking events in the

general stream of religious life as would impress the imagination of the outsider.

Then came the War. All political controversies were silenced —and the popular mind and the time of Parliament alike were occupied in the primary task of organizing for victory. Up to the very outbreak of the conflict, from the point of view of the ordinary man, Randall Davidson was still rather an increasingly important figure in the background than a great public character: a very cautious and a very wary man, not too anxious to commit himself. With the growing gravity of the War, he gradually emerged. His steadfastness and his devotion to the work in hand made their impression. His refusal to be carried away, whether in ultra-nationalism or ultra-pacificism, begot a confidence in his judgement. There was something massive about him, massive and true. And throughout the four and a half years of the War, on the repeated solemn occasions on which he had to address the whole people at or through special national services, he spoke the brave, strong, and heartening words of a Christian bishop. He said nothing common, or mean—nothing vindictive. On the contrary, he did not hesitate, in the very midst of the conflict, to utter his protests against actions and speeches which seemed to him unworthy of the traditions of his country. It is true that he lacked the high and imaginative ardour of a seer, and set small store by sentimental oratory, or idealistic appeals, trusting rather to the arguments of what he called common sense. But, perhaps for that very reason, people would often take much from him which they would not have taken from more prophetic and enthusiastic lips. Certainly he was far better known, and more fully respected, when the Armistice was signed than he had ever been before.

With the close of the War, he emerged still further. And we notice two facts of deep interest. He retained his old concern for political crises, and his passion for knowing as much as possible of what went forward in those circles. But there he was much more the spectator than the actor.

The first striking fact which we notice is that he tended much more to prove himself the great constructive Churchman. This revealed itself in one or two ways. Thus the holding of the Lambeth Conference, in 1920, under his presidency marked a great epoch not only in the idea of Christian unity but in the setting

on foot of constructive plans towards its achievement. The appeal to All Christian People resounded through Christendom, inevitably carrying Archbishop Davidson's name whithersoever it went. Again, the passing of the Enabling Act in 1919, and still more the regular sitting of the new Church Assembly from 1920 onwards, not only showed Dr. Davidson as the prudent master builder of the Church of England, but also revealed him to the rank and file of Church people all over the country both as a most considerate and impartial Chairman and as a living human being, in a way that was impossible before.

The second fact of outstanding interest is this. During the War and the years that followed, the office of Archbishop of Canterbury gathered to itself a wholly new character in the international field. Appeals began to reach Lambeth from all over the world. Patriarchs and Metropolitans, and the various oppressed and persecuted Churches in the East, begged for and even demanded his support or intervention. This was largely due, no doubt, to the great political prestige of Great Britain, and the assumption that the Archbishop of Canterbury would be able to exercise a corresponding authority. It was owing in part to the special quality and the historic character and continuity of the Church of England and its sister Churches—a character which made the judgement of the Lambeth Conference a much wider affair than the opinions of new Assemblies on a world-wide scale meeting for the first time. But it was also due to the feeling of trust in the personality of Dr. Randall Davidson which had been tested over so many difficult years. It was not only appeals that reached Lambeth, but requests for counsel and leadership. 'What do they think of us at Lambeth?' was, said Dr. J. R. Mott, the missionary traveller and statesman, in May 1923 to the Archbishop, the sort of question which he was continually asked in his journeys up and down the world. Certain it is that during Randall Davidson's tenure of the archiepiscopal see the office of Archbishop of Canterbury acquired a commanding position in the communions of Christendom unprecedented in the previous history of the Church.

II

Dr. Davidson had a long experience of archbishops and bishops on which to look back, and used at times to speak of the difference

between their duties, or their times, and his. In this very year —1923—shortly after his seventy-fifth birthday, when pondering the possibility of resigning, he spoke in a ruminating sort of way to his chaplain of the contrasts behind and of the difficulties ahead; and the following is a note which that chaplain made at the time. It was May 21, 1923, actually the day on which Bonar Law's resignation of the Premiership was announced—a fact no doubt that stirred his own thoughts. He said that he sometimes wondered whether the time had not come for him to hand over to another who was more in touch with the needs of the generation than himself. Looking at the last three Archbishops he felt that Tait was *felix opportunitate mortis*—he had done a great work placing the Church in the life of the nation—but would have had no understanding of or patience with ecclesiastical details and the disputes of Benson's time. He felt that Benson again had died *feliciter*, for the modern movement of parochial church councils etc. would have simply irritated him, but he had done great work in other more ecclesiastical fields. Temple's best work had been done before he came to Lambeth. For himself he felt that he had done good work in certain directions, in launching the new Church Assembly, in keeping the balance in favour of Liberalism and enabling both conservative and advanced thinkers to remain in post. But had the time come to end? He did not want his primacy to end in a feeble way. He wondered whether he was a drag on modern ways: there ought to be a drag—it was useful: but the drag ought not to be in the position of leader. Particularly he wondered how far he was in sympathy with the modern social interpretations of Christianity and modern modes of worship. If he resigned, no doubt his position would be a difficult one; people seeing him about would wonder why he resigned, if he kept well—and it would be difficult not to do things if he were still able to take an active part.

A month or two later, on July 13, following a tumultuous meeting of the Anglo-Catholic Congress at the Albert Hall, at which the Bishop of Zanzibar (Weston) appealed to the Congress to insist on their right to worship Christ in the Tabernacle and said that he did not ask the Clergy to obey their Bishops except when acting in accordance with Catholic tradition, the Bishop of Salisbury, who had been present, told him: 'We are in for a new Reformation', to which the Archbishop had replied: 'If it is to be

a new Reformation, younger men must tackle it. I am too old for that.' And he was very much depressed, and added: 'I feel very Protestant to-day.'

The remarks thus quoted about his personal problem were more in the nature of thinking aloud than a demand for an answer; and certainly any for whose opinion he did actually ask were of one mind in bidding him stay where he was. But they throw an interesting light on his view of his predecessors and of contemporary problems.

Similarly, he used sometimes to speak of the difference between Bishops as he knew them first in Tait's day, and the modern Bench. Bishops were 'more interesting' in Tait's time, and later, than they were in his own Primacy, though the general level of present-day Bishops was higher; and in the old days there were great clashes in the Bishops' Meetings.[1] He also recalled his own time as diocesan Bishop, occupying one of the four sets of episcopal lodgings in the Lollards' Tower at Lambeth Palace, where he lived for years with three great men, all very learned, who between them could answer any question you might ask.[2] Of those who had been diocesan Bishops when he was enthroned, only three—the Bishops of London (Winnington Ingram), Wakefield (Eden), and Liverpool (Chavasse) still held the same sees in the same Provinces—while Bishop Talbot had been twice translated,[3] and Dr. Edwards, Archbishop of Wales (Bishop of St. Asaph, 1889), Dr. Owen, Bishop of St. David's (consecrated 1897), and Dr. Williams, Bishop of Bangor (consecrated in 1898), had in 1920 become Bishops of the disestablished Church of Wales. Of the newer Bishops, as it seemed to him, there were few with whom he could take intimate counsel as he used to take counsel with Bishops Paget[4] and Wordsworth. It is true that Bishops felt the increasing claims of diocesan work, in modern conditions; but they were extraordinarily loyal to the Archbishop, readily responding to his special calls, as well as faithful in attendance at Bishops' meetings. The taking of counsel, in a regular way, over large questions, was a difficult thing; though sometimes Dr. Davidson was perhaps unduly despon-

[1] See *Life of Robert Gray*, II 33–51.

[2] Dr. Stubbs (Oxford), Dr. Westcott (Durham), Dr. John Wordsworth (Salisbury).

[3] Appointed Bishop of Rochester, 1895; Southwark, 1905, Winchester, 1911.

[4] Bishop of Oxford.

dent, feeling that Bishops could not realize how much was done by Lambeth and by Lambeth alone.

On the Archbishop of York, however, from 1909 onwards, Dr. Davidson came to lean more and more. He was the closest counsellor and most trusted of all, both most unselfish in his readiness to come from York to Lambeth to consult about the affairs of the Church, and most effective in the advice he gave. Indeed, it may be questioned whether the Archbishops of Canterbury and York were ever before in the history of the Church of England on such intimate terms of mutual trust and affection.

The Archbishop of York in 1928 became Archbishop of Canterbury, and by his kindness the biographer is able to print Dr. Lang's own view of the constant and intimate consultations:

> I have been asked to write a Note about the relationship between the Archbishops of the two Provinces during twenty years of Archbishop Davidson's tenure of his office. It may, I am sure, be confidently said that never before in history had this relation been more close and cordial. Indeed it was a co-operation so unprecedented that it seems in itself to be an event noteworthy in the long history of the Church of England. It is very difficult to compress within a few sentences any account of an intercourse so constant and so prolonged. It was an honour and a privilege for a man much younger in years to be taken from the first into the full confidence of Archbishop Davidson, to learn from him as from a Master, to watch his knowledge, wisdom, and experience at work among all the problems—national and ecclesiastical—of his time.
>
> We had, of course, our distinctive outlooks and temperaments, but I cannot remember (except perhaps once) any real difference. His calls for such help and counsel as I could give were somewhat exacting in view of my own work as Bishop of a large Diocese and Archbishop of the Province of York: but I regarded each call as an honour, and tried to obey it. Constant visits to London were made the easier by the kindness with which the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson (as she then was) made me look upon Lambeth Palace as my London home for all these twenty years. My memory will always recall talks in the Study at Lambeth, prolonged far into the night, and Mrs. Davidson looking in to rebuke us and bidding her husband go to bed. At the beginning of almost every year, I used to spend a week at Canterbury for a more unhurried review of current and ultimate problems of the Church than was possible at Lambeth.

Let me try, though it is not easy, to summarise some of the impressions made upon my mind by these years of intimate co-operation. He carried into every detail of his work a deep, it sometimes seemed an almost burdensome, sense of his responsibility. He approached every letter he had to write, every person he had to see, with the same thoughtful care as he gave to large matters of policy. It was indeed his chief pleasure in life to talk to important persons about important affairs; but to all sorts of people, whether important or unimportant, he would give the best of his experience, judgement, and sympathy.

Again, it was most impressive to watch the exercise of his singular gift of judgement. On every matter which came before him he would ponder over every aspect of the case, every word he wrote or spoke about it, and the result always seemed to have the quality of decisiveness. Respect for and trust in his judgement was a chief cause of his ever increasing influence. It can well be imagined how deeply touched I was by the words twice repeated in the final Blessing he gave me, as recorded on another page—'Give him judgement'.

It is not for me to speak here of other elements in his character, as I am only speaking of impressions made by seeing him at work. But I cannot close without some reference to his religion. Doubtless in the overwhelming pressure of his life he had little time for private meditation or prayer; but it always seemed to me that his whole work was done in the spirit and atmosphere of prayer, in the desire to see the God-ward aspect of every matter with which he had to deal; and in constant and humble reliance on the guidance and help of God.

After watching him for twenty years in the midst of his ceaseless labours for the Church and people I feel that no words more fitly sum up my impressions than those which his wife chose for his grave in the Cloister Garth at Canterbury—'He fed them with a faithful and true heart: and ruled them prudently with all his power'.

And Archbishop Lang's judgement may fitly be followed by a long letter also specially written to the biographer by Bishop Gore (July 23, 1931):

You asked me to write some kind of 'impression' of the great Archbishop. I have been first sick, and then busy with arrears and other necessary occupations, but this letter is intended as a meagre fulfilment of what I think I promised in response to your request. You can, with my good will, either (*a*) put this letter when you have read it into the waste paper basket as not wanted for your

purposes or (*b*) send it back requesting alteration or omission or expansion or (*c*) make any use of it you please as it stands.

I had very little personal contact with R. D. till I became a bishop in 1901–2. I knew how much intimate friends of mine admired him (him and Lady D.[1] taken together), but I had not much personal experience. I disliked his Erastianism (in the popular rather than the historical sense of this word) and what I dare say I should have called his 'official optimism'. While I was a diocesan bishop (1902–19), he was, as you know, very kind to me and guided me in my ignorance. But we had several collisions of a rather serious kind. This is not the place to expound my own views, except as illustrating the Archbishop's mind. I desired the C. of E. to be the home of a wide toleration. but a toleration which had declared limits. I did not want doctrinal prosecutions, in view of the unsatisfactory nature of the court and other causes, but I wanted the bishops to make evident that denial of the historical articles of the Creeds, on the part of the clergy, could not be countenanced or accepted as tolerable. I drew up a resolution which I should have wished the bishops to pass: which, he said, if it were passed, would force him to resign. I did not desire any such thing, and knew of course that the merest hint of such a consequence would prevent its passing. It was on event amended, and passed in a form which rejoiced me, and was reiterated several times. One of the bishops—Dr. Chase—took it seriously, and acted upon it. But I think the Archbishop's attitude, and that of most of the bishops, was to regard it as something done to satisfy dogmatic persons and not to be seriously acted upon. I was reminded of a saying of Dr. Jayne's, that the bishops were like the slothful man in Proverbs who fails to roast what he took in hunting. But in the Archbishop's case it was assuredly not sloth which affected him. It was a deliberate desire to avoid raising a clear issue, and to maintain a tone of official and general optimism by the avoidance of definition. We had another collision over the definition (for the purpose of the New Church Assembly) of the Churchman who should be admitted to vote—whether confirmation should be required. Here again I was struck (with his justice to me in giving me full opportunity to say what I wanted but also) with his deliberate unwillingness to bring a clear principle forward to

[1] The Bishop of Wakefield (Dr. Seaton) told the biographer that when he, as Principal of Cuddesdon, paid his first visit to Lambeth in August 1914, on the invitation of the Archbishop, Bishop Gore, as Bishop of Oxford, said to him, 'Have you never met the Archbishop before? Well, you are going to the most beautiful home in England—with not a particle of side or swagger about it, and you will meet the very wisest man in all England—and as for Mrs. Davidson, she is a pearl among women.'

determine an issue. The clearest declaration of principle I remember him making was his declaration on the essential independence of the Church in spiritual matters, which he made after the rejection of the Revised Prayer Book by the House of Commons. I never got to know him very well till I had resigned my bishopric and came to live in London. Then I used very often to sup at Lambeth on Sundays and have long talks with the Archbishop in his study, who told me everything that was going on, and wanted to hear what I had got to say. Then we became very intimate. We knew to the end that there was a difference of principle between us. But I was overwhelmed by the sense of his personal goodness: his exceedingly genuine humility and the total absence of spite or uncharitableness or injustice in his character. His deep knowledge of the evil in the world, whether the secular world or the religious, which he never attempted to minimize, never dimmed his Christian outlook or his sense of mercy. He hated the knowledge of sin, which was always being presented to him, but it never embittered him. I never saw him out of temper, even when he was confronted with some one deliberately provoking or maliciously misrepresenting him. And the depth and sincerity of his personal religious life—his life of prayer—was unmistakable. In spite of his attitude towards 'heretics', I do not think he was ever touched by 'doubts' in his own mind.

Intellectually what was most noticeable in him was his almost miraculous memory for persons and events, not only ecclesiastical persons or events. He was not a philosopher, or a man of letters, nor perhaps would you call him a theologian—though his knowledge of the theological opinions current in the Victorian Church, and in the first decade of this century, was wide and accurate—his chief interest was in persons and events. He loved his position in the House of Lords. It may be doubted whether any Archbishop during the centuries since the Reformation has held the position he did in the House of Lords: but there, I think, nothing gave him more satisfaction than to correct erroneous statements as to matters of fact. Only the future can decide whether the almost absolute mastery which he won in the counsels of the bishops—both those of the Church in England and those of other lands—was wholly good for the Anglican Communion. But I do not think any one can doubt that it was gained and deepened to the end in the main by the grand and stainless character of the man.

I am rather ashamed of sending you this. You must take it as a rough statement which must be revised, when you can give me an idea whether you want it, or what you want in it.

The letter shows in a striking way the difference in outlook between the two men. Dr. Gore delighted in opportunities for making things precise and clear, and there were many amusing friendly dialogues between them. Thus, in June 1923, when they were talking together about Cardinal Mercier, and the Archbishop had to say something somewhat careful in public to prepare people for the announcement about the Malines Conversations at the end of the year, he said to Bishop Gore, 'I don't think I gave anything away', and, when Bishop Gore replied, 'On the contrary', the Archbishop added, 'Of course people may think that I failed to seize an opportunity—yes, but I do not want to grasp an opportunity at the risk of being misunderstood'. And there is also a story told by Dr. Gore himself about his attitude when approaching the Archbishop's study for a talk on some subject of importance, and his attitude at the moment of departing when the talk was done. The Bishop is speaking to a friend:

'When I go up the stairs at Lambeth, I say, *Charles, you be very careful.*

When I come down the stairs, I say, *Charles, you know that you never meant to agree to that.*'

It must be admitted that others besides Dr. Gore lamented what he describes as the avoidance of definition. Convinced evangelicals, for example, while very well aware that Archbishop Davidson was no ritualist, could not understand his steady persistence along a middle course, and were inclined to put it down to a want of conviction. He gave the impression not of leading the Church in a direction which he had thought out, but of being led by circumstances as they arose; and of disliking to face the ultimate consequences of each step in his policy. And so far as ritual is concerned, it must be acknowledged that there was some truth in this charge. He was, as we shall see, not really interested in the intricacies of Prayer Book Revision; and here it might be the case that those who knew their own mind were able—in a phrase sometimes used by Dr. Gore—to 'squeeze' him. But with regard to the deepest things, and what he believed to be the essentials of the Christian faith itself, and also the call and character of the Church of England, avoidance of meticulous definition was a foundation principle, because he believed that such avoidance was a part of the faith.

And more still must be said. There are two kinds of leadership.

There are those who are leaders of a cause on the success of which they stake everything they have: and all their efforts, all their acts, are devoted to the achievement of their particular plan or their particular doctrine. Such leaders will drive forward as fast as they can, and will cry aloud to their followers to make haste after them. But there is another kind of leader, who having a charge entrusted to him and a body of people at whose head he is placed, rather seeks to act as the interpreter of the best mind that is in them and to give it expression, to discover the *communis sensus* of the society, and to use all the means in his power to give it the opportunity of expression. Such a leader will guide and will show the way, and he will teach and suggest, but he will not be likely to lift his voice from the housetops, and to cry aloud to the laggards to come on at full speed. He will realize the diversity of human nature, of the material with which he has to deal, and will give it, or lead it to, the best and the highest unity of which he believes it to be capable under the given conditions. Such a man will not be the leader of a forlorn hope. His is the leadership of the Chairman or the Moderator. He will wish to keep the boat even, without endangering the passengers. He prefers peace and agreement before violence and confusion. He runs the risk of misrepresentation, and is unlikely to win great popular applause. But he is not on that account to be dismissed as an unsuitable kind of leader in dangerous and unsettled times.

III

Although no Archbishop of Canterbury is free to give all the time he would wish to the care of his Diocese, Dr. Davidson took a very real interest in the life and work of the Church in East Kent and Croydon. He did not, at least in the years after the War, travel about in the parishes a great deal, but he was always accessible both to clergy and laity who desired his help. And he constantly surprised successive Bishops of Dover by his personal knowledge both of men and places. Again, he always endeavoured to attend the annual Meeting of the Church of England Temperance Society and preached on the Sunday in the town in which the Meetings were being held. Further, he did all he could to promote the work of moral welfare throughout the Diocese. From the very first year of their married life, he and Mrs. Davidson had felt the call of this particular need with special

force, and the moral welfare workers knew that they had in both him and his wife a true friend and counsellor. Indeed, in this work he had been, from Rochester days onwards, a pioneer. So far as the general parochial work of the Diocese was concerned, he used such special opportunities for getting to know the parishes as those provided by the annual Weeks of Prayer and Preaching held in different deaneries each year in the autumn. The special missioners or preachers were commissioned by him, as a rule on the Saturday afternoon, in one of the churches in the deanery, and in addition he would take his turn as preacher on the Sunday in one or more churches in the deanery. Most of his residence was inevitably at Lambeth Palace. But the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson used to go to Canterbury for certain special periods or events, the two Ordinations at Advent and Trinity, Whitsuntide, the weeks around Christmas, and a longer spell in the autumn, including as much as possible of the months of October and November. Each autumn too he held the Annual Meeting of Archdeacons and Rural Deans, an occasion which was thoroughly valued by both sides and gave the Archbishop an opportunity of counsel and information on both diocesan and general questions. In the summer the Diocesan Conference took place, and this gave the Archbishop an opportunity, which he used to the full, of abundant hospitality to the Diocese as a whole in the Old Palace. Many were invited to stay for a couple of nights, and there was an At Home in the evening for all members of the Conference, where there was a quite extraordinary atmosphere of affection and welcome. It has not been possible to deal in detail with the diocesan side of the Archbishop's work, in which he was most admirably served by the Suffragan Bishops of Dover and Croydon, but just so much has been said lest it should appear through omission that he was wanting in devotion to the Diocese, or in the affection and trust of his clergy and laity.

IV

The Archbishop's counsellors and friends were by no means all of them diocesan bishops; and they were extraordinarily varied in character.

One was Sir Lewis Dibdin. He was Dean of the Arches, and First Church Estates Commissioner. In 1924, on the resignation of Lord Parmoor, he succeeded also to the office of Vicar-General.

Sir Lewis was in almost daily contact with the Archbishop all the time he was at Lambeth and was consulted upon almost everything, though seldom (if ever) on ecclesiastical appointments. He was very learned and very conscientious, but somewhat impatient of criticism from those less learned than himself. He was a disciple of Archbishop Benson, but, unlike his master, an evangelical. He was also a strong Establishment man. The Archbishop owed much to his service in all sorts of ways, and no trouble was too great for Sir Lewis to take, as the countless memoranda in the files bearing his name make plain. Incidentally, he gave ungrudging help in difficult cases concerning clerical discipline. The Archbishop always attached great importance to his counsel, yet followed the wise Rule of St. Benedict where it says of the abbot: *Audiens consilium fratrum, tractet apud se.*

Another counsellor was the Bishop of Dover, Dr. Bilbrough, most cheerful and faithful of Suffragans, through whom the Archbishop kept in the closest relations with the Diocese of Canterbury, and with whom he often went fishing in Scotland in the summer. Another was Mrs. Creighton, most staunch and indomitable. And there were many besides. The Archbishop kept his mind and his affections open to old and young. Sometimes the latter regarded him as a little too inclined, as they put it, 'to take the wind out of a man'. Thus, a junior overseas Bishop once said that the Archbishop was a 'champion deflator', his policy being to stretch your proposal at once to its extremest logical conclusion, and if you suggested the desirability of having more Bishops, he would show it to be ridiculous by saying, 'I suppose you mean that every Rural Dean should be a Bishop.' But, though Randall Davidson was critical of vagueness and windiness, and liked to bring men down to the earth, their habitation, no one was more ready to listen, and to try to understand the thoughts of the younger generation. He won the friendship and the reverence of all sorts and kinds of people. Men and women, when they went to see him, got a sense of security from their talks, and even a man so utterly unlike the Archbishop as the writer Joseph Conrad said, fresh from seeing him for the first time at the Old Palace, in January 1923, 'I go back to my work sustained.'

Sometimes from the style and tone of letters addressed to him (as both Lockhart and Southey observe) a man's character may

be gathered even more surely than from those written by himself.[1] The Archbishop, during his summer holidays, used to spend a few days at Cloan with the Haldanes, and he delighted not only in his friendship with the Lord Chancellor and his sister, Elizabeth Haldane, but in the wonderful charm of their mother. Two birthday letters in the two years following the Archbishop's seventy-fifth birthday, which passed between him and Mrs. Haldane, are too touching not to be reproduced. The first is a reply to the Archbishop's counsel on her entering the centenary year:

MRS. HALDANE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Cloan, Auchterarder, N.B. May 3rd, 1924.

I would have written immediately on the receipt of your most exquisitely beautiful letter to myself, had I been able. It was too good in you to send me such a precious message of affection and interest and wise counsel for the future. I prize and value all immensely. I need not remind you that I never cease to pray for the good of the Church and people through your means, and also for a special blessing on yourself and on dear Mrs. Davidson. I have full confidence that our prayers are heard, and rejoice in the full expectation that the blessing of God will rest and remain with you and yours.

The nearer I approach eternity, the more satisfied and happy that life seems to become. I do not know why; but I think it is owing to the greater realization of the Sovereign will of God, overruling everything and leaving us helpless in His hands.

We *rest* as little helpless infants in His arms.

May I, once more, thank you and Mrs. Davidson, and warmly welcome you home, and will you allow me to be the bearer of constant petitions on your behalf and of the church of God, always remaining a quiet unobtrusive unit in the body corporate united closely in spirit and most affectionately attached.

The second is a letter written by the Archbishop on his own seventy-seventh birthday:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* MRS. HALDANE

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 7 April 1925.

I am painfully conscious of wrongdoing in adding this rivulet to the flood which will pour in upon Cloan this week. And to sin with one's eyes open is grave indeed. But selfishly I cannot refrain.

[1] Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, chaps. v and xvi.

This is *my* birthday. I am 77, and when I saw the light in 1848 (in a week of Continental hurly-burly and of Chartist disorder at home) you were already a well grown up lady four years past her 'teens. Yet somehow I never can get myself to regard *you* as being nearly so old as *I feel*. Whenever I talk to you I find a well-spring of buoyant thought, and an easy readiness in handling the memories of the past, which I admire but cannot rival. And will you let me say to you that your quiet gift of sure touch upon the deepest things has been to me, many a time, a spur and an inspiration. I like to thank you for it now. Sometimes when I find myself plunged perforce in the 'strife of tongues', and perhaps rather frightened and depressed by the sense of inability to guide things as one would, I have recalled simple words of yours about the Guide and Keeper of our souls, and have gratefully reminded myself of your assurance that you do not forget us in your prayers.

'What a many' people in difficult places, or with hard steering to do in rough water and rough weather, you must in these long decades have been thus uplifting though they knew it not. I should like you to know that one at least of these weather-beaten folk pays to you in his own thoughts and prayers the meed of gratitude which you have earned.

And another thing. We are in happy touch with those who, in middle life or beyond it, are now exercising from your home or its out-posts, the sort of influence which *tells* in fields social or political or scientific, and who owe their power of straightness and of forcefulness in no small part to what they learned from a Mother whom we can all of us thank for what she has done and is still doing for each. In the truest sense 'Her children arise and call her blessed'.

I trust you, my dear friend, to pardon all this, for it comes from my heart.

I am venturing to send you a little book—the 'text book' of my master and prophet and friend for nearly forty years—Dr. Westcott. I think you will find in it some thoughts which will be after your mind.

May our Lord Himself have you in His keeping now and always.

V

We end with a note on the Archbishop's religion, though with due heed to that reticence which he, above all men, would deem most necessary here. It was part and parcel of his whole being. But it had nothing emotional about it, and nothing of the peculiar ardour, or the sacramental quality, which mark the great masters

of private or liturgical devotion. It was simple and straightforward, and closely bound up with the work or the needs of the day. He attended the daily services of Lambeth Palace Chapel, always adding to their peace and gravity by his reading of the Lessons and of the final prayers. Sundays he usually spent quietly at home, of set purpose, for recuperation and study and reflection. And when people came to him at some crisis in their lives, he often prayed with them in a way which gave them strength and comfort for a long while to come, as in the following prayer, much treasured by him with whom he used it:

> Grant, O LORD, that in the weariness of unceasing work our intercourse with Thee may ever be fresh.

Of himself he used to say:

> As one grows old, I find that meditation takes the place of more definite prayer; and that one thinks upon people and problems and work, as in the Presence of God.

He had a profound belief in Providence; in God's working through history. Therefore he regarded the ordered sequence of events as of the most serious import. 'The Lord reigneth', he used constantly to say. This kept him calm and firm amid the turmoil, and also made him deem those who took the second step before they were sure of the first, in some particular course of action, as not only foolish but irreverent. A favourite text was 'One generation shall praise Thy works unto another'. Once, preaching on this text about Archbishop Whitgift, he said, 'In the life of a man, from boyhood to old age, some parts may be, and certainly will be, more stirring, more eventful, than others; but each bit has to do—quite necessarily and clearly—with what went before and what comes after.... God has had a purpose in moulding that life, personal or national bit by bit, and to His all-seeing eye each little epoch, each set of years, is concerned with all the rest, both past and future.'[1] His instinctive approach to every subject was historical and evolutionary, and he saw every issue that came up as continuous with all else that had gone before it. Again and again he took the view that if people understood how a state of things had come to be, they would see what the next right step was. And when he stressed the evolutionary in history, it was always in terms rather of God's action than of mere develop-

[1] *Captains and Comrades in the Faith*, p. 38.

ment. We might not be able to see the relation between the little issues confronting each one of us and the plan of the Great Commander, but such a relation there always was. And his own sense of the importance of most of the things he was given to deal with was, at least in large measure, a sense of their ultimate importance in God's purpose. In close connexion with his conviction that God was at work in history came his sense of Man's personal responsibility—'answerableness', he would call it—for all his daily actions, the sense that eternal issues were involved in the choices and decisions of every hour. Thus at every step man might advance or hinder God's purpose. His trust in God was of a straightforward and simple kind, an almost childlike faith that light and strength would come in answer to prayer when the difficulties and hindrances seemed too great. Again and again those nearest him have seen the Archbishop fussed beyond measure at not being able to get something out before he went to bed, to see his way through some problem, and then quite obviously leaving the matter in faith and committing himself to the belief that if he awoke early and remained in bed something would be given to him in the morning—as it always was.

Very significant as to his own personal practice is the following passage from a sermon entitled 'Prayer and Business'.[1] It happens to be a sermon preached at the very beginning of his Primacy, but was characteristic of the whole attitude of his life. It is the account of a man, very busy, immersed in the duties of his office, and practising his religion in the very midst of his secular work:

'. . . the story of Daniel sets before us no picture of a mystic visionary, an ascetic thinker living outside the stream and swing of the world's life. He is set before us as a busy man of affairs, with a huge trust laid upon him for active administrative service; immersed, as we should nowadays express it, in public business. But on the life is set the stamp of faithfulness to God, whatever that faithfulness might cost. . . . This man, of quiet, unflinching, prayerful purpose, avowedly took the work which was allotted to him—the public work in a heathen capital—as of Divine appointing, to be done to the very best of his power under the all-seeing eye and the personal guidance of the Lord his God. . . . But the two sides or divisions of his life were inseparably one, and therein, in part, lies the lesson of his story. It is in the very centre of what the

[1] *Captains and Comrades in the Faith*, pp. 329–31.

> Bible tells us about his converse with God—in the midst of what we should nowadays call his 'deepest religious thoughts' and words and visions—that we find the old man immersed in the duties of his secular office. 'I rose up and did the King's business.' The vividness of his communion with God is not one whit restrained or marred by his secular work, nor must that secular work—those prosaic, responsible duties of his office and calling—be set aside or disregarded even when there has come to him the deepest, the most overwhelming of spiritual visions or messages from on high. The two 'departments' if we may use the word, were the complement each of the other. The vision might literally overpower him when it came—nay, it did so overpower him utterly—but it would send him back the stronger to his duties. 'I rose up and did the King's business, and I was astonished at the vision.'

Such was the spirit of communion with God in which Randall Davidson fulfilled the duties of his calling. His relations with his fellows were marked by a faith of a similar kind. He had a real trust in and a genuine power of evoking the great spiritual and moral possibilities of ordinary human beings. He was a man in whose presence people grew.

CHAPTER LXXIV

A YEAR OF CHANGE

Parliaments are now grown to be quite other things than they were formerly. MARQUESS OF HALIFAX, *Some Cautions offered to the Consideration of those who are to chuse Members to serve for the Ensuing Parliament.*

THE actual date of the twentieth anniversary of Archbishop Davidson's enthronement as Primate was February 12, 1923. By a happy coincidence, on that very day a Meeting of the Privy Council was held, and King George made his Declaration of Consent under the Royal Marriages Act to the projected marriage of the Duke of York. The Archbishop of Canterbury was summoned—the Lord Chancellor and the Prime Minister, the Lord President, the Home Secretary, and the Lord Chamberlain. We may be sure that the occasion awoke many memories of the great Queen whose grandson was now on the Throne, of the old days at the Castle, and of the many changes and chances, marryings and giving in marriage, since the Archbishop himself had first gone as a young Dean to Windsor forty years before. What wonder that, as the Clerk of the Privy Council noted in his journal for the day, his Grace should be 'the modest recipient of every one's congratulations'.[1]

I

The year 1923 was a full one, and the Davidson papers show a great deal of business and a great deal of intercourse of various kinds. A few extracts will illustrate the manner of things which occupied the Archbishop's mind and time:

Dictated February 4th, 1923.

I have been in rather a crocky condition, was unable to preach as usual at the close of the year, being largely in bed during that fortnight with troublesome indigestion which refused to yield to the ordinary treatment. Then we went to Ludwell for ten days, and there I was better. . . .

The Assembly week had gone well. I sat through all the sessions except one afternoon when I purposely put Ebor in the chair,

[1] *Memoirs of Sir Almeric Fitzroy*, ii. 794.

not because I was really unwell, but because it was better to have a little elasticity. I have not had much important speaking to do during the week, but have had to be a wakeful chairman. The debating has been of a high order, admirable speeches being made by Ebor and Durham and several more. We gave general approval to the scheme for dividing the Winchester Diocese, but with a very emphatic warning to the Committee which will be formed for the revision stage that they should in their revision consider amendments, and I think they will. I do not like the scheme as it stands, but it would have disheartened the diocese too much if we had simply refused general approval, and thus postponed all action of any kind for at least a year.

Dictated March 18th, 1923.

On Friday March 9th, Dr. Deissmann of Berlin spent several hours here. I found him most friendly. We did not discuss the wartime correspondence which had passed between us, but he spoke quite freely about the present state of German feeling, which he says is not really anti-English, though it is angrily anti-French. He is very unhopeful about the future in Germany owing to financial stress. He will not admit that there is any very strong militarist group of the old fashion now remaining, though of course there are a few die-hards. He ridiculed (but seriously, not lightly) the idea that Germany could by any possibility in present conditions raise a new Army, or start a new war, but without reserve admits its helplessness. He is delivering some lectures in England, but is apparently engaged almost entirely in Nonconformist circles, and, except for his talk with me, has little or no intercourse with Church of England folk. I got Ryle and Iremonger and Mrs. Creighton to meet him, and Armitage Robinson was staying here; so he got a good dose of Anglicanism for his good.

Dictated April 22nd, 1923.

Yesterday, Saturday, I preached at St. Mary Aldermanbury, about the First Folio of Shakespeare—the sermon is being published forthwith. It may appear in Monday's press. The sermon gave wide satisfaction—Sidney Lee, Gollancz, Headlam, and many more speaking rather eagerly about its value. The service was followed by a luncheon at which there were some admirable speeches.

Dictated August 12th, 1923.

In truth, this summer has been one of the most important in my life, not because of great things happening, but because I seem to

have been more in the forefront of people's minds than ever before. It is not easy to know why this has been, but so it is. I think it is partly due to a great fuss about my birthday last April, 75th, coming on the top of an earlier fuss in February about the completion of my 20th year of Archbishopric. . . . I have been very regular in House of Lords attendance, and have been considering the rights and wrongs of it. I am clear on the whole that it is best to do as I have done and go practically every day when the House sits, for my room has been to a greater degree than ever before beset with people, public men, desiring interviews. All kinds of important people, on subjects political, international, and of course ecclesiastical, have been coming thither for talks, and I think it is not without value that I should put in an appearance at the House itself whenever anything of the least importance is happening. I have not made many important speeches, but numerically I think they have been fairly frequent. I have talked about Russia; about the Eastern Church; about Divorce; about East Africa (Kenya), and rather importantly about a very local matter, the Whitgift Hospital at Croydon, which became the centre of acute controversy among historians, architects, aesthetes, though indeed the thoughtful people were all on one side and we triumphed overwhelmingly.

. . . The National Assembly meeting in July (9th–13th) was very important, but not heatedly controversial. We dealt in a businesslike way with big subjects, pensions, dilapidations, and the like, the only very controversial question being the proposed division of the diocese of Winchester. Upon that subject I was in a difficult position. It was commonly recognised, among those who knew the facts, that I could, if I liked, destroy the proposed Bill by some outspoken opposition based on my personal experience, both of that diocese, and of the Church at large. But while I disliked the Bill, I felt distinctly that if I so acted it would do real harm. I had in the previous session urged that the matter should go again before the Winchester Diocese, which should consider in Diocesan Conference the criticisms and objections, and I felt fairly sure that there would be there a large minority hostile to the Bill. I found that the minority dwindled into the merest handful, and this appeared to me to make it the duty of the Assembly to yield to the wish of the diocese, provided no really trifling proposals were made. As the Bill issued from the Assembly, it requires the raising of more than £100,000 before the desired change can be effected, and this will, in my judgement, hinder the thing indefinitely and give time for ampler consideration. If I had in the Assembly bludgeoned the Bill out of existence, its destruction

would have been regarded as wholly my handiwork in the teeth of the wish of the people who understand the subject better. As it is, no one can question that the problem has been reasonably handled, and that if a mistake is made by the diocese, it is by a deliberate and democratic voice. I spent a night at Farnham three days ago—a farewell visit, I suppose, to the Talbots there, though we may visit their successor, whoever he may be. It was pathetic in the extreme, and I felt deeply for them both. I have never seen Farnham looking so beautiful, and as I told the Bishop (now that the milk is spilt and my tongue loosed) the beauty of the scene made me detest the measure more than ever! . . .

The next matter of importance which has been occupying me during recent months has been the discussion of new ecclesiastical appointments to be made by the new Prime Minister. I find Baldwin delightful to deal with. . . .

I am a little disappointed by our management of social things this year, though I cannot blame either myself or anyone else. Looking ahead in the spring it always seems that we should have some opportunity for quiet dinners of few people than practically turns out to be possible. I had looked forward to doing something of the sort this year. We have failed to do so, and yet it seems inevitable. We had one very successful evening party to which all kinds of important people, diplomatic and other came. We omitted to have any notice of it in the press, and I must admit that if we had done so we should have created more soreness on the part of the uninvited! We also had . . . a large and successful party for the Stewards of the Sons of the Clergy. We have had some interesting visits from outsiders, including Soderblom from Upsala and his family. We had a quiet and successful dinner for Lloyd George, President Murray Butler being there also. We have paid visits to Norwich, to Bristol for the Wesleyan Conference, to Walmer Castle for the great Shepway Court, or demonstration by Beauchamp as Warden of the Cinque Ports on August 4th. This last was historically and picturesquely triumphant. Whether it will do much good I am not clear, but I think it can do no harm, and it gave me an opportunity of saying something guardedly, but definitely, about the appalling problem of our responsibilities in connexion with the Franco-German confusion and strife.

We have dined out rather more than usual, e.g. with Lord Newton, with the American Chargé d'Affaires, with Lord Lee, with Lord Lansdowne, and we also dined at the great banquet which the Prince of Wales gave with admirable effect in St. James's Palace. This reminds me that I have omitted to mention the marriage of the Duke of York in Westminster Abbey in April—

which again was a most successful function—the address to my great satisfaction being given by the Archbishop of York. He is less played out in the giving of these addresses than his brother Primate!...

II

Dictated October 28th, 1923.

We had more than six weeks in Scotland, and barring the fact that we got wet practically every day we had nothing but good to record. First there were some 15 or 16 days at Lairg with Bilbrough, father and son. . . . We caught some salmon, but there was too much water in the river, and I personally got very few. Dover fished more vigorously, and with more skill, and also had better luck. We had about 30 fish in all, the average size being some 17 lbs; a very high standard.

From Lairg we went to the Portlands at Langwell, and had a delightful week. . . . The Duchess drove us on to Stirkoke when our week was up, and there the Hornes gave us a different sort of experience in quiet local interests. . . . The great Langwell car was sent for us to bring us back there for a night on our way to Moy where we were for a few days with the Mackintosh. Wet as usual, but not uninteresting. . . .

Then a week at Aberuchil, with a day at Danira, and the renewal of old memories, very vivid to me, of early shooting days and boyish fishing and the like. . . .

Then a week with the Haldanes at Cloan. . . . I had much interesting talk too with Haldane about the political situation. He thinks there is no political future for Lloyd George or for Asquith, or presumably for himself; but he does not anticipate a Labour Government until several years have passed by, which means he would personally be approaching the age of the 'shelf'; and anyhow, he would not, whatever he may say, be really a congenial spirit to the Labour folk who would hold the reins. It is all very well for him to theorize about his Labour principles as an abstract doctrine, but when it comes to practical politics he would be a back number.

Old Mrs. Haldane was an inspiration as always. She seems to the eye no worse than in former years, but I gather that, as a matter of fact, there are symptoms which might at any time bring her wonderful life to a close.

From Cloan we went to Dalmeny, and I very greatly enjoyed the renewal of talks, once so frequent, but latterly so rare. Rosebery is at present a pathetic figure in the country's life, though the country does not see him. It is strange to find a man with his

wealth of reminiscences, political and personal, stretching back across a full half-century, and no opportunity at present, or at least no used opportunity, of saying his say, or contributing anything to the nation's life. I find him specially anxious to talk in his own quiet and reserved way about religious things and the relation of life here to the life hereafter. I think he turns to me rather more easily than to others on these matters, though perhaps he may talk to men of whom I know nothing. I do not think so. I sat with him, and drove with him, and we had abundant intercourse. . . . After we had left, he wrote to Edith about the pleasure our visit had given him—a sort of reversed Collins!

While we were at Dalmeny, we spent a full morning at Muirhouse. I was most agreeably surprised to find the small degree of interference with old things. Looking from the top of the Tower one would hardly see any difference between the scene now and the scene 50 or 60 years ago. The Wellingtonia in the flower garden was brought by me in little packets in my hand from the Pantheon in Oxford Street, where I bought it, just 60 years ago.

Mr. Sanderson showed us all over the house, and walked with us to the beach and was kindness itself. They have modernised the house with admirable taste, though, of course, the old frescoes etc. have disappeared, and everything looks much more different than it really is.

Mr. Sanderson specially wished us to open the cupboard door in my Father's old room, and showed us the marked heights of all of us back to the year 1859. There must be at least 40 entries on the door, the successive generations of ourselves, and Harry's children, and Ernest's, and some cousins. He insisted on my being measured again, and writing my name opposite the mark. He did it all with excellent taste, and I valued his appreciation of the stories of those past years.

Dictated November 18th, 1923.

On Saturday [November 3] the marriage of the Crown Prince of Sweden; strange to marry the same man a second time, but I think all promises happiness. It gave me the opportunity of paying a deserved tribute to Prince Louis, the bride's father, and I had evidence at once of how much pleasure this gave to the King and Queen, Princess Louise and others. . . .

Meantime Mr. Baldwin, as Prime Minister, had announced a new programme of Protection in a speech at Manchester on November 2; and a great struggle began on the issue of Protection

versus Free Trade. Parliament was dissolved on November 16, and the General Election was fixed for December 6.

Dictated November 18th (continued).

As regards the issue of the impending conflict nobody seems able to form any estimate of a trustworthy sort. At the Parliamentary Banquet . . . which I attended last Wednesday,[1] I sat between Neville Chamberlain, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Ramsay MacDonald and had plenty of talk with both, though of course with a certain measure of reserve in either case, and of course I had so to talk as not to be speaking to both neighbours at once.

I found Ramsay MacDonald extraordinarily interesting. He had just come back from a journey to Constantinople and Athens, Corfu and Rome, and other places—a hurried tour, but he is a man with his eyes open, and he had a great deal to say about Turkey and about Italy. He takes a pessimistic view of the European situation, and is really apprehensive of the renewal of war at no distant date.

In the early days of the New Year the Archbishop was, as his memoranda show, intimately informed of the different stages of the crisis. Indeed his interest in the successive scenes in the development of the political drama was intense. And he was in at the death, spending no less than six hours in the House of Commons listening to the speeches which wound up the Government's life before the fateful division on January 21, when the Government under Mr. Baldwin was defeated by a combination of Liberal and Labour votes. On January 22, Mr. Baldwin resigned and Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was commissioned by the King to form a Ministry. The Archbishop followed the formation of the first Labour Government with keen attention. He was much impressed by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, and in mentioning the fact in a private letter to Bishop Talbot (January 27, 1924) he added, 'Have you read the memoir he wrote of his wife? It seems to me a really fine picture of a remarkable woman, and its pathos is deep.' To Mr. Ramsay MacDonald himself he wrote as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD

[22 January 1924.]

This letter is not of the same sort as most of those which will be submerging you to-morrow. I want to strike a different note.

[1] November 14.

Having a day in bed a week ago gave me the opportunity of reading from cover to cover your memoir of the earthly years of the gracious and radiant lady whose influence upon your life must have been alike an inspiration, a stimulus and an abiding force. I have seldom read a book of its kind which has moved me more deeply, and I should like to be among those who thank you for giving it to us all.

At this moment what impels me to write is the thought which was mine as I listened to you yesterday in the House: the difference between what the taking of this great trust means to you now —and what it would have meant had she been here to share it with you. That such a trust is shared, and such a burden halfborne, by a true wife is a fact which no living man can realise better than I, with my experience of 45 years of what it means. How often it happens that when the biggest things, be they trust or adventure, come to a man, they come to him after those who would have cared most to see him facing them have passed beyond his ken. Whether he is outside their ken is another question. I do not dare to say that any of us is left *alone* in that sense.

I hope that in entering upon the great task which is now yours in the world's life, you realise how many there are of us who do watch, who do care, who do pray, who do desire in the best way to aid, even if their judgement as to the wisest policy in any given problem among our many perplexities, may be different from your own. If such a thought can make loneliness a little less, I shall be thankful to have reminded you of it.

A few days later, on February 4, he met the new Prime Minister at dinner in Lord Parmoor's house, and immediately the two men warmed to one another. Curiously enough, they found they had a common link in John Morley:

whom he appears to have known more intimately than anybody else did, seeing him almost every day during these last years. He rather interested me by saying that Morley had again and again talked to him about me, and about what he thought was my usefulness in the line I had taken about India and about other things.

III

On October 30, 1923, just before the political crisis, came the death of Mr. Bonar Law, who had succeeded Lloyd George as Prime Minister. Mr. Baldwin obtained the Dean's consent to his burial in Westminster Abbey, and wrote to ask the Archbishop to take part in the funeral service.

The Archbishop's views on the Dean's discretion in such cases are illuminating. In his opinion, the Dean should certainly agree to a formal request from the Government in such a case, leaving the responsibility for the decision with the Government. He thought however that, where a public man who was not a statesman—like George Meredith—was concerned, the Dean was perfectly free to form his own judgement on the rights of the case, and the strength of any popular demand. A former Dean of Westminster, Dr. Armitage Robinson, happened to be staying at Lambeth on the day of the funeral, November 5, 1923. Dean Robinson agreed that any Dean of Westminster would certainly follow the expressed wish either of the King or the House of Commons (or the Government acting on its behalf) with regard to burial in the Abbey, though adding that the Government would of course always consult the Dean before their wish was announced. Dr. Robinson recalled the great agitation that had taken place in the time of Dean Stanley over a monument which it was proposed to erect in the Abbey to Prince Louis Napoleon, the Prince Imperial, who died June 2, 1879. Queen Victoria and Dean Stanley strongly desired it. The public, however, was opposed. In the end, the House of Commons on July 16, 1880, resolved by 162 votes to 147, that 'in the opinion of this House the erection of a statue to the memory of the late Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte would be inconsistent with the national character of that edifice'.

Dean Robinson, it is interesting to note, had himself decided against burying George Meredith in the Abbey.[1] A leading article appeared in *The Times* urging it strongly, but the Dean was steadfast in his refusal, in spite of that and of much other pressure. His view was that George Meredith was not in the highest rank of men of letters and in a few years time would have ceased to be a conspicuous literary figure. He had also had to settle the question of commemorating Herbert Spencer.[2] A group of admirers asked the Dean to allow a bust of Herbert Spencer to be erected in the Abbey. Dean Robinson took counsel; but of those whom he consulted, the philosophers said that Spencer was no philosopher though he might be a scientist, while the scientists said he was no scientist though he might be a philosopher. The Dean accordingly refused; and was glad to receive a word of

[1] Died May 16, 1909.

[2] Died December 8, 1903.

commendation for his refusal from Lord Kelvin, who said to him one day at a party at Buckingham Palace, 'I am glad you did not put that fellow Spencer in the Abbey!'

In 1927, the Archbishop was himself consulted with regard to Lord Oxford and Asquith. The Dean of Westminster (Dr. Norris) asked him to advise the reply to be made in case he received a request. The Archbishop took the line already described, that if the Dean were approached in any way on behalf of Parliament the request ought to be granted. In his opinion not only was Lord Oxford a much greater man than Bonar Law, but it was very proper that a great war statesman, particularly the Prime Minister who had made the decision that England should enter the conflict, should be buried in the Abbey. When however it was announced that Lord Oxford had left instructions that he was to be buried as privately as possible, and that therefore burial in the Abbey, which the Dean offered, must be declined, the Archbishop was not well pleased. He thought that such wishes, however much they might be inspired by modesty, ought not to be respected. In his judgement great men belonged to the nation, and in such matters the individual ought not to override the nation's wishes. He added that if a great man objected to cremation (that being the condition of burial in the Abbey) such a wish might be respected, but he could not agree that the mere wish for a private burial was in such cases a proper wish.

CHAPTER LXXV

THE ASSYRIAN CHURCH

Who can name the Catalonians without a tear? Brave, unhappy people! Drawn into the War by the encouragement of the Maritime Powers . . . now abandoned and exposed to the resentment of an enraged Prince, whose person and interest they have always opposed. . . . Poor, unhappy Catalonians, worthy of a better Fate! Good and gracious God! to whom shall be attributed the loss of this brave People? Dreadful the doom of those who shall in thy sight be esteemed their destroyers. RICHARD STEELE, *The Crisis* (1714).

AMONG all the Churches—and nations—outside England with which the Archbishop of Canterbury had to do during his primacy, none had a braver or sadder story, and none made more continuous calls on his sympathy and his thought, in the years after the War, than the Assyrian Church. The Assyrians were a primitive and agricultural people, living in clans under a Patriarch, known as Mar Shimun (the Lord Simon), and were settled in two separate districts. One section lived near Lake Urmia in north-west Persia, under Persian sovereignty; the other and larger section were highlanders, established in the mountainous country north of Mosul in Kurdistan under Turkish rule. They first came into definite and regular relations with the Church of England in 1886, when Archbishop Benson founded the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians for purely educational and religious purposes, and especially 'the education of those youths who will hereafter become bishops, priests and leaders of the people'.[1]

I

The Mission lasted from 1886 to 1915; but in the last few years there had been a considerable cooling in the friendship of the Assyrians for the Anglican Church, and a strong movement towards an alliance or union with the Church of Russia. Indeed the situation had become so strained in 1913, that Archbishop Davidson (who had followed the Mission's fortunes most closely from the start) was obliged to inform the Head of the Mission (August 7, 1913) that if the ancient Assyrian Church wished to

[1] Archbishop Benson to Mar Shimun, June 2, 1886: *Life of Archbishop Benson*, ii. 184.

effect a union with the Russian Church, there was nothing to do but to accept the situation.

In September 1914, the Missioners, when compelled to leave the country on account of the war, reported to the Archbishop in a joint letter (September 18, 1914) that Mar Shimun showed no regret when bidding them good-bye, and expressed no desire to see them again:

> It appears to us, therefore, that the time has come to record our conviction, arrived at most reluctantly and after much thought and consideration, that Mar Shimun and his people definitely desire to get rid of Your Grace's Mission, in order to leave the field clear for more effective helpers.

It was not, therefore, unnatural that after the Missioners had returned to England, taking the War and everything else into account, the Archbishop's Assyrian Committee, on May 26, 1915, resolved as follows:

> That the present unhappy circumstances and the enforced withdrawal of the Mission staff make it necessary to terminate the operations of the Mission at the end of the current year.

II

The Assyrians were drawn into the War in the wake of Russia, but long before the end of 1915 they were in great distress. With the Russian collapse in 1917, they suffered disaster after disaster at the hands of the Turks, and in May 1918 their Patriarch Mar Benyamin was murdered by a Kurdish brigand acting under Persian instructions. By the end of the War, the main body of the tribes were living, as refugees from their homes, in a great camp on the plain of Baquba under British protection, reduced to some 45,000 men, women, and children.

After the War, the question of their future settlement arose. They had joined the Allies when Russia was a great Power; and the collapse of Russia had involved them in calamities which nobody could have foreseen. Where should they live, and to whom should they turn for support? The Archbishop's Mission had formally closed down, and the Archbishop had made it quite clear that, whatever happened in the War, 'the resumption[1] of our old

[1] The Archbishop of Canterbury to W. G. Langdon (U.S.A.):

12 July, 1915.

It is quite certain that after the War the conditions of that whole region must be different from what they have been before. If the Russians are in possession, I

work after the war would be impossible'. But some of the Missioners, notably Dr. W. A. Wigram and the Rev. F. N. Heazell, were far too devoted to their Assyrian friends not to wish to do everything they could to help them in their adversity. And Archbishop Davidson himself was anxious to do whatever he could. But his powers were limited. Both the Archbishops, however, and the old Missioners, and the Archbishop's Assyrian Committee which was still in existence, did their best to secure the presentation of the Assyrian case to the British Government or through them to the Allied Powers: and the files of correspondence, and memoranda of interviews, bear witness to the persistency with which that case was presented through successive years.

There were three principal moments when the Archbishop's personal assistance was most strenuously invoked—and they were marked by the arrival in England of three principal spokesmen of the Assyrian claims.

III

The first occasion was in 1920, and the spokesman was the Lady Surma d'Mar Shimun, the sister of the Assyrian Patriarch.

She came, with the full sanction of the British military and civil authorities in Mesopotamia, as the official representative of the whole Assyrian nation, authorized to lay their case before the British Government, and if necessary before the Peace Conference at Paris. She at once made a deep impression on the Archbishop. She had been educated in the Mission, spoke English quite well, and was an extremely intelligent woman, about thirty-four years old, with a fine natural dignity. She had never been out of Asia before. A close friendship soon sprang up between her and the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson. And by his

imagine that the Assyrians are almost certain to make arrangements for joining ecclesiastically with the Orthodox Church, whether or not any special conditions are allowed them. If on the other hand (which God forbid) a Germanised Turkey should be dominant in those mountains and plains the position again would be different from any that we have known In any case therefore we feel that the resumption of our old work after the War would be impossible. I say 'the resumption of our old work', for I do not at all mean that it is our wish or intention to lose touch altogether with the Syrian folk with whom we have had this association for more than a quarter of a century. But when we start afresh hereafter it may be on larger lines enabling us to co-operate and be in touch with other bodies of Christians in those whole Eastern regions.

arrangement, she saw the Queen, Lord Curzon, the Rt. Hon. E. S. Montague, and others.

Lady Surma stayed in England from October 1919 until August 31, 1920. During the whole of this time, the Assyrian settlement was the chief burden of her thoughts—and she often discussed it with the Archbishop, who in turn discussed it with Lord Curzon and other Government authorities. But the Government tarried. For all sorts of reasons the authorities found it hard to make up their minds. Lady Surma pressed certain pledges said to have been given to the Assyrians towards the end of the war.

In reply to the Archbishop's inquiries, these pledges were formulated as follows:

The REV. W. A. WIGRAM, D.D., *to the* REV. G. K. A. BELL

Watling House. St. Alban's. July 15th. 6.30 p.m.

Your letter of July 14th has only come to hand this moment. As concerns the Assyrians and British promises. I am not aware of any definite *written* promise made by British Officials to the effect that the British Government would do its best for the Assyrians, if they supported them in the war. Verbal promises to that effect, however, were given by Captain Gracey, an officer on the staff of General Offley Shore, who was sent to Urmi at the time of the Military Mission to the Caucasus, in the Spring of 1917, to organize the nation as a British and Russian ally. These promises were given at a meeting of the 'notables' of the nation, held at Urmi, in the American Mission, under the presidency of Dr. W. A. Shedd of that Mission.

It was then, by the advice of this Captain Gracey, that the Assyrians entered into that alliance with Simko Agha, which led directly to the death of Mar Shimun.

Military difficulties (notably the Russian collapse) prevented the execution of General Shore's strategic plan, but the nation was definitely recognized as an ally of Great Britain. For the rest of the war, they acted as such, and messages were sent to them (in particular that brought by Lieutenant Pennington to Urmi in July 1918) directing them how to act in that capacity.

Further, the contingent raised from among this nation (under British Officers) has been in British employ in Mesopotamia since the close of the general war, and has been on active service, and won honorable mention, in a campaign against the Kurds.

These facts surely constitute a definite recognition as an ally,

and are enough to justify the general expectation of the nation, that Great Britain would not neglect their interests and safety in the general settlement.

I have sent a copy of this letter to Surma Khanim, asking her to communicate at once with you if she has anything to add to what I have written above.

LADY SURMA *to the* REV. G. K. A. BELL

House of Retreat, Lloyd Square, W.C. July 16, 1920.

I got the copy of the letter that Dr. Wigram sent to you. I have nothing to add to the letter, except that letters too, were brought to Dr. Shedd by Lieutenant Pennington to direct us in our action. And it was in January 1918 that Captain Gracey[1] came, had the meeting in Urmi etc. also French officers of the red-cross were present. Alas! nobody should think of asking a written promise from British officials. *Their* word was a promise once in our part of the East. I am afraid we have to get used to some changes.

The Archbishop in turn made representations to the Foreign Office. But all that he could discover (so he told Dr. Wigram) was that 'during the war . . . particularly in Eastern regions, a good deal of diplomacy was conducted under the wing of the War Office, rather than the Foreign Office'. The Archbishop had many communications with the Government. But no proposal seemed to bear fruit. 'It is extraordinarily difficult', he wrote to Dr. A. J. Mason, Chairman of the Archbishop's Assyrian Committee (August 16, 1920), 'The Government, plainly enough, is at its wits' end. Unless we can send a great force of troops it is mere mockery to pretend that we could give secure protection to the Assyrians. . . . The truth is that we have had left upon our shoulders at this juncture responsibilities ranging far

[1] Mar Polus, writing to the Archbishop, thus describes the visit in January 1918 of Captain Gracey, an officer on the staff of General Offley Shore and reputed the author of the promise of help:

'January 10, 1919.

During these days there was sent to us an ambassador, an Englishman, by name Captain Gracey who spoke in our assembly· it was at the time of the late Patriarch who preceded me: there were present also the Russian Consul, Mr. Nikitine, and the American Vice Consul, Dr. Shedd, and the Latin Bishop, Monsignor Sontag, and the Chief of the French Medical Staff, Mon. Cushwal, and all the chief men of our nation: he (Capt. Gracey) commanded us to hold out and to preserve our lives from the destroying Turks· he promised us that after three months we should be helped by the Allies, and we rejoiced greatly at his words he remained with us for a few days and then left for Tabriz.'

beyond anything that we can discharge. The Americans have really left us in the lurch.'

Surma Khanim left England for Basra on August 31, 1920—and wrote to the Archbishop on the eve of her departure that 'your love and sympathy for me will be a sweet and sacred remembrance during my life. And what you have done for me will never be forgotten.' But there were, as she also said in her letter, many sorrows waiting for her at Baquba. There is a great sheaf of correspondence between the Archbishop and Dr. Wigram on the whole subject of the settlement, throughout 1921; and accounts of many interviews (as well as letters) between the Archbishop and the authorities at the Colonial Office. It is impossible to summarize them here. But while Lady Surma had been in England, Mar Shimun XX (Polus), who had succeeded Mar Benyamin (the murdered Patriarch) in 1918, had died of consumption in May 1920. In her absence a minority of the Assyrians had taken the rash step of consecrating a boy of thirteen, Mar Ishai, nephew of Mar Polus, as Patriarch. This caused a cleavage between the Patriarchal family and the rest. By September 1921, the refugee camp at Baquba was dispersed: and a settlement of the Mountaineer Assyrians, in the Mosul Vilayet, was achieved, at an estimated cost to the British Exchequer of £400,000. But the Mosul frontier was uncertain—and revision expected. The Assyrians themselves were not easy to deal with, after two years of life in refugee camps. The settlement was not satisfactory; and, as a high British official admitted to the Archbishop, the British had undoubtedly made promises to the Assyrians which they were bankrupt of the power to fulfil: partly owing to the American default, and partly owing to the original Russian collapse.

IV

In May 1923, a new crisis arose with the startling change of policy announced by the British Government in Baghdad, by which the period of the Treaty between Great Britain and Iraq fixed—only eight months before—in October 1922 for twenty years was reduced to four years, or till such earlier date as Iraq might be admitted to membership of the League of Nations. This produced a great revulsion of feeling among the Assyrians in Iraq. They believed that they had finally embroiled themselves with Islam by their attitude during the War, and felt there-

fore that it would be impossible for them to remain in Asia after the withdrawal of British troops. Their whole attention therefore became concentrated on emigration, preferably to Canada or Australia.

In this unhappy situation, a new Assyrian visitor, Mar Timotheus, kinsman of Lady Surma and Metropolitan of Malabar in India, came to England. He was about forty years old. His health was bad, and he was subject to attacks which prostrated him for long periods, and his illness without doubt affected his spirits. He had long interviews with the Archbishop and others, including Government officials. He asked that the British Government should find the Assyrians a home. But he unhappily found it difficult to convince either the Archbishop or the Colonial Office that he was a very practical ambassador. Some of his proposals would have involved a war with Turkey—though Mar Timotheus said he did not want war. The Archbishop was obliged to face him with realities—and at a special meeting the Committee of the Archbishop's Assyrian Mission put into his hands a long Memorandum (drafted by the Archbishop), which set out the position as he and the Committee saw it, for Mar Timotheus's guidance on a projected visit to America, whither he urged him to go now. After outlining the history of the Mission's beginnings, emphasizing its purely religious aim as stated at the very start, and noting that 'the official papers issued at that time (1886) make it absolutely clear that the objects of the Mission were wholly spiritual and educational, and that everything of a political kind was excluded', the Memorandum proceeds:

Nov. 7, 1923.

A new situation arose a few years before the War. Approaches were made by Russian authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, to the then Mar Shimun with a view to Russian protection, material as well as spiritual, being extended to the sorely-pressed and poverty-stricken people, both on Persian and Turkish sides of the frontier, who owed allegiance to Mar Shimun as Patriarch. The Patriarch accordingly explained to the Archbishop of Canterbury that he and his people desired to avail themselves of Russian rather than Anglican aid, and while retaining friendly relations with those who, like the Archbishop's Mission, had given them the sort of help above indicated, proposed to place themselves rather under the guidance of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Letters to that effect passed between Mar Shimun and the Archbishop of Canterbury at that time, and by August 1914, though there was no actual breach with the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission, the Patriarch was endeavouring to place himself definitely under the guidance and direction of the Russian authorities.

At the outbreak of War, or rather early in 1915, as a result of Russian overtures and promises of help, the Assyrian fighting men rallied to the side of the Allies and fought against the Turks. But Russia, instead of holding, as had been anticipated, the dominant position in those regions, lost even the status it had held. The whole area was ultimately plunged into utter confusion. Before the War was over, Mar Shimun wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury stating with plaintive earnestness, that his people had been abandoned by the Russians and left to the tender mercy of the Turks, and that they must again appeal to him to use his influence for their salvation.

The Armistice was signed a few months later, and the hope was at that time widely entertained that means might be found of re-establishing the Christian communities, both Armenian and Assyrian, in regions under their own quasi-independent Government, or under some Mandatory control. There was even a high hope that a Mandatory position might be undertaken in Mesopotamia by the United States. It is unnecessary to describe the political perplexities, disappointments, and confusion which late years have seen. It is certain that the Assyrian people have suffered untold hardship, and it is in no way unnatural that they should feel bitterly disappointed in finding that active European control under Christian auspices will, so far as it exists, be withdrawn ere long from the whole area which is the historic home of these Christian peoples. Into the question of political understandings or virtual promises given, or which were understood to have been given, by the military or political authorities during the War, it would be inappropriate to enter in this Memorandum. The point is that such political and military history is wholly independent of that which belongs to the Archbishop's religious and educational Mission. Naturally the representatives of the present Patriarch turn in their distress to the source from which so much friendly aid had been given them for a great many years until the time when they decided rather to rely upon the Russian support which would, as they hoped in their poverty, be of a more material kind. No one can be surprised if they fail to distinguish clearly at this time between the responsibilities, whatever they be, attaching to the political authorities, and the supposed responsibilities of the Archbishop's Mission, a Mission which had from its very beginning

repudiated any responsibility other than that of a religious and educational kind.

After the War, Surma Khanim, the remarkable lady belonging to the Patriarchal family, and chosen to be her people's spokesman and to explain their necessities, visited England in 1920, under the auspices of His Majesty's Government, and was received by the British authorities, who attached the highest importance to her very able advocacy and her lucid exposition of her people's needs. Lord Curzon bore strong testimony to this in the House of Lords. Surma Khanim, herself a pupil trained by the Archbishop's Mission, was, during her stay in England, naturally in close touch with the Archbishop of Canterbury and others connected with that Mission, but she never failed to realise the distinction between the political or material considerations and the considerations belonging to the religious authorities as such.

On the 15th May 1922, a letter was written to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be carried as a commission by Mar Timotheus, Metropolitan of Malabar, a native of Assyria who proposed to visit England from India to plead for his suffering fellow countrymen in Mesopotamia. Owing to a local law suit and other Indian business his journey was postponed, and he laid his letter before the Archbishop of Canterbury when he reached England during the present Autumn (1923). That letter, while it deals with the necessity for new Schools and other religious and educational needs, does to some extent appeal also for what is, in this Memorandum, described as political aid; and it has been necessary to point out to Mar Timotheus the distinction which this Memorandum draws. The Archbishop of Canterbury, however, has done his best to secure for Mar Timotheus the attention of the representatives of His Majesty's Government, who have shown perfect willingness to hear all that he has to say, and who have written to the Archbishop a very important explanatory letter, a copy of which is in Mar Timotheus' hands. In that letter the extreme difficulty of the situation is set out clearly and frankly, and it would only complicate matters were this Memorandum dealing with the Archbishop's Mission to enter into these.

It will not be supposed from what is above written that the Council of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission is indifferent to the terrible situation of the people whom, for so many years, the Mission has endeavoured, religiously and educationally, to help. The position is deplorable. Disappointment—even indignant disappointment, is natural, especially among those who are unable to estimate adequately the great political issues which are involved, and the vast sums that would be required were the political

aspirations of the Assyrian people to be adequately satisfied. Everything that the Archbishop of Canterbury and those who work with him can do to further the interests of a Nation and a Church for which they have endeavoured so much, will continue to be done, and the Archbishop will in no way relax the constant effort he has made to aid His Majesty's Government by information or advice in its endeavour to grapple with the apparently almost insoluble problem of the situation.

In regard to the kind of work for which it has in past years held responsibility, the Archbishop's Mission has repeatedly assured the representatives of the Assyrians as well as the British Government and other authorities that, as a Council, it would to the very utmost of its power promote the establishment or revival of Christian Schools. But, as has been repeatedly pointed out, this endeavour can only be made with even tolerable effectiveness when the political and social conditions are such as to give reasonable guarantee for quietness, progress, and social order. These conditions are very far from having been realised at present.

The Memorandum was a grievous blow to Mar Timotheus; but it was the only way of making him see the real situation and the limitations of the power of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The next few months, however, brought little further light—though there are many letters showing the Archbishop's close interest in the question of the frontier. In April, 1924, Mar Timotheus left England for America—a disappointed man.

V

In the summer and autumn of 1924, the question of the boundary between Iraq and Turkey became acute; and the Archbishop had a good deal of correspondence on the subject, in view of the importance of the decision on which side of the Boundary the Assyrians were to be placed. In September 1924, the Council of the League of Nations decided to send a Commission to settle the question; and the Commissioners arrived in Baghdad the following January. That very month the seventeen-year-old Patriarch, Mar Shimun, arrived in England to undertake a plan for his education that had been discussed by Mar Timotheus on his behalf. The Archbishop himself was not quite happy in his mind as to the result of a spell of ordinary education in England—as a training for his peculiar duties. But it was arranged that Mar Shimun should be received as a pupil at

St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, where he remained for about a year, entering fully into the life of the College.

In March, Lady Surma wrote to Mrs. Davidson expressing her happiness at the care taken of Mar Shimun, and also saying she had seen the League of Nations Commissioner who could promise her nothing. She added:

LADY SURMA *to* MRS. DAVIDSON

March 31, 1925.

Of course if there is not somebody to put the Assyrian cause strongly in the 'League', I fear that, having so big and important things to settle, our poor cause will be forgotten, or more likely will be soaked in Mosul oil.

In response to a further letter from Lady Surma, suggesting that she might herself be sent to Geneva to plead for the Assyrians, the Archbishop wrote promising to do his best, but warning her against hoping for the impossible. He was in constant touch with Sir Samuel Hoare at the Air Ministry, with Sir Percy Cox[1] and Mr. Amery at the Colonial Office; and eventually it was arranged that Lady Surma should fly to Geneva. The case for a boundary which would include the villages north of Mosul was put before the League by Mr. Amery. At the same time there was an agitation in the Press, abusing the Government and clamouring for the abandonment of Britain's obligations, mainly on the ground that by so doing great economies would be secured. The Archbishop was moved to make a public appeal to the Prime Minister against any such surrender:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. STANLEY BALDWIN

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 28th September, 1925.

If I keep silence I should not be doing justice either to my own feelings, or to the representations made to me by others with regard to the plight of our fellow Christians in Mesopotamia. It seems to me that public opinion is largely failing to realise virtual pledges of honour which are ours in regard to these unhappy people. In the statements, arguments and appeals, which now find currency in the papers, the main emphasis appears to be laid upon questions of finance, questions of the material resources of the country—oil

[1] Sir Percy Cox was British High Commissioner in Mesopotamia, 1920–3; and British Plenipotentiary for negotiations with Turkey regarding the Turko-Iraq frontier, 1924.

or other—and questions of military strategy. With none of these am I competent to deal. . . .

I have myself, as you probably know, been for many years in close touch with the Christians of that whole region, and especially with the Assyrian Church. It is unnecessary for me to remind you of the acute sense which those Churches entertain of Britain's moral obligation, as regards the endeavour to protect them from the possibility of hideous and irreparable cruelty and wrong. I am now in close touch with the Christian leaders who are trying to safeguard the interests of the Assyrians and others, upon whose aid in the regiments we enlisted from among them Britain relied during the war.

Uninformed newspaper writers, and perhaps some politicians who are less uninformed, may talk airily to the effect that our proper policy is simply to rid ourselves of any responsibility in those distracted regions. They base their argument on economic grounds, and of course I am profoundly conscious of the complications of this question. I do not, however, feel justified in not assuring you how widespread among earnest and thoughtful people in England and Scotland would be the sense of shame, were it to be announced that we meant simply to ignore the pledges which we practically gave, and to leave the Christian populations in a position, to say the least, of the gravest peril.

It is with a full sense of the extraordinary difficulty of the situation that I desire to assure you of the strength of religious opinion which will be behind you if you are able to make it clear that, whatever else happens, we do not forget, or ignore, the obligations which we have incurred.

The Prime Minister promised that the Government should not lose sight of 'this important aspect of the problem'.

In October, a further appeal to public opinion was made by the Archbishop in view of the large deportation of Christians from Turkish territory, and the tragic suffering caused. A special Assyrian and Iraq Christians Committee was formed under his presidency, with the energetic leadership of Sir Henry Lunn, and the support of Mr. Amery. The Archbishop spoke at public meetings, and a fair amount of money was raised. But the Assyrians were once more filled with alarm by the decision of the League, in December 1925, which gave Mosul to Iraq under the mandate of Great Britain, but left the Assyrian territory (in the Hakkiari country) on the Turkish side of the frontier—a decision which proved later to be fraught with most unhappy consequences.

Lady Surma had come to England from Geneva, and saw a good deal of the Archbishop. The Archbishop communicated his view to Mr. Amery in the following letter:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. L. S. AMERY

28th December, 1925.

I am afraid from what [Lady Surma] tells me that there is very little prospect of these unhappy Nestorians being settled on the frontier line in any way that would seem to them satisfactory for the future. This is disappointing, but I am bound to say they make a strong case as to the difficulties. Surma says that there are not, she thinks, more than the merest handful of children, say a dozen, among all the thirty thousand of her people who are now living in the flat country south of the Brussels line—this is owing to its unhealthiness. She may be exaggerating, but she has a great many facts. This is rather a depressing result to reach after all our efforts.

Mr. Amery was most sympathetic throughout the negotiations, but he could not hold out any hope of an improvement of the boundary—and he was not specially encouraging about the alternative plan put forward to Lady Surma by a body of Assyrian petitioners, 'that we should be emigrated to one of the British colonies whose climate suits us, so that we may live in peace and find an end to all our tribulations'. It seemed that there was nothing to be done, except to arouse sympathy. And the Archbishop welcomed the proposal made by Sir Henry Lunn that Lady Surma should visit America and tell her story there. She visited the United States and Canada in the spring of 1926—but the results were disappointing. She returned to Mosul in November 1926.

VI

The settlement of the Assyrians was still a problem for the future. The truth was that a problem, which might have been solved with comparative ease in the early days after the War, had been postponed and postponed until no satisfactory solution was possible. The British statesmen at home had allowed the conclusion of peace with Turkey to wait until victory had been forgotten. The Americans (as the Archbishop always felt) had contributed to the difficulty by washing their hands of the whole

Mesopotamian question. And money spent on their maintenance, enough to have settled the nation several times over, was no more available. The Assyrians, it must also be confessed, had sometimes brought new difficulties upon themselves—e.g. in the Great Raid of 1921, when Agha Petros attempted to create an independent state in the territory from Gawar to Ushnu; or in the Kirkuk outbreak of May 1924. Yet, to balance this, the Assyrian levy had done excellent service under British officers, and was still providing an admirable defence for the ground establishments of the British Air Force in Iraq. It was a piteous tale. The Archbishop kept the needs of the unhappy people as much to the fore as he could—but important as his influence and his interest were, he was not Prime Minister, nor was he the leader of a political party. He did his best to comfort Lady Surma, and told her of the constant assurance which he had received from the British officials on the spot that they would help in any way they rightly could. But his words, though full of sympathy, could only bring cold comfort to Lady Surma and her people:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* LADY SURMA

22 June, 1927.

The fact is that the hopes we entertained during the war, and at its close, about the settlement of your tribes in a land of their own, where they could be protected by English influence, proved impossible of full accomplishment.

In August 1927, Mar Shimun left England for Iraq, having completed two years of English education, the first year at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and the second at Westcott House, Cambridge. On reaching Mosul, he found new difficulties and divisions in which Mar Timotheus himself played a prominent part. He wrote and told the Archbishop of the situation: though, alas, in its material aspects that showed no change. In November 1927, Dr. Wigram went out to Iraq, and sent the Archbishop a full account of what he found. But he was only able to state problems—which were still to await solution. The main question naturally concerned the settlement of the Assyrians, and the Archbishop was not destined to live to see any real progress made in that field.

CHAPTER LXXVI

VARIOUS EMPLOYMENTS

How various his employments whom the world
Calls idle, and who justly in return
Esteems that busy world an idler too.

COWPER, *The Task.*

THIS chapter headed 'Various Employments' might be equally well entitled 'A Chapter of Illustrations'; for we propose in the main part of the chapter to give a few typical instances of the calls which were made on the Archbishop's time and counsel, in addition to the heavy routine tasks of every day and the larger subjects which demand a special and fuller treatment. The employments described will for the most part fall within the closing five years of his primacy, though not quite entirely; and their variety, which could without difficulty be considerably enhanced, will help to illustrate the many-sidedness of the life at Lambeth. But, that we may avoid giving an impression of unbroken toil as the Archbishop's immutable lot, we shall end the section with a brief note on his holidays.

I

As Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Davidson had a special link with the Whitgift Hospital, Croydon. This was an ancient College with its cottage homes combined into a fair court, and its old brothers and sisters, founded in 1596 by Archbishop Whitgift. In 1923, not for the first time, the Croydon Corporation promoted a road widening scheme which would have meant the demolition of the Hospital. The first attack had been made in 1884, when the Croydon Council desired to pull it down and build a Town Hall on the site. That plan was defeated locally. There were later schemes for road widening, on which Archbishop Benson kept a watchful eye.[1] And Archbishop Davidson

[1] Describing a visit to the Hospital in January 1889, Archbishop Benson wrote this in his Diary: 'I proposed to the whole table-full that we should let the College be removed to widen the street, and rebuilt in some pretty quiet country place. They said almost in horror that not a brick of the College must be touched—dear old place—and that they much preferred Croydon to any country place.

'Then I said would it not be agreeable to them to live at their own homes with

had himself helped to defeat a scheme involving demolition in 1909. The present onslaught was even more dangerous. On February 21st, the Archbishop went with a deputation to the Ministry of Transport, carrying in his hand the original Rules of the Hospital signed by Archbishop Whitgift's own hand. On April 18, he took part in a debate in the House of Lords, on a motion by the Earl of Crawford:

> That it be an instruction to the Committee on the Croydon Corporation Bill to strike out of the Bill all powers relating to the compulsory acquisition of the Hospital of the Holy Trinity (otherwise known as the Whitgift Hospital) in Croydon with its Chapel and Offices.

The Archbishop, after referring to the facts of the case, said:

> We are keeping this year (1923) in some of its forms the tercentenary of Shakespeare. There is a large demand, as booksellers will tell you, for a vision of the England of Shakespeare's days—its scenery, urban and rural; its people and its buildings. Here we have a building, beautiful in its simplicity, remarkable for its quiet dignity, in the middle of a great noisy borough, built in Shakespeare's day, opened, worked, and occupied in Shakespeare's day practically as it is now, and used from that time forward, as it was used then, with the same green sward, the same little chapel, the same little common room and hall, the same warden's chambers, and the rest, from that time down to this. It stands at the centre of the great borough Are we to allow it to be pulled down? If so, for what? To make the motor traffic, or the tram traffic a little easier or a little speedier at that point, while at the same time preserving intact the public house which stands opposite, and the shops that might well make way for the traffic. That is what we are asked to do.

The instruction was unanimously adopted.

The Archbishop had a genuine love of historic buildings, and deplored their destruction as though it were almost a sacrilege, so deep was his care for the continuity of English life. And it was the same kind of feeling which lay behind his dislike of the division of the old diocese of Winchester into three small bishoprics, and the alienation from Winchester of the historic Farnham

their own friends, and have a weekly allowance in full for whatever they now enjoyed? There was quite a clamour in answer—"No! no!" they almost shouted; "College was the thing—we are all proud of the College."' *Life of Archbishop Benson*, II. 254.

Castle. His words on the episcopal palaces connected with the three senior sees of London, Durham, and Winchester, in the debate in the Church Assembly on the Division of Winchester Diocese, July 12, 1923, are significant of his attitude:

> It was not for love of big houses that most people desired to maintain the great places like Fulham, Farnham and Auckland Castle, which were symbols of what happened in past history, and examples of the way in which English people regarded the peculiar responsibility for the common good that rested on the men who lived in them. It was not for their own sakes, but for the common good, that a special status of responsibility was attached to these three dioceses. . . . A Bishop of Winchester, whose income was smaller than that of most dioceses in England, who had left the ancient home at Farnham which had a place in English life for many centuries, and was living in a house within the precincts of the Cathedral City, could not necessarily and inherently retain all that the old state of things carried with it. . . . Lord Selborne had suggested that if the diocese of Canterbury were to be reduced to the City of Canterbury and very little more, there would be no real change as regards the status and prestige of the diocese. The analogy was not close, because an Archbishopric had a status of its own. But Lord Selborne ought to have gone further, and asked whether it would make any difference to the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, not merely if the See of Canterbury were reduced, but if he vacated Lambeth, and Lambeth were transferred to a council or a committee with a power of sale or power to use it for other purposes, and the Archbishop had to live at No. 16, The Precincts, Canterbury. The position of the Archbishop would not be ruined by that; but it would certainly be a changed position and the change would affect a great many things in English life. They were dealing to-day with something that concerned many different threads of English life, and reached back along those threads into the roots of English history.

II

A department of his official activities which gave him the keenest satisfaction was his work as Principal Trustee of the British Museum. The following account is from the pen of Sir Frederic Kenyon, with whom (as Director) Dr. Davidson was in the closest association during most of his tenure of the Primacy. Sir Frederic in sending it adds 'no words would be strong enough to

express my sense of his services to the Museum or of his kindness to myself':

The Archbishop first became a Trustee of the British Museum in 1884, as the nominee of the Sovereign. As Archbishop of Canterbury, he became *ex officio* the senior of the three Principal Trustees, and as such presided at every meeting of the Trustees or of the Standing Committee at which he was present. Some at any rate of his predecessors had not regarded these *ex officio* responsibilities as being of prime importance, and had only attended when some special business seemed to require their presence; but Archbishop Davidson took the duty seriously, and found it a pleasure. Though one of the busiest people in the kingdom, he attended whenever he was not imperatively required elsewhere; he made himself familiar with the work of the Museum, and his interest in it was very far from being perfunctory. With his natural gifts of character in addition, he was an admirable chairman, understanding all the points that arose, and was able both to guide and support the executive officers of the Museum.

My own acquaintance with him began shortly before my appointment as Director, when he sent for me to Lambeth, no doubt to satisfy himself as to the propriety of my nomination. To an inexperienced Director his support and advice were of inestimable value. He wished to be informed in advance of any important question that was likely to come up, and to have the materials for forming his judgement put before him; and he never failed to respond to any request for advice or help. He made it his principle to support the executive officers, and he never fussed about minor details; but he required to be informed, and to satisfy himself of the reasonableness of the course proposed to be taken. If he was not satisfied, he would seek information elsewhere, but never without informing the Director that he wished to do so and asking his assent. Such occasions were rare; but I remember one in particular, when he thought a suggested appointment would have been a hardship to another deserving member of the staff, and it need hardly be said that his judgement was followed. Where he gave his confidence, he gave it fully; and the Museum under his guidance was a happy family, and was troubled by few crises.

He was, however, quite ready to fight for the Museum when it was necessary. In the time of my predecessor, there was a period of sharp controversy, involving the relations between Bloomsbury and the Natural History Museum. The Archbishop went into all the details of the case, made up his mind as to the rights of it, and thereafter supported the Director and Principal Librarian without

flinching. A recrudescence of the same trouble occurred early in my time, and again the Archbishop took his full share in publicly defending what he was satisfied was right. In such cases he never spared time or trouble. He took his full responsibility as the head of the Governing Body of the Museum.

His interest in the Museum included a constant care for the interests of the staff. He was always anxious that the senior officers of the Museum should receive due public recognition of their services. It was sometimes an ungrateful task to secure this recognition from an unsympathetic Prime Minister with many claims on his consideration; but the Archbishop did not hesitate to expose himself to rebuffs on behalf of the staff for whom he felt himself responsible. I have many letters from him expressing his regret that what he thought the just claims of distinguished officials of the Museum (not put forward by themselves in any instance within my knowledge, but on their behalf) had been disregarded; and, if he had had his way, some unfortunate omissions in this respect would not have occurred. If for a time no recommendations were put forward, he would sometimes ask whether they were not due. He thought that the merits of the Museum staff were undervalued in the world at large, and he did all that he could to secure their more adequate recognition.

Another instance of his care for the interests of the staff was in connexion with the Official Guide-Lecturers, who had come into existence during his time. When all efforts to secure a moderately adequate remuneration for them through the ordinary channels had failed, he put himself at the head of a formidable deputation of Trustees to the Prime Minister, which carried too much weight to be resisted. The sum involved was insignificant, except to the recipients of it; but he thought it their due, and was ready to exert himself to secure it.

During the War, the Museum had to face two crises of first-class importance. The first was the question of the protection of the collections from the danger of attack from the air. The Archbishop, as head of the body of Trustees, was in the early days of the War the target for much ill-informed and panicky criticism. The actual danger was at that time small; indeed there was more risk of injury to the collections by hurried removal than from enemy action, while public alarm would have been increased by exaggerated precautions. The Archbishop accepted this point of view, but not without satisfying himself on the subject by personally visiting the Museum, inspecting the basements available for storage, and interviewing some of the heads of departments. At a later date, in view of increased popular fears, he represented that,

in the then existing circumstances, more alarm might be caused by not taking precautions than by taking them; and while it might be true that the chances of injury were mathematically very small, if a bomb *did* drop on the Museum, the Trustees would certainly be blamed for inaction. His advice, as usual, combined a wise estimate of actual facts with a statesmanlike perception of the necessity of taking account of public opinion; and the policy of graduated protection then adopted was on the lines which he had indicated. The final removal of all the more valuable objects to places of safety in the last year of the War, necessitated by official warnings of the greatly increased air peril to be expected, was a different matter, as to which there were no two opinions. It was a matter of necessity; though, as it turned out, no bomb fell on the Museum throughout the War.

A more serious crisis was the sudden proposal in December 1917 to take over the whole Museum as head-quarters for the Air Ministry. This hastily formed and ill-considered scheme had to be resisted to the utmost by all who cared for the treasures of the Museum and the honour of the country, to say nothing of the best interests of the Air Ministry, for which the Museum buildings were very ill-adapted. The Archbishop threw himself into the front of the fray, which was sharp though fortunately short. He attended two meetings of the War Cabinet to state the case for the Trustees. At the first his plea was somewhat light-heartedly dismissed on the ground that if the Air Ministry wanted the place, the opinion of the Trustees did not much matter; but at the second, when public opinion had expressed itself with unmistakable vigour, the advocates of the scheme beat a prudent retreat, and the Archbishop returned triumphant to receive the thanks of his colleagues for his successful defence.

For twenty-five years he remained the head of the Museum, as first of the Principal Trustees; and having served under him as Director for nineteen of those years, I can testify to his deep interest in the Museum, his courtesy and efficiency as chairman at the meetings of the Board,[1] his care for all grades of the staff, his loyal support of the officers, his constant readiness to help and advise, and (I cannot help adding) his most kindly personal friendship to

[1] The business was of the most varied—and unexpected—kind, and the Archbishop on returning to Lambeth, used often to remark on the surprises which he had encountered. Thus in a Memorandum of June 22, 1922, he noted. 'On Saturday 22nd a very important meeting of the Natural History Museum—an odd question arose which it seemed strange that we ecclesiastics and statesmen should have to settle—the tendency among negro boys to eat young flamingoes, or again the skin-diseases of the humpbacked whales'. (*Dictated July 25*)

myself. I know my predecessor had the same warmly affectionate feeling for him. When the time came for his decision to resign the Archbishopric, it became evident that he would deeply regret the termination of his connexion with the Museum; for his trusteeship being *ex officio*, it would cease with his tenure of the Archbishopric. It was clear that the Museum was not to him merely one of his official responsibilities, which he had discharged just because it was his way to take his responsibilities seriously, but that it had a strong hold on his affection. Fortunately it was found possible to avoid a severance which would have been equally regretted by the other Trustees and the staff. A Trustee (his old Harrow contemporary and friend, Lord Kilbracken), whose age and absence from town had for some time debarred him from attendance, readily resigned his Trusteeship, to which the Archbishop was promptly elected; and a supernumerary place was created for him on the Standing Committee, so that he might continue to take an active part in the administration of the Museum. His gratitude for this arrangement was most feelingly expressed; and to those connected with the Museum it was most gratifying to have this unimpeachable evidence of his affection for it. So, when the end came, he died as a Trustee of the Museum, after forty-six years continuous service; and the Museum felt deeply honoured when Lady Davidson invited its Director to be one of the pall-bearers at his funeral.

III

The Archbishop, by virtue of his office, was the recipient of many strange requests. Few were stranger than those repeated at intervals from 1915 to 1927—that he should arrange for the opening of a box supposed to contain sealed prophetic writings by Joanna Southcott—described by some as a prophetess, by others as a fanatic, and self-designated as 'The Lamb's Wife'—a farmer's daughter born in Devonshire in 1750. She had left directions at her death in 1814, after a most remarkable career, that the box should not be opened until a hundred years had passed, and then only in the presence of twenty-four Bishops, as representing the four-and-twenty elders described in Revelation iv. 4, and with a carefully prescribed ceremonial. Many were the petitions, and many were the prophecies, that if only the Archbishop would open the box untold blessings would result for the whole world. His invariable response was that it was unsatisfactory that any box containing old papers should be kept locked up for so long, and that in his judgement it should be

opened; but he was accustomed to add that to prevent erroneous reports some one should be present at the opening, accustomed to making minor legal investigations—such as taking affidavits from witnesses or the like—say 'a solicitor in the neighbourhood who was entitled to public confidence', and that the papers should be placed under proper custody and examined at leisure by some impartial and competent man. He steadily refused, however, to be in any sense a party to the opening himself. The following is a letter sent by his direction in 1922. It is not without its humour:

The ARCHBISHOP'S PRIVATE SECRETARY *to the* REV. G. C. ROBINSON

Private. November 2nd, 1922.

The Archbishop of Canterbury directs me to thank you for your letter of October 28th, about Joanna Southcott and her mysterious box. For many years past His Grace has been importuned by good and earnest (but, as he thinks, misguided) people to convene a solemn council of Bishops before whom this box may be opened. He has always been strongly against such a course, feeling, as he does, that the whole idea of the opening of the box in such circumstances is fantastic, and that the belief of Joanna's followers that it contains some wonderful revelation of the Divine purposes rests upon quite unsubstantial grounds. He has, however, said that he sees no reason why the box should not be opened by the people who have the custody of it, in the presence of some reputable person or persons, in order that those who have an interest in the matter may be satisfied as to what it contains, but he has consistently declined to be a party to any arrangement of the kind demanded by Joanna's followers. Some ten years ago Bishop Boyd Carpenter, anxious to set the minds of these worthy enthusiasts at rest, consented to be present, with a few other trustworthy persons, at an opening of the box. But the good people concerned would not accept anything short of a council of 24 Bishops (representing, it was suggested, the four-and-twenty elders of the Apocalyptic vision) and the solemn opening of the box in their presence (see PS.). The Archbishop thinks that those who, like yourself, are not followers of Joanna, and yet desire the Bishops to accede to the request, cannot fail on reflection to see in what an absurd position the Bishops would be placed if, having consented to the conditions demanded, the box were opened in their presence and found to contain nothing more than an additional collection

of the strange writings of that strange woman—or, conceivably, nothing at all!

PS. The Archbishop wishes me to add that, as a matter of fact, several Bishops did undertake to be present at the opening, and the Dean of Westminster offered that it should take place in the Jerusalem Chamber. This was declined by Joanna's followers, who said (if His Grace recollects rightly) that there must be, besides the 24 Bishops, 2,000 maidens in white—a not very easy arrangement. They were to represent, he thinks, the angels. Meantime two or three people wrote to say that there were rival boxes in different parts of England, and the Dean of Westminster and the others concerned allowed the matter to come to an end. This is private, but the Archbishop thinks that you ought to know about it.

The whole proceedings struck the Archbishop as 'partly profane and partly ridiculous'. The opening of the box was at last achieved on July 11, 1927. The scene was the Church House, Westminster, under the auspices of the National Laboratory for Psychical Research. The box was opened in the presence of one Bishop alone, the Bishop of Grantham, with the help of a Professor, and of a sufficient audience. The contents of the box had been already X-rayed, but, when the bands round it had been cut, the first two objects extracted by the Bishop were a woman's night-cap and a book called 'The Surprises of Love: or An Adventure in Greenwich Park'. The remaining treasures were a little less strange, but of hardly greater importance to the destinies of the world—a lottery ticket of 1796, a calendar of the French Court in 1793, a medal of Augusta, Princess of Wales, of 1772, a pistol, a dice-box, and a few coins. It was, truly, a queer revelation![1]

IV

In the course of his life there were many occasions on which the Archbishop was asked to give his advice on marriage questions of different kinds—and the demands increased after the War. In offering his counsel, he was never doctrinaire. But, while perfectly clear in his ruling, he often appealed to what he called common sense, and sometimes founded his answer on the actual wording of the marriage vows in the Service in the Book of

[1] In view of this discomfiture, episcopal aid is now (1935) being solicited for the opening of another box, alleged also to be the true box.

Common Prayer. Thus, where one of the parties was a Quaker, and so unbaptized, he would not feel obliged, solely on the ground of lack of baptism, to advise against marriage in the parish church, if both parties so desired; but would ask rather whether both parties fully appreciated the whole solemnity and doctrine of the Service, including the significance of the life long vow in the Name of the Trinity. From time to time he was asked to give advice or a ruling where one of the parties was a Jew. His attitude on such occasions is well indicated in the following letter to a young woman, the grand-daughter of an archdeacon, well known in old days to the Archbishop:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* MISS ——

November 2, 1925.

I have your important letter of October 29th. The problem you raise is one which has frequently been before me. It resolves itself practically into this: Can a parish priest be urged to marry a man who distinctly declines to call himself a Christian and who has to make a Declaration of a most solemn kind 'In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'? There are many men who, though nominally Jews, are virtually Christians of a liberal sort, and I have every wish to encourage such. But it is another thing to ask a priest to put those words into the mouth of a man to whom the central phrase is not only unmeaning but untrue. I had to discuss the subject with a leading statesman not long ago whose son was in the same position as the bridegroom in this case, and after looking into it all he told me he was sure that I was right. I am very sorry but I cannot say otherwise, deeply as I sympathize with you in the circumstances.

His correspondent replied that, when her fiancé first discussed the question with her, 'he was prepared to be baptised if that was essential, but we were told it was not—for which he was glad as he did not like the idea of going through a service in which he had to make reservations'. She added:

MISS —— *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

November 4, 1925.

Another question I would ask Your Grace, if you feel that it is wrong for an unbaptised person to use the termination 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'—would it not be possible to omit that and substitute 'In the name of God the Father'?

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* MISS ——

9 November 1925.

I thank you for your letter of November 4th. I note what you tell me as to an interpretation which the bridegroom might, in this case, be prepared to put upon the Christian words; but in the same letter you point out to me that he is definitely not in any full sense prepared to accept the position of membership in the Christian Church as such. You tell me that he is not baptised, and that he could not in honesty be baptised because he would have to make 'reservations'. With a view to meeting the difficulties, you suggest that I should sanction the alteration in the Marriage Service of the very solemn words in which the bridegroom makes his declaration. To do this would be illegal, even if it were desirable. I am very sorry indeed that you should be confronted with difficulties so grave, but I think you hardly realize what would be the position were the Archbishop of Canterbury to declare that it is the duty of a parish priest to use this quite distinctly Christian Service with a Christian declaration of a dogmatic kind at its centre for the marriage of one who, however earnest and excellent his religious life, is not prepared to declare himself a member of the Church of Christ.

The Archbishop's general attitude towards changes in the Law regarding the dissolution of the marriage bond has been explained in some detail in connexion with Lord Buckmaster's Matrimonial Causes Bill 1920. He had, however, an increasing number of personal problems propounded to him by clergy and others. He never shirked the difficulties which particular cases only too often involved; and was always willing both in letter, and in conversation to give the best help he could. But the principles which guided his advice were always the same; and are clearly stated in the following letter, written to an incumbent of the diocese regarding his son who had become engaged to a lady who, some six years previously, had divorced her husband for gross misconduct. The incumbent concerned was very unhappy and wished to do what was right. The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. ——

July 18, 1924.

I am afraid I can never regard it as other than extremely undesirable (I could use a much stronger term) that a man should

marry a lady who has passed through the Divorce Court. We may be perfectly persuaded in our own mind of the innocence of the petitioner in a Divorce Suit, and very often he or she is, as you say, much to be pitied, but undoubtedly the remarriage of such a person, be it man or woman, is contrary to the spirit and intent of our Church, if not to its positive enactments. I express the sense I entertain of disapproving of such marriages by declining to issue a Licence for their celebration. I do not say that it is impossible that such a Licence could be issued in some quite extraordinary case, but as a practice we decline to issue them.

With regard to a priest celebrating such a marriage in church after Banns, I have never forbidden him to do so if he makes up his own mind that it is right. I do not think he is guilty of an offence by so doing, and I leave the responsibility with him. I do not think, again, that it would be true to say that the priest celebrating such a marriage is condoning sin. It would be difficult to declare it so, when we remember that such men as Bishop Christopher Wordsworth of Lincoln, Bishop Edward King of Lincoln, and Canon William Bright of Christ Church, three of the staunchest Churchmen of the century, though deprecating these marriages as undesirable, believed in and advocated their legitimacy. I am not sure that Bishop Wordsworth does not draw a distinction between the husband and the wife in the matter. But anyhow none of those three regard the thing as in itself sinful. I do not consider that an innocent divorcee thus remarried is thereby excluded from Communion.

I feel deeply for you in this trial in your life, and I feel sure that you are acting wisely in taking care not to let what has occurred bring about a breach between yourself and your son. I am quite sure that you want to do what is right in the matter.

Again, as the Visitor of some schools and on the governing body of others, the Archbishop had, on more than one occasion, to consider the difficult situation caused when a schoolmaster divorced his wife and married again. These cases undoubtedly caused him a great deal of anxiety, as two separate questions were involved, one concerning the continuance of the individual master on the staff, the other, the admission of the master as a member of the Church of England to Holy Communion. Generally speaking, the Archbishop took the view that the first was a matter for the headmaster, and one in which the governing body might claim some say; while the second was a matter for the Bishop of the diocese. With regard to the latter he did not take

any different line from that which he was accustomed to take in dealing with the various individual cases which came before him. Putting the matter succinctly, he wrote to a particular headmaster who had consulted him, as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* HEADMASTER OF ——

November 20, 1922.

Personally I have never regarded the remarriage of the innocent party after divorce as disqualifying for Communion the innocent man or woman who has thus remarried; but I greatly dislike and disapprove of such remarriages. I refuse to grant Licences for them or to perform them. Some of my Episcopal brothers go further and regard the remarriage as grossly sinful. I cannot myself take that view greatly as I disapprove of the act. I follow in this the line taken by Bishop King and Dr. William Bright.

On the general question with which the headmaster and the governing body were concerned, after a good deal of consideration he expressed his final views in a letter which was clearly intended by him to be of general application:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* HEADMASTER OF ——

July 27, 1923.

You will remember that in our recent conversation I told you that I should like to write you a letter indicating my personal view respecting the problem you have recently had before you at ——.

I feel strongly that a man who accepts a mastership in one of our great Public Schools places himself under limitations affecting his personal liberty of action to a degree inapplicable in the case of an ordinary man, whether he be in Orders or a layman. The life, and not least the domestic life, of a schoolmaster concerns many others besides his intimate friends or his family circle. Especially does this principle become applicable when any question of divorce and remarriage arises. There may be men who are placed in a position which, in their view, necessitates application to the Divorce Court for relief. I do not think this is certainly so, for I believe that judicial separation could practically effect in almost all cases what is obtainable by a divorce, with the single difference that remarriage is not possible. But, granted that divorce may sometimes be necessary or possibly even desirable (a large assumption), it is quite clear that a man cannot be

under a corresponding obligation to effect a new marriage. I think that if any master on the staff of a great Public School decides to apply to the Divorce Court, opportunity should be taken by the Headmaster or the authorities of the School to intimate to him that, should he obtain a divorce, his remarriage after such divorce would not during the life of the divorced wife be consonant with his position as one of the School Staff of Masters. There is perhaps no subject upon which there are keener feelings aroused at present, in great sections of our population, than upon this subject, and, considering how far reaching is the trust which parents repose in the master under whom their son is placed in a Public School, they ought not, I think, to be liable to the risk of finding that the master whom they thus trusted has placed himself in a position which they regard as morally wrong. Further, if a new wife takes the position towards little boys which the wife of a good schoolmaster rightly takes, the difficulty is enhanced, and the distress to certain parents who feel keenly on such matters is necessarily great. At the same time, the parents are in present conditions precluded from removing the son, as he probably could not obtain a corresponding position in any other school.

A Headmaster ought not, I think, to find any real difficulty in putting this before any master whom he knows to be instituting divorce proceedings. But the Headmaster's action in so doing would, I suppose, be facilitated if he were able to say that he was acting upon a settled rule or custom or upon the advice of those to whom he is entitled to turn for authoritative counsel. I have, of course, no such status as entitles me to lay down such a rule with authority or to prescribe to a Headmaster the course he ought to follow, but I should not feel quite happy, in view of what has recently occurred, did I not say that such is my deliberate opinion, and place the opinion thus on record. Nor should I feel myself precluded from stating to colleagues on the Governing Body, or to Headmasters and Assistant Masters in our Public Schools, that I do formally put this opinion in writing as one by which I am prepared to stand. I would go further and say that, if a Headmaster were being appointed to a School wherein I occupied a leading position on the Governing Body, I should probably feel it to be right to make to him such a formal statement of opinion. Of course it is entirely different with regard to one who is already a Headmaster. He must judge for himself as to what is right after weighing circumstances and counsel to the best of his ability.

V

From the first moment that it even appeared to come within the range of practical politics, the Archbishop was a firm supporter of the League of Nations. It was, therefore, very fitting that Dr. Davidson should be asked to preach the sermon in St. Peter's Cathedral,[1] Geneva, on the Sunday before the opening of the Third Assembly of the League of Nations. But it was none the less very remarkable—and made a great stir at the time—that an Archbishop of Canterbury should preach in the pulpit of John Calvin. The Archbishop, describing his visit, wrote thus:

September 12, 1922.

> During the last fortnight we have had an experience novel and unforgettable in attending the Assembly of the League of Nations. It was suggested by many of those prominent in the matter, notably Willoughby Dickinson and Robert Cecil, that it would be a good thing if I were to preach at Geneva before the opening of the third Assembly of the League, and after going into the matter we decided to accept. Arthur Balfour, Fisher, and Lloyd George himself expressed to me their earnest satisfaction at my resolve, and that it would make a genuine difference to the position of the League in the public eye.

He saw a great deal during the time—going over the Headquarters of the League, and of the International Labour Office, attending two meetings of the Council, besides the Assembly, and having many talks with Balfour (on the problem of the Holy Places in Palestine, and the Near East generally), Lord Robert Cecil, Mr. Herbert Fisher, and others, as well as with leading Swiss pastors and laymen:

> Sunday, September 3rd, we went to the English Church early. I celebrated, and walked home with Robert Cecil. We went to the Cathedral by 10.30 or so, and found the congregation mustering already in great force. Seats were reserved for officials of all sorts, and the whole place was crowded. Some were standing at the West End where hearing must have been difficult. Arthur Balfour came in before the service and was introduced by me to the Consistoire.

The Archbishop went to his place at the east end of the cathedral, the little silver cross on its ebony staff, which had been presented

[1] 'By courteous permission of the Consistory of the National Protestant Church at Geneva.'

to him by the Bishops of the Lambeth Conference, steering him through the people, past the pulpit, up to the stalls on the East—a rather notable and unfamiliar sight in this Protestant shrine. Mr. Balfour read the Lesson. The sermon, which 'lasted for some 50 minutes, but nobody seemed to mind', was an admirably planned and considered statement of the Christian doctrine on the obligation of a State and a group of States towards our Lord's words 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God'; on the positive duty of the nations to seek righteousness; and on the positive constructive work done by the League itself in promoting the righteousness of God—'in its deliberate care for what is just, what is merciful, what is tender to human weakness', with special reference to the 22nd and 23rd Articles of the Covenant. And it ended with a strong, massive appeal against war:

> I have left to my last word the gravest and most urgent of our thoughts, that to which, after all, the League of Nations owes its birth—the awful, the horrible, the devil-devised barrier of war. Vain to talk of the 'righteousness of God' while that monstrous arbitrament impends. . . . We have seen with our own eyes, we have heard in our own homes and hospitals, its unspeakable, its illimitable horrors. And deliberately we say that, God helping us, there shall be no 'next time'. The foremost thinkers and statesmen and rulers now alive in Christendom have thrown their strength into devising plans—by tribunals, by delays, by pledges, by conditions, by sanctions—to make the thing impossible. And meantime we may surely say that militarism has fashioned its own coffin. We are here to clinch the nails. Every thinking man who is worthy of the name, whatever his creed, whatever his nationality, is with us in the resolve. Civilized humanity, yea, and uncivilized, is on our side. It is, or it ought to be, unthinkable that we fail. . . . We are here to-day as Christians. If only every man and woman who holds that holy faith, could realize for himself, for herself, what the love of Jesus Christ our Saviour means, would there be need for a League of Nations? Before the impact of that love, whatever is vile or cowardly or self-seeking would go down, and righteousness and peace would stand. And it is there. Use it to that great end. Concentrated here on holy ground in this nineteen hundred and twenty-second year of grace—year of Christ—we call God to witness that, as Christians, we will neither doubt nor flinch nor fail. Once let the Christian men and women upon earth, West and East, North and South, kneel to God side by side, stand shoulder to shoulder before men, to say what they mean

shall happen, or rather, what shall not happen, in the round world again, and they are irresistible. Would to God that any words of mine to-day should help to rally that unconquerable force to pledge itself with one voice to the great emprise. Resistless, invincible, yes, because it is the Will of God, and if we answer to that Will there is none other that can stand. The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. May the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

But though the Archbishop was beyond doubt a steadfast champion of peace—he was always a realist. He was not willing to commit himself to vast world conferences, with no special plan behind them—and more than once he refused to be party to a great utterance in favour of world peace 'at this very time for example (October 1922) when the Near East is hovering on the brink of war, which we are doing all that we can, God helping us, to avert, but which may become any day a reality'. The very same distrust of generalities and vagueness also made him somewhat cold to Memorials on War Guilt, or Peace Letters. Thus he wrote to the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Temple):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF MANCHESTER

October 9, 1924.

I realize the importance of your suggestion that the Bishops should commit themselves to a statement about War guilt in 1914, but I own that I see the greatest difficulty or even impossibility in getting the Episcopate to sign any document of the sort you suggest. I fear I should myself feel bound to say, if the matter were discussed, that while I entirely agree in saying that a hundred years of international rivalries, commercial and other, had their natural sequence in a War it is impossible to place ourselves on a level with either Germany, Austria, Russia, or possibly France, in regard to responsibility for the 1914 War. I know too well the ceaseless endeavours which had been made by all our best leaders in this country to avert such a calamity and to quench as far as they could the inflammatory endeavours of our militant section of Englishmen. If I feel this, I am certain that many other Bishops would feel it much more strongly, and even if this were not so, can it be said that a private Meeting of Bishops is a proper place for formulating a document on that subject? I cannot think so. But I should like to talk the matter over with you.

In a similar spirit he refused to sign the following peace letter to

the Prime Minister, which was forwarded to him by Mr. Arthur Ponsonby:

Proposed Letter to the PRIME MINISTER

Sir,

We the undersigned, convinced that all disputes between nations are capable of settlement either by diplomatic negotiation or by some form of International Arbitration, hereby solemnly declare that we shall refuse to support or render war service to any Government which resorts to arms.

The Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* A. PONSONBY, ESQ.

November 26, 1925.

Sheer stress of work by day and night has delayed my reply to your letter of November 19th. I am afraid I could not sign, for transmission to the Prime Minister, the blunt little letter which you enclosed. I do not think that we can thus in a sentence dogmatize in such a way as to cover all possible contingencies. Ought the Swiss in the days of William Tell to have made such a declaration? Ought Belgium to have made it in 1914? Perhaps you will say 'Yes' in both cases. but peace-lover as I am, my dogmatic instinct is not keen enough to take that view in this unhesitating way. I have never been able to support the principles which Tolstoy inculcated, and your letter to the Prime Minister seems to mean that and nothing else. The League of Nations would have to be rewritten if this were what we held.

VI

It was just in these last five years of his Archbishopric that Dr. Davidson came into touch with the great new public service of broadcasting.[1] In March 1923, he was approached by Mr. J. C. W. Reith, the General Manager of the Company, with regard to the provision of addresses at religious services on Sundays, and the formation of a small advisory committee. At that time, so Mr. Reith told the Archbishop, there were something like 100,000 listeners in London. The Archbishop was much interested in the whole idea, asked various questions, and saw at

[1] The British Broadcasting Company was formally incorporated December 15, 1922, and on January 18, 1923, received a licence to establish and work a system of broadcasting.

once the possibilities. In the course of conversation Mr. Reith suggested that the Archbishop might like to hear wireless for himself: and accordingly he and Mrs. Davidson dined with the Reiths on March 20. While they were talking together before dinner, Mr. Reith pressed the button turning on the wireless unobserved by the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson. They were entirely amazed. The Archbishop arranged for a conference of some fourteen Churchmen and Free Churchmen on April 20, 1923—sending out the following note for agenda beforehand:

> On Friday, April 20th, at 5 p.m., I am holding at Lambeth Palace a little private meeting of some twelve or fifteen people to discuss the question laid before me by the promoters of the Broadcasting System as to the use which could rightly and profitably be made of broadcasting on Sundays and especially Sunday evenings. Ought there to be a religious element? If so, what? And by whom arranged? The officers of the Broadcasting Company, whose aim is obviously a high one, are anxious to have wise advice.
>
> RANDALL CANTUAR:

The meeting actually took place in the Archbishop's room in the House of Lords. The Archbishop warmly welcomed Mr. Reith's two principles of (1) no transmission during the hours of service, (2) a religious address every Sunday evening. An advisory committee was set up in London representing the Church of England, the Free Churches, and the Roman Catholics; and similar committees were started in connexion with the various stations. The question of broadcasting regular church services was discussed between the Archbishop and Mr. Reith; but this was postponed, and Mr. Reith himself took the view that, after the refusal of the Dean of Westminster to allow the wedding of the Duke of York to be broadcast from the Abbey, he was not ready to make any more overtures in that direction for the time. The Archbishop's own first broadcast was on the last night of the same year, December 31, 1923—and all went well.

VII

The Archbishop was not a frequenter of the theatre. He appreciated a really good production of Shakespeare's plays; and though not musical he thoroughly enjoyed Gilbert and Sullivan's operas. It was not, however, until the last years of his life that, as

Archbishop, he actually saw a modern play—the first two being Drinkwater's *Abraham Lincoln* and *Robert E. Lee.* In 1924, he saw Bernard Shaw's *St. Joan*, and the following letter from the actress who played the title part—an old friend of the Davidsons since Rochester days—reflects something at least of his interest in that drama.

DAME SYBIL THORNDIKE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

6 Carlyle Sq. New Theatre. June 7, 1924.

I do not know how to thank you enough for writing so kindly and so helpfully in the midst of your overwhelmingly busy life. It was a great encouragement and stimulant to us both to have such a letter. When one is engrossed and absorbed, as we have necessarily to be in the technical side of one's art, one is apt to lose sight a little of the other side of it—for which of course one primarily exists—the effect on the public. This play and the Greek plays have shown us how the public do respond to something which is fundamentally great. This *St. Joan* is particularly wonderful to me because it is the first great Christian play I've ever known. The Greeks have influenced our art so much—and even Shakespeare in his greatest moments gets away from Christianity to the real tragedy of the Pagan. It was Shaw or Masefield that said to me the other day 'There is no such thing as a Christian tragedy', and *that*'s what has made 'Joan' so marvellous to me—it has shown that there *is* in people—in humans—something as profound as tragedy but transcending it. Tragedy was the expression of the highest and most moving—the deepest things that humans share; I've often wondered why there was nothing that touched the heights and depths that was of happiness instead of sorrow—but I've found out its only in Christianity one gets the bigger expression. One has known it in pictures. Christianity has produced the greatest—that's why I love *St. Joan* so—it has something of the quality of the mediaevals, only in the modern expression. But it needs great Christians to write this thing which transcends tragedy, and G.B.S. has at last shown a Faith which we who know him and love him have been sure was there—but he hides his own self so—and he is such a great deeply religious man. Please forgive this long vague answer. Your letter was so wonderful—we wish we could find more such plays—but they will come, I feel, because people *want* them. Thank you from both of us for your very kind thought—coming to the play and writing to us.

The Archbishop liked a good, simple story, well acted. Once he

went to see Tchekov's *Cherry Orchard*. Miss Mary Mills who went with him writes:

> It was an anxious experiment, but succeeded because in every scene he felt that something must bring matters to a head; and as the curtain went up on one scene he whispered, 'I think he *must* propose now!'—but of course nothing did occur.

Dr. Davidson was on various occasions privately consulted by the Lord Chamberlain, when questions arose about plays on religious subjects. Two typical answers are given below.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EARL OF CROMER

13th November 1924.

I return herewith the Play *Judas Iscariot*. I wish they did not write these Plays, for the men who write them are not men qualified to handle these great subjects greatly. This good man has handled it feebly but quite harmlessly unless we were to say that nothing of the kind could be on the Stage at all, and that position can no longer be sustained. So far therefore as I am concerned I should raise no criticism to your giving him the licence. My belief is that the Play is so thin that it would not attract great attention. One dare not, however, say this when the title is of so sensational a sort and the whole subject is so unfamiliar to quantities of our fellow countrymen that they may imagine Mr. Thurston to be an original theological thinker, which is very far from being the case. Nothing could be more reverent and proper than the style in which he writes, granted that we are to have such Plays. I am rather glad that Bernard Shaw does not take a Play of that sort in hand for he might raise for us much more perilous issues.

A more difficult issue was raised when John Masefield asked for permission to present for public performance a play in which Our Lord appeared. The play (*The Trial of Jesus*) was stated certainly to go beyond what had been previously allowed in the treatment of the subject. The Archbishop gave his opinion as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* EARL OF CROMER

10th March 1926.

I have read the Masefield play, or nearly all of it. The problem before you is not an easy one and I am afraid it is going to be a recurrent one. In these circumstances it seems to me that the moment has come when there must be some quite definite ruling

adopted for the time at least in dealing with these border-line religious questions when they arise. If so, one very simple rule would be that whatever else is sanctioned or forbidden it must be definitely forbidden that our Lord Himself should be represented on the stage as a character in a play. In this particular play the author has said nothing that is irreverent and nothing, so far as I can judge, which is necessarily inconsistent with the Gospel narrative, though I should take exception if I were a critic to some of the implications, and I think it most undesirable that the passages about our Lord's Mother which you have marked should stand in any authorised play. Of course the opinion which the speakers express in those passages is not a new or modern scoff or talk; it has occasionally found expression for many generations but it is unnecessary to the course of the narrative and I think it does harm.

The real point, however, on which I should lay emphasis is that our Lord appears as a character in the drama and although his actual spoken words are said with greater or less accuracy to be only what Scripture or ancient tradition gives us, the fact remains that the Divine Figure is placed upon the stage. Of course 'Oberammergau' would be quoted by the other side, but that stands entirely by itself. It has never been regarded as falling within the category of licensed dramatic representations. I think a quite clear rule laid down to the effect that our Lord Himself must not appear in a drama would be understood by the public generally if the question were raised. Once sanction it and I do not see where you could stop. Suppose, for example, some great drama were written on Miltonic lines introducing not our Lord only but even God the Father. Most people I think would be shocked and public opinion would certainly support the authorities in refusing licence for it. Masefield I think is a very reasonable person and I believe would understand such a prohibition as I have suggested. Its value lies in its definiteness. It is not a matter of degree alone but of positiveness, and this would make the rule easier both to understand and to apply. Probably in this case you would feel it to be right that a letter should be written to the author so as to show that you are not accusing him of irreverence or profaneness but that you simply must apply such a rule as I have suggested. Of course it would not mean that you were necessarily going to sanction every Gospel drama from which the Figure of our Lord was absent. Each case would have to be considered on its merits, but you could at least be quite definite in the particular point.

I am afraid that all this is rather unhelpful, but I find it very difficult to say more. To tighten the rein overmuch when the

author is reverent in intent and phrase might I think lead to reaction and protest, whereas I do not think protest would be awakened by the definite ruling that the Figure of our Blessed Lord Himself must not be produced in any drama which you sanction.

VIII

The Archbishop was from time to time invited to write prefaces, or (in later years) tributes to his contemporaries. He often consented, and indeed liked to pay honour to those who had been his friends or fellow workers. On one particular occasion he was invited to undertake the more arduous task of writing a study of Queen Victoria in the closing years of her life. In 1925, he noted in his Papers as follows:

> I have been feeling very anxious as to what might happen when the next volume of Queen Victoria's Letters are published, as I think they may present a picture of her which would need a good deal of explanation if it is to be rightly understood. I have long had a great wish that Rosebery should write a little preface to the volumes, for it would come with quite unique weight from him, considering his detachment from partisan questions and the width of his knowledge of European as well as English statesmanship. We visited him at Dalmeny in September, and I pressed it upon him again, but I could not get him to undertake even the briefest production of the kind. I dread the growth of a totally misleading view, which may be taken by a generation of readers who never saw her, and who will probably quite underrate the magnitude of her real influence on English life, and the grounds on which it rested. Of course he and others say that I ought to write something myself, but that is quite different from anything which might emanate from a man like Rosebery. Any words of mine would be utterly discounted in a way which his could not. Bigge agrees with me about this, and the same applies, though for different reasons, to himself; what he wrote would be looked upon as belonging to the clique of her own people and not to English life as a whole. I am hoping to see Rosebery again at the Durdans, and shall return to the charge, but with very faint hope of success.

The Archbishop read some of the proofs of the new volume (Second Series, vol. i) in the summer. He tried his best to persuade Lord Rosebery to write, but with little result. 'I could no more extract from my decrepit brain a piece worthy of Queen Victoria than I could jump over the moon'—so he wrote to the

Archbishop on February 8, 1926. Mr. G. E. Buckle, the editor, then begged the Archbishop himself to write a short article. The Archbishop consented, and the article duly appeared in *The Times* on February 24, the day before the publication of the *Letters*. He was glad to do it, for, as he said, the general estimate of that august Lady amongst the younger generation of average Englishmen was not a true one, underrating her real greatness both as woman and as Queen. The Archbishop spoke of her unfailing memory, 'tireless diligence applied with straightforward common sense', 'lofty moral standard', 'imperative sense of duty', 'intense human sympathy', and the whole 'permeated by genuine religious earnestness'. But perhaps the most interesting paragraph in the article, from the biographer's point of view, is the following:

> What exactly it was which constituted the irresistible charm attaching to her, I have never been able quite clearly to define, but I think it was the combination of absolute truthfulness and simplicity with the instinctive recognition and quiet assertion of her position as Queen and of what belonged to it. I have known many prominent people, but with hardly one of them was it found by all and sundry so easy to speak freely and frankly after even a very long acquaintance. I have sometimes wondered whether the same combination of qualities would have been as effective in a person of stately or splendid appearance. May it have been that the very lack of those physical advantages, when combined with her undeniable dignity of word and movement, produced what was in itself a sort of charm? People were taken by surprise by the sheer force of her personality. It may seem strange, but it is true that as a woman she was both shy and humble. Abundant examples will occur to those who knew her. But as a Queen she was neither shy nor humble, and asserted her position unhesitatingly.

The tribute (which in the end had a brief note from Rosebery attached as a sort of postscript) was received with general admiration. Lord Rosebery himself described it as giving 'the fairest and most illuminating portrait of the Queen that we have'. Mr. Buckle wrote to the same effect, and with a particular appreciation of the literary expression: while the following, from Lord Esher, was a prophecy of the complete change of public opinion about Queen Victoria which in fact followed the publication of the *Letters* with an almost miraculous rapidity:

VISCOUNT ESHER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Roman Camp, Callander, N.B. 23 Feb. 1926.

I like your admirable paper immensely. I only wish my review was half as good. The most striking thing you say is the contrast between the shy humble woman, and the Queen, who was neither. It is so true.

The silly people, and the writers out for 'effect', who scoff at the Queen and her servants have no chance at all against the overwhelming facts and the 'documentation'—as the French say—which cannot fail to place the Queen on a par (not second) with Elizabeth. Both had their frailties. Both left a deeper mark on England than any other sovereign.

Rosebery would have been good. But *no one* carries so much conviction as you do—standing outside the political arena.

IX

There was one employment or post of honour which did not come his way, though many desired it for him, partly because of this very independence of the political arena. But the story is not without its value.

It so happened that in the spring of 1925 a new Chancellor for the University of Oxford had to be elected, in succession to Lord Cave and Lord Milner. The President of Trinity sounded the Archbishop in the middle of May to see whether he would allow himself to be nominated. There was much talk and much correspondence. It was clear that the Archbishop had a good deal of support. It was also clear that those who, on the conservative side, had so recently secured the election of Lord Milner had no other candidate to put forward. But the Archbishop disliked the notion of any contest—and he particularly disliked the thought of a contest which would be anti-liberal, and also anti-Asquith; for Lord Grey had retired in favour of Lord Oxford, who had the support, outside the residents, both of Sir John Simon and of Lord Birkenhead. The Archbishop accordingly wrote the following letter to the President of Trinity (Dr. H. E. D. Blakiston):

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* PRESIDENT OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

Lambeth Palace. May 30, 1925.

Let me first say how gratefully I appreciate the kindness, the considerateness and the judgment which you have shown as

regards myself in this rather tangled business of the Chancellorship. I have also had a quite new and unexpected revelation of friendship and confidence on the part of many of those whom I respect most cordially both in Oxford and outside. To them too I am intensely grateful. I am, of course, not so foolish as to suppose that personality has been the main factor, or even a large factor, in evoking the encouragement and support of those on whose behalf you have been writing to me. It is largely to the Office which I hold that the respect has been shown and this I most warmly appreciate on public grounds.

But in all the circumstances, as they have now developed, I do not feel that I could appropriately or with any satisfaction allow myself to be nominated with a view to a contest with Asquith, who, both in his personality and in the record of his life, has so much that marks him as a fit man for that great position. I hope that he may be elected without a contest.

He sent a copy to Lord Oxford, who replied as follows:

The EARL OF OXFORD AND ASQUITH *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

The Wharf, Sutton Courtney, Berks. 1 June, 1925.

I cannot sufficiently thank you for your own letter, and for letting me see the enclosure.

I can honestly say that I was not at all anxious to become a candidate; indeed, I was well content with the selection of Milner.

And the idea of a contest on anything like party lines was thoroughly repugnant to me; as I have no doubt it was to many of those who were wishful that you should consent to stand. It was only when I was assured that my nomination was desired by not a few who belong to the other political camps that I agreed to it.

The generosity and real friendliness which you have shown me in the matter I can never forget. They form one of those rare tributes of which a man may well be proud.

X

From these various employments Randall Davidson turned with never-failing delight to his holidays. He especially enjoyed a holiday abroad, above all in Italy, whether in Venice or Florence, or by Lake Maggiore at Baveno or Cannero, or by some of the other lakes. He loved the walks on the hills by the lakes, and the rests during which Mrs. Davidson or Miss Mills might

read aloud while he would sketch, thus practising what was a very real gift that in former days found expression in admirable water-colour drawings. In Florence his favourite haunt was the Spanish Chapel; and the pictures which particularly pleased him always had history in them. He had an intimate knowledge of Venice, and in September 1922 spent twelve golden days of sunshine there, enjoying the gondola as well as the long rambling walks about the streets, backwards and forwards on the bridges.

But the Italian holidays were not so usual after the War as they had been before. It was Scotland that most clearly called him. Sir Walter Scott once said to a friend, 'If I did not see the heather at least once a year, *I think I should die.*'[1] It was the same with the Archbishop. We give two pictures from those who nearly every year had the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson with them in their homes north of the Tweed. The first is from Miss Elizabeth Haldane describing the time at Cloan:

> Once the Archbishop crossed the Border and reached his native land he seemed to us to cast off his cares of office and to become the boy he was at Muirhouse when he used to carry a sister-in-law on his shoulders. With his gaiters discarded he became what our people described as 'like ane o 'oor ain ministers', which meant that every trace of the self-consciousness which the Scot associates with high dignitaries in the Church of England disappeared. And when he took Family Prayers on Sunday evenings he adopted the Scottish fashion of doing so quite simply, knowing that this was what would appeal to the household.
>
> Then at Cloan we had such wonderful walks, for he cared for long walks just as we did, and as Mrs. Davidson did, for she and he seemed the same as far as tastes and interests were concerned. We wandered over the Ochils and negotiated dry-stone-dykes and burns successfully. So many of these walks remain in my mind because of the conversations that took place on them. My brother Richard and he discussed deep politics as well as personalities, and we every now and then joined in. . . .
>
> Then he loved fishing and the young people longed to get him to 'guddle' i.e. catch trout in a burn from under the stones by hand —he knew the pastime well—and knowing his passion for the art, they tried one Sunday afternoon to arrange to leave fishing tackle all ready close to a solitary little loch, and see, if every one discreetly disappeared, whether he would succumb to the temptation and break the Sabbath! Needless to say their efforts were in vain.

[1] Lockhart's *Life of Scott*, ch. xxxix.

The second picture is supplied by Mrs. Andrew Carnegie and shows the Archbishop and Lord Davidson on their visits to Skibo Castle:

He and Lady Davidson were always such welcome visitors, for he was so genial and took such a keen and delightful interest in all the little incidents of our home life. Every body loved him, from the oldest to the youngest member of the family. I remember, particularly, one afternoon when the grandchildren were trying to fly a large kite directed by their father on the lawn. They had some difficulty in raising it at first. The Archbishop was starting out for his walk, but everything was forgotten in his keen interest in watching every detail of the kite's raising. He was like a boy, and was as pleased as the children when they finally succeeded in raising it to a considerable height.

Often in the evenings the young people would retire to the billiard room to make fudge (an American sweet) in a chafing-dish. The Archbishop would slip away from us in the drawing room, and later we would discover him seated beside the young people, a broad smile on his face, watching the process—from the cracking of the nuts then being added to the boiling mixture of sugar and milk, and no one was more interested and pleased with the finished product than he. He also often joined the young people in playing billiards and they always enjoyed their games with him, for he was as keen as they.

. . . In every way, he joined heartily in everything that interested us. The prattle of the children interested him. He would draw them out to tell of the books they were reading and listened intently to what they told him. He always took occasion, during his visits, for a little friendly talk with each member of the family, and he showed such genuine interest, we were delighted to talk quite freely to him. During one of his early visits in my husband's lifetime, a very delightful incident occurred, and a few years ago when I told the Archbishop my husband's life was being written by Burton J. Hendrick, he asked me if I would like to have him write out the incident for Mr. Hendrick to use if he wished. Of course, I was delighted. The Life of Mr. Carnegie has just been published and Mr. Hendrick uses the incident just as the Archbishop wrote it, and I copy it for you:

'I have always been a student of birds and their ways. I mentioned to Mr. Carnegie that I had that morning watched one of the autumnal gatherings of golden crested wrens, who were about to flit, and who, before flitting, are accustomed to gather excitedly, and are strangely tame at such a time. He was

interested and asked me to take him to the place. We went together, and I felt the usual trepidation one has lest an animal whose actions one has foretold should decline to "play up" when the time comes. We were standing on a little rustic bridge over a burn at the edge of a wood not far from the house. The wrens were all about us, in the trees and even on the ground. I urged Mr. Carnegie to remain absolutely still; this he did, and to my wonder and delight one of the wrens hopped up the rough fir branch which formed the railing of the bridge and on which his hand was laid. It went on, hopped up his arm and sat on his shoulder. I have never seen such a thing before or since, and I was profoundly grateful to the wren for thus endorsing the rather rash prophecy I had made as to its behaviour. Since then I have tried more than once to stand near a gathering of wrens at such a time, but the bird I have described was, so far as my experience goes, a unique personality.'

CHAPTER LXXVII

THE LAST YEARS—MISSIONARY AND RACE PROBLEMS

It is by the finest tints and most insensible gradations that Nature descends from the fairest face about St. James's to the sootiest complexion in Africa. At which tint of these is it, that the ties of blood are to cease? and how many shades must we descend lower still in the scale, ere mercy is to vanish with them?

LAURENCE STERNE to IGNATIUS SANCHO, July 27, 1766.

FEW things interested the Archbishop more than the questions so constantly referred to Lambeth by Bishops overseas. No trouble was too much, no season too busy for him to give them the very best help he could. Some of the help was given by letter, some by personal conversation—and it may be safely said that hardly any Bishop of a diocese overseas came to England on leave without a part of a day, or more often a night, at Lambeth or Canterbury. Among many questions with which he was asked to deal, some were concerned with matters of internal organization; some with problems of race; some with the development of a young self-governing Church; and some with the relation of the Anglican Churches to other Churches in their neighbourhood. He was always anxious to enlist the help of those who had a responsibility in the matter—often more for their sake than his own, though this never appeared; and constant were the visits of the Secretaries of the Missionary Societies, and the Missionary Council, and the International Missionary Council, and Commissaries of different dioceses.

We have already in an earlier chapter given instances of the problems which he handled, and the reality of his care for the work of the Church overseas will have been apparent in various other pages of this biography. It is impossible to do justice to the scope of his interest, or to the continuous exercise of an almost patriarchal solicitude for different parts of the Anglican Communion. A few incidents, however, may be quoted to give some indication of the variety of the claims upon his time and attention.

I

Our first illustration is of a personal character, and concerns one of the very few cases in which he felt obliged to tell a Bishop

that he ought to resign. A clergyman of unusual evangelistic powers had been appointed before the War to the charge of an immense diocese in the Pacific. He endeavoured to raise the large sum of £100,000 to maintain religious, educational, and medical ministrations on an ample scale in every centre in his diocese in which there were British residents: and he proposed to make England his head-quarters for raising this fund during five or six years, making annual visits to his diocese. The plan was not unnaturally criticized, and the appeal failed. The Archbishop had many interviews and much correspondence with the Bishop, and persuaded him to return to his see. Unhappily, however, the Bishop did not prove a good administrator, and serious complaints of the administration of the diocese reached the Archbishop at Lambeth. He returned home, this time seriously ill; but, after a time of recuperation, the Archbishop saw him again and encouraged him—for though, as usual, very sanguine about the future, 'he seemed to have a better basis than formerly for his hopes'. The Bishop after some further delay arrived back in his diocese in July 1914. But it soon became clear that the condition of the diocese had gone from bad to worse, and had become, in the Archbishop's judgement, wellnigh hopeless.

On September 10, 1914, the Archbishop wrote to the Bishop, telling him frankly of the adverse reports about his administration (or, rather, lack of administration) of his diocese, and adding:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF ——

10 September 1914.

I may be mistaken, but it seems to me that two alternatives only are before you. One is that you should settle down in such central place as you deem best, with a firm resolve and a published promise that you will stay there steadily for some years to come, except for visits to particular places within the Diocese, and that on these visits you will really be at the call of those who want to see you, and will stir up enthusiasm by persistent and devoted service. That is one possibility. The other is that you should resign. It goes to my heart to say this, but I think it is only honest both to you and to the Church that I should now say it. I attribute the failure—for so I must so far regard it—as having been due chiefly to your absence from the Diocese, and subsequently to your ill-health. This last was, again, responsible, by no fault of yours, for a further absence. You will judge whether you now feel strong enough and buoyant

enough and hopeful enough to be able to adopt the first of the two courses I have suggested. If so, God bless you in it. If not, the other course seems to me to be inevitable. No one realises better than I the peculiar difficulties of your extraordinary Diocese. It is not merely the long-extended coast-line, the distance between the different centres, and so on: it is also the system of what one may call trustee-chaplaincies, where a church has come to be regarded as almost the private property of those who form its committee, or vestry, or trustees. All this needs for its management an extraordinary tactfulness as well as a persistent, a quiet, and a self-forgetful energy.

Well, I have said my say. This letter is entirely private, and you may feel that I am taking an unfair and discoloured view of the situation. Perhaps I am, but I have done my best, and I cannot feel that the prolongation of the present state of matters, without my saying to you what I have here said, would be wise and right either for yourself, or for the Diocese, or for the Church at large. I pray God to help and guide you to a right decision. We are at one in our desire that what we do may be to His glory and to the good of the Church wherein we are set to be Bishops and guides.

Before this letter (which the Archbishop afterwards described as 'the sternest letter I have ever written to a brother Bishop') reached its destination, the Bishop was once again on his way back to England. En route he wrote a long letter to the Archbishop, laying all the blame for all the difficulties he had encountered, partly on certain people with whom he had failed to get on, but, mainly, on a particular Missionary Society, with whom he declared that he could no longer work.

An interview with the Archbishop followed, in which the Archbishop read to him the letter from himself quoted above. The Bishop admitted that every word in it was justified, and said that he believed that resignation was the only proper course for him; although he adhered to his view that he had been the victim of circumstances rather than of his own shortcomings, and he also urged that his ill health had been largely responsible for his non-success. After much correspondence it was agreed between the Archbishop and the Bishop that the following paragraph should go to the Press:

The Right Rev. ——, on account of ill-health, placed in the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury his resignation of the Bishopric of ——. The resignation will take effect on Dec. 31st, 1914.

The resignation took place as arranged. But the Bishop lived eleven more years, and during the whole of this time, as the voluminous correspondence makes plain, the Archbishop, with other staunch churchmen, did his best to help him through his troubles, and befriended him in various ways until the end came in November 1925.

II

Our next illustration shall be in connexion with missionary work among Moslems in Egypt. The Coptic Church is the national Christian Church of Egypt, but its missionary activities are slight, and there was said to be a leakage of not less than 400 Copts to the Mahommedan religion every year. Such staunch Anglican evangelists as Bishop Gwynne and Canon Gairdner, who desired to convert the Moslems to Christianity, were greatly concerned at such a state of affairs. They proposed therefore to take a number of native Egyptians belonging to the Coptic Church, to train them as evangelists, and ultimately ordain them in the Anglican Church. The flaw in their plan was that it savoured of proselytization by the Anglican Church, in a way likely to be resented by all Eastern Churches. The Archbishop pointed this out to Bishop Gwynne, who accordingly, with the Anglican missionaries in Egypt, composed what they called a 'Spiritual Charter' to which they asked the official assent of the Coptic Patriarch. In answer to the request, the Patriarch sent the Bishop a most flattering but non-committal letter, in which the Patriarch told him of his prayers to Almighty God 'to preserve your honourable person for ever and ever, to give you success in your beneficent deeds which bring blessing and happiness on mankind'. With the letter he sent his photograph 'as souvenir to your beloved respected person'. 'This', wrote Bishop Gwynne to the Archbishop, 'is not quite what I wanted, but as much as we are likely to get at the present time'... and he added (March 7, 1924):

The BISHOP IN EGYPT AND THE SUDAN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

I should be very grateful if Your Grace would kindly inform me whether, in your opinion, we might go forward on this declaration

of friendship from the Patriarch, and whether it would satisfy that portion of our Church which might give trouble if there were found in our native congregations men and women from the Coptic Church.

The Archbishop grasped the situation at once. He pointed out the weak points in the Spiritual Charter, and asked for reconsideration of what was, he supposed, only in a very initial and draft stage:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP IN EGYPT AND THE SUDAN

March 19, 1924.

I am certain that there are numbers of our own people who would be staggered to learn that we propose 'to ordain when the time came the fittest persons [we] can find and irrespective of their ecclesiastical antecedents'. Apply this in other fields—in Scotland, in the United States, in India—and we might find ourselves in strange confusion.

Explanations followed, and an interview at Lambeth, which reassured the Archbishop to some extent; but he could not (as he remarked) forget the line taken by so learned a man as Canon Liddon when Archdeacon Popham Blyth was appointed 'Bishop of the Church of England in Jerusalem'. So he promised to discuss the whole situation with Bishop Gore, who was going out to Egypt in January 1925. The result was a new document, which said what was wanted, but in a very different way, unexceptionable from the Orthodox and the Anglo-Catholic point of view. It was called 'Practical working principles of the Arabic Branch for the (Anglican) Episcopal Church in Egypt'. It stated quite clearly that the Anglican Church in Egypt had no desire to increase its membership by accession from other organizations, whether Coptic, Orthodox, Presbyterian, or otherwise; but, recognizing the fact that individuals belonging to those other organizations do sometimes on their own deliberate initiative desire to join the Anglican Church, proceeded to lay down certain conditions on which such individuals might be admitted. It received the assent of Coptic and Anglo-Catholic, of Bishop Gwynne, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Church Missionary Society.

III

The next illustration shall be from China. The story of the Church in China during the last few years of the Archbishop's life affords various illustrations of the deep interest which he took in the growth of the Anglican Communion overseas. There were many personal letters, some of them touching in their character. The Archbishop had a great reverence for such men as Bishop Cassels, the missionary Bishop of the vast diocese of Western China, an apostolic labourer for the Church. Another close friend was Bishop F. L. Norris of North China. During the various troubles in China, political and other, he was ever ready to show his sympathy, and cheered the Bishops by his messages from time to time. But perhaps the most important and significant instance of the help he gave, is that connected with the development over many years of the dioceses in China into an autonomous Church of the Anglican Communion. Up to 1912, the Anglican dioceses in China were a collection of dioceses unrelated to one another and owing their allegiance to three Home Churches—the Church of England, the Church of England in Canada, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in America—from which came their financial support. In that year, there was organized, for the first time, a General Synod on which all the Chinese dioceses were represented. This prelude is necessary before we turn to a group of events centring round Bishop H. J. Molony, the Anglican (and English) Bishop in Chekiang.

In 1917, with the approval of the General Synod of the Anglican Church in China (Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui), a Chinese-born priest, Archdeacon Sing, was chosen by Bishop Molony to be his assistant Bishop. It was a new step in the history of the Church in China—as there had been no Chinese-born Bishop before. But his election raised various problems. The existing diocesan Bishops were English, American, and Canadian. They had been consecrated by Bishops of their respective Home Churches, and at their consecration had promised obedience and loyalty to the proper ecclesiastical authorities of those Home Churches. To whom should a Chinese assistant Bishop (who incidentally could speak no English) give his allegiance, pending the creation of Provincial organization in China? The Archbishop of Canterbury—when asked to approve the

consecration of Archdeacon Sing, at once pointed out the importance of this question. He wrote to Bishop Molony, February 26, 1918:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP IN CHEKIANG

Prior to the consecration of a Bishop by the Bishops of the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui it is absolutely essential that some formal regulation should be made respecting the manner in which the Chinese Church is to secure the orthodoxy and the loyalty of a man nominated for the Episcopate. . . . I am ready to agree that notwithstanding any usage to the contrary hitherto observed in regard to China a Bishop who is a native of China shall on consecration make his profession of canonical obedience to the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui and the laws, canons, doctrine and discipline thereof rather than to any other ecclesiastical authority.

The necessary regulation was adopted; and Archdeacon Sing was consecrated in Shanghai, in October 1918, as Assistant Bishop in Chekiang.

Ten years later, in 1928, Bishop Molony wished to resign. By that time the Anglican Church in China had become more fully organized and more nearly autonomous. And though some dependence on the Home Churches remained, owing chiefly to dependence on financial aid, the Archbishop, in July 1928, stated emphatically his individual opinion 'that the quasi-Metropolitan relationship exercised by Canterbury, Canada, and U.S.A. cannot continuously be maintained in regard to Bishops belonging to the Church in China' and added that he was 'most keen to bring this arrangement to an end'. He gave substance to his conviction in dealing with Bishop Molony's resignation—and insisted, when the Bishop wrote offering his resignation to him, that the proper authority to receive and accept the resignation of a Bishop of the Anglican Church in China was the Chairman of the House of Bishops. So it was to the Chairman of the House of Bishops of that Church that Bishop Molony resigned—and the proper precedent was set.

In the same year, 1928, a successor had to be appointed for the see of Chekiang. And the Archbishop did two things which gave the autonomy of the Church in China a deeper emphasis. He encouraged and secured the nomination of Bishop Molony's successor (Bishop Curtis) by the House of Bishops (instead of through the C.M.S. by himself); and he requested the Chairman of the

House of Bishops to arrange for the consecration of the new Bishop in China. Bishop Curtis was accordingly consecrated on January 6, 1929, in Ningpo, the first English Bishop to be consecrated in China, and the first 'foreign' Bishop to be consecrated as a Bishop of the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui and *not* as a Missionary Bishop of the Church of England. The importance of this event in the development of a self-governing Church in China is obvious.

IV

Our last illustration deals with a different kind of missionary problem, which received a large share of the Archbishop's attention after the War—the rights of the natives in Africa. One call for his help came in the summer of 1920, from the Rev. A. S. Cripps, a champion of the native races in Southern Rhodesia, and a poet of no mean distinction. The Archbishop listened with sympathy, and helped him to put his statement of the right of the Matabele and Mashona people to a sufficient share of land, both to Lord Milner at the Colonial Office and to the public. But the territory which in the problem of the welfare of the Africans was raised most acutely was East Africa, and here he was in the closest touch with the East African Bishops. As an evidence of the steady interest which he took in all such matters, as well as of his readiness to help, an extract from a reply to the Bishop of Zanzibar's appeal in October 1920 may be quoted:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF ZANZIBAR

4 October 1920.

I am of course familiar with the successive Despatches of Lord Milner and have also been in correspondence with him on the question, not wholly alien from this, about Native rights etc. in Rhodesia. You may rely upon my supporting you to the best of my power in all that seems to me to concern the highest interests of the Natives. I have, as you know, fought the battles for the Native Races under the pressure of labour problems in—e.g. the South Sea Islands, Queensland, West Africa, Ceylon (imported Tamils), Nigeria, and in India itself. I think there are more, but these alone spring to my mind.

In the East Africa Protectorate, or, as it afterwards came to be known, Kenya, the matter came very much to the fore. A cir-

cular issued by the Chief Native Commissioner, in October 1919, from Nairobi appeared to introduce a new principle by which able-bodied male natives were to be induced by 'every possible lawful influence' to go into the labour field. The Bishops of Mombasa and Uganda, and Dr. Arthur of the Church of Scotland Mission, criticized the circular strongly, but, on the assumption that recourse would in any case be had to compulsory labour, urged that so long as it was clearly necessary it should be definitely legalized. The Bishop of Zanzibar took the strongest exception to any legal recognition of forced labour, and the missionary societies in Great Britain also regarded such a course as highly objectionable. An appeal was made to the Archbishop, whose response was immediate. He worked in the closest co-operation with Mr. J. H. Oldham, the able and statesmanlike Secretary of the Conference of the Missionary Societies of Great Britain and Ireland; and on his uncommon thoroughness and capacity for acquiring information and measuring its value, as well as for shaping a positive and practical policy, the Archbishop put the greatest reliance. The Archbishop studied the facts closely, and had successive interviews with missionaries and many others who had dealt with the difficulties on the spot in a civilian capacity; and he took pains to appreciate the settlers' point of view as well. When he felt himself sufficiently equipped with information he pressed the cause of the Africans in Kenya most persistently. And from the autumn of 1920 onwards we find him in constant touch with the Colonial Office and successive Secretaries of State and Under-Secretaries. In August 1920, Lord Milner issued a dispatch to the Governor of the East Africa Protectorate which said that a policy of compulsory labour for private employment 'would be absolutely opposed to the traditional policy of His Majesty's Government'. But it still allowed compulsory labour for public purposes in an unsatisfactory form. On December 14, 1920, the Archbishop led a deputation to Lord Milner (with whom he had previously had long talks), presented him with a Memorandum, signed by the leaders of the Missionary Societies and a large number of eminent men in and out of Parliament, calling attention to the grave dangers under the existing system, and appealed for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The deputation did good in showing the existence of considerable anxiety, though its request for a Royal Commission

was not granted. A little later Mr. Churchill, as Secretary of State, issued a dispatch of September 5, 1921, placing it on public record that it was the declared policy of the Government to avoid recourse to compulsory labour for Government purposes except when this was absolutely necessary for essential services, and laying down that the powers conferred under the Ordinance could only be used with the previous sanction of the Secretary of State.[1]

A very important element in the whole situation was the status of Indians in Kenya, bitterness among whom had been greatly increased by the disparaging references in official reports, and proposals for strict control of immigration. The Indian cause was championed by the Government of India. Protracted discussions took place between the Secretary of State for India and the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Proposals for a new franchise giving a more favourable position to the Indians for representation on the Executive Council, caused a considerable agitation among settlers and Indians in Kenya.[2] All through the spring and summer the Archbishop was in constant communication with Indian statesmen and their friends as well as the missionaries. He saw many people closely in touch with policy in India—and many others as well: and the following note in the midst of a bundle of correspondence gives a slight idea of the range of his interviews:

Kenya. 18th May 1923.

I have now interviewed Oldham, Andrews,[3] Sastri, Ross, Bp. Willis, Lord Hardinge, the Bp. of Bombay and of course the Duke of Devonshire. I have read carefully General Stone's article in the xixth Century for May. (See Memoranda.)

In close co-operation with Mr. Oldham, the Archbishop made a strong appeal to the Duke of Devonshire, as Colonial Secretary, in a letter of May 29, 1923, accompanied by a Memorandum of

[1] Cmd. 1509 (Also compare Cmd. 2464 Kenya Compulsory Labour for Government Purposes, July 1925.)

[2] The population in Kenya was estimated as follows (April 1923): Natives, 2,500,000 to 3,000,000; Europeans, nearly 10,000; Indians, 23,000 to 24,000. There were 300,000,000 Indians in India.

[3] The Rev. C. F. Andrews, a friend of Gandhi, Rt. Hon Srinirasa Sastri, leader of an Indian delegation; W Macgregor Ross, formerly Director of Public Works in Kenya; the Bishop of Uganda; a former Viceroy of India; Dr. E. J. Palmer.

policy, having assured himself that the Indians were prepared to accept the terms of the Memorandum:

Memorandum. Kenya.

(1) H.M. Government to declare that it is their policy that the East African Crown Colonies and Protectorates, including Kenya, shall be administered under the direct authority of the Imperial Government acting as trustee for the native inhabitants and for civilisation as a whole, and that as between the different communities inhabiting these territories the interests of the native population are paramount.

(2) A royal commission to be appointed to consider and report how this principle can best be applied to conditions in Kenya, with due regard to the rights and claims of each of the alien immigrant communities.

(3) No material change to be made to the disadvantage of any of the three communities until the commission has reported and H.M. Government has acted upon the report.

Much correspondence and many interviews followed—and it became clear that the official opposition to a Royal Commission was very strong, owing mainly, it appeared, to the difficulty of finding a personnel which would not be suspect by one side or the other. The Indians were gravely discouraged, fearing that nothing at all would be done. In the end, on July 23, 1923, the Duke of Devonshire issued a White Paper,[1] which made two important pronouncements:

Primarily, Kenya is an African territory, and His Majesty's Government think it necessary definitely to record their considered opinion that the interests of the African natives must be paramount, and that if, and when, those interests and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail. Obviously the interests of the other communities, European, Indian or Arab, must severally be safeguarded. Whatever the circumstances in which members of these communities have entered Kenya, there will be no drastic action or reversal of measures already introduced, such as may have been contemplated in some quarters, the result of which might be to destroy or impair the existing interests of those who have already settled in Kenya. But in the administration of Kenya His Majesty's Government regard themselves as exercising a trust on behalf of the African population, and they are unable to delegate or share this trust, the object of which may be defined as the protection and advancement of the native races.

[1] *Indians in Kenya*, Cmd. 1922.

And:

> His Majesty's Government cannot but regard the grant of responsible self-government as out of the question within any period of time which need now be taken into consideration. Nor, indeed, would they contemplate yet the possibility of substituting an unofficial majority in the Council for the Government official majority.

But the request for a Royal Commission was refused. The Archbishop, speaking in the House of Lords on July 26, 1923, when the Duke of Devonshire made the announcement, welcomed the statement of principle stated above 'that the interests of the African natives must be paramount' as of the utmost importance. He knew, however, that the Indians were not satisfied and he made the following important point—'Everything must turn . . . upon the manner in which this scheme is put into practice.'

The White Paper did indeed cause dismay to Mr. C. F. Andrews, speaking for the Indians, and he went so far as to declare that it was no use saying that native interests were paramount 'if you go and make European interests paramount in practice'. The Archbishop answered his criticism, and his letter shows once again his desire to be fair to all sides, as well as his thoroughness:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. C. F. ANDREWS

5th September, 1923.

I tried to understand the subject to the best of my power, and I took all the pains I could to realise the Indian position as represented by yourself and by Mr. Sastri.

I appreciate the extreme importance which you feel to belong to this, as a test case, as to the genuineness of Government recognition of Indian Citizenship in the Empire. It seems to me also that this was determinedly weighed by the Colonial Office and India Office before the ultimate Document was issued.

I am inclined to think, that, if I had been drafting the ultimate decision, I should have said more about Indian Citizenship and its value, and our obligation to recognise it, but I think this was shown not inadequately by what was decided.

I do not think you are quite fair to the Settlers' side. I hold no brief for them, and I should have deplored it had the decision been to the effect that they had, so to speak, won their case all along the line. I do not think this is so at all, and I was impressed and somewhat pleased by finding how marked was the disappointment of

some of those who represented the British Settlers when the decision was made public. Certainly, the Government had a most difficult course to steer, and, although I should personally have liked to see an ampler recognition of the Indian case, I felt that the Government had to look, not at the Indians in Kenya alone, but at the imperial problems of a wider sort as well. . . .

What pleased me most was the prominence given to the fundamental principle that both English and Indians who are in Africa as immigrants, are, in some measure, outsiders, and that the real people entitled to primary consideration are the Native Africans. . . .

I am afraid that all this will seem to you very disappointing, and that you would have liked me to say that India is being ruthlessly trampled upon by this Government action. I cannot think so, or say so. I should like India to have secured more, and that the security should have been more explicit, but, if I try to look at it with all the fairness possible, I am forced to the belief that the Government has, in the main, done what is right.

The race question in Kenya came up again in subsequent years, but the story of this crucial occasion has been rather fully told as an instance of the Archbishop's interest in a problem of unusual significance for the Christian statesman as well as the missionary, and of the method which he followed. The correspondence of 1923 to 1927, as well as reports of debates in the House of Lords, show that he followed the later developments with the closest attention and felt a good deal of anxiety with regard to the actual way in which the principles laid down in the White Paper were being worked out.

Two further events may be noted. On June 6, 1923, the Archbishop took part in a Conference of six Governors and ex-Governors at the Colonial Office, under the Chairmanship of Mr. Ormsby Gore, the Under-Secretary, which resulted in the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British Tropical African Dependencies.[1] Again, in a debate

[1] The following accepted invitations to serve on the Committee: the Bishop of Liverpool (Dr. David), Bishop Bidwell (nominated by Cardinal Bourne), Sir Frederick Lugard, Sir Michael Sadler, Sir James Currie, Mr. J. H. Oldham, Sir Herbert Read, with Major Hans Vischer as Secretary. It is perhaps interesting to observe that the Meeting of Governors and ex-Governors which led to the appointment of this Committee, took place on Derby Day, showing that the consideration of African education was regarded by those representatives of the governing classes of Great Britain as preferable to the attractions of the Derby.

on the land policy in Africa, in the House of Lords, on May 20, 1925, the Archbishop elicited from Lord Balfour, speaking for the Government, the unexpected declaration that the Government were proposing to set up an institution (later known as the Committee of Civil Research) bearing some resemblance to the Committee of Imperial Defence to deal with civilian problems, including those of Imperial development.

CHAPTER LXXVIII

EPISCOPAL APPOINTMENTS

I cannot wish well to a popular election of the clergy, when I consider that it occasions such animosities, such unworthy courting of the people, such slanders between the contending parties, and other disadvantages. It is enough to allow the people to remonstrate against the nomination of a minister for solid reasons.

BOSWELL, *Life of Dr. Johnson* (1772).

No Archbishop of Canterbury can ever have exercised a greater influence in the appointment of the Bishops and other chief officers of the Church than Randall Davidson. That influence began even before his coming to Windsor in 1883, with his very first interview with Queen Victoria, and the part which he took in the nomination of Archbishop Benson as the successor of Tait. It continued through his tenure of the Deanery, and of the two sees of Rochester and Winchester, right down to Queen Victoria's death in 1901. It remained unchanged in the opening years of King Edward's reign, while he was still Bishop of Winchester. It is the purpose of this chapter to describe his relations with the Crown, through successive Prime Ministers, as Archbishop of Canterbury, and the manner in which his advice was given and received.

I

The personal interest which Queen Victoria took in ecclesiastical patronage was unique in its degree; and her influence was also of exceptional quality. And though the Archbishop always maintained that the exercise of such personal influence in a perfectly constitutional form was a valuable factor in securing the best nominations, it was clearly a characteristic rather specially personal to the Queen. Her two successors on the Throne, King Edward and King George, were both alive to the importance of the best Church appointments, and careful to weigh the merits of alternative names before their formal submission; but, generally speaking, they had not the same individual interest in each particular case. In any event, while Randall Davidson's counsel to Queen Victoria was rather personal than official as Dean and Bishop and Clerk of the Closet, his own official responsibility

increased when he became Archbishop. It was therefore with the Prime Ministers that he was most directly and closely concerned; and it was they who asked for and received his recommendations when particular vacancies occurred.

During his Primacy seven different statesmen occupied the post of Prime Minister of Great Britain—three of them Conservatives or Unionists (Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. Bonar Law, and Mr. Stanley Baldwin), three Liberals (Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Asquith, and Mr. Lloyd George), and one belonging to the Labour party (Mr. Ramsay MacDonald). They were very different men, with very different traditions. Indeed, three of them were Presbyterians and one a Baptist. They all, though some less strongly than others, realized their responsibilities in relation to Church patronage. They all gave careful attention to the Archbishop's recommendations, and never, in the many instances of episcopal nominations during twenty-five years, did they make a single appointment which they knew to be fundamentally objectionable to the Archbishop. This does not mean that they always took the Archbishop's advice about fitness for a particular see, but that, if the Archbishop insisted that a particular person was wholly unsuitable for the office of Bishop, no Prime Minister ever during these twenty-five years persevered with his name. Some appointments were, of course, less satisfactory than others, and some the Archbishop, left to himself, would not have made; but in every case the merits and qualifications of the person ultimately chosen were carefully and conscientiously considered; and there was no instance whatever of what could fairly be called a mere political job.

The method which the Archbishop usually followed when a vacancy occurred was this. He would, without loss of time, either speak or write to the Prime Minister about the particular bishopric. Some Prime Ministers knew much more than others about the work of a Bishop and the needs of the diocese, and about the personnel of Church leaders—and this was notably the case with Mr. Asquith. If necessary, the Archbishop would describe the general conditions of the diocese—or indicate the kind of Bishop required at a particular juncture. As a rule he would discuss both the diocese and the possible successors in conversation with the Prime Minister, as well as in correspondence. And, in all but quite exceptional cases, he would furnish the Prime Minister with

some three or more names of people to be considered—only very rarely concentrating the whole of his strength on a single person. He would also make his own inquiries from various sources as to names which might have been independently suggested to the Prime Minister—whether for his own or for the Prime Minister's guidance. It may indeed be argued that there was a reluctance to suggest or to appoint extreme men in any school of thought, and that the Bench therefore lacked the presence of some eminent figures who were leaders in a particular Church party. But while party leaders did in fact become Bishops (like Bishop Gore and Bishop Knox), Bishops cannot so easily remain party leaders; and on investigation it would probably be found that the number of men *vere episcopabiles* overlooked on such grounds in the twenty-five years was smaller than might have been expected. The two general impressions left on the mind, after reading the extensive correspondence and memoranda covering this quarter of a century are, first, that though like other human beings they might not always succeed, Prime Minister and Archbishop both did their very best to find the most suitable men for the Bench of Bishops; and second, that Archbishop Davidson exercised a predominating influence upon the character of that Bench.

II

Mr. Arthur Balfour, the Prime Minister who nominated Archbishop Davidson himself, remained in office until 1905. He was an intimate friend, and the first advice actually required of the Archbishop related to the filling of the vacancy which his own appointment to Canterbury caused, and of the see of St. Albans, with the consequential nominations to Exeter and Newcastle. His first letter on the subject, after the offer of the Archbishopric is a good illustration of his attitude. He wrote on January 5, 1903, and after expressing the view that undoubtedly the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Talbot) would be the best man for Winchester, he named six other Bishops, in favour of any of whom good arguments might be put forward, and put the pros and cons of each case separately, winding up with the Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Ryle). With regard to St. Albans he suggested the Bishop of Newcastle (Dr. Jacob)—and as the latter's successor the Suffragan Bishop of Thetford (Dr. Lloyd), or possibly (with two others)

Dr. Robertson of King's College. He went on with a word about the vacant Deanery of Winchester, and ended:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. A. J. BALFOUR

January 5, 1903.

I have said my say. I hope it is not too lengthy. Of course it is a mere contribution to your material for decision. It is hard upon you to have so much all at once to decide.

The contribution proved very effective. But difficulties arose in the way of appointing Bishop Talbot to Winchester. He was criticized as too sympathetic to the Ritualists; and the criticism found expression in a leading article in *The Times*. The Archbishop was never insensitive to public opinion on points like these.

In the end Dr. Ryle went to Winchester, to be succeeded as Bishop of Exeter by Dr. Robertson: while Dr. Jacob moved to St. Albans, and Dr. Lloyd to Newcastle. It was a good augury. Till the end of Mr. Balfour's government, the closest connexion was maintained between Downing Street and Lambeth.

III

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (Prime Minister 1905–8) was more independent. He and the Archbishop were real friends, but the latter used to say that no one more constantly sought his advice and more seldom took it. Indeed, Sir Henry himself admits as much in a letter written about the vacant see of Chichester, 'an exceedingly difficult place to fill' on account of the recent passing over to Rome of 'no fewer than 17 Curates and Vicars'. . . .

The RT. HON. SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Private. 5 Nov. 1907.

I am afraid you will think me very finnicky and fastidious: but I have not yet found my man for Chichester. The Bishop of Wakefield, as you expected, declined. . . .

I am using much freedom with you, in always bothering you, and, as you once said, never acting on your advice. But you will be lenient to my doubts and perplexities!

The remark brings out Sir Henry's real desire to do what he believed to be his duty, coupled with his almost fastidious conscientiousness in a field in which he was not himself specially well informed. In fact, he said on another occasion, to the private secretary (Mr. Henry Higgs) into whose department Church patronage fell, 'Our hesitation arises from our being so *méticuleux*.' Nevertheless the personal relations of Sir Henry and the Archbishop were most cordial. 'He is a most sensible man,' said Campbell-Bannerman to Arthur Ponsonby of the Archbishop, in his last days when the Archbishop visited him so often. 'I say "sensible", because he thinks just as I do!'

The next Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, who held office altogether for nearly nine years (1908–16), had a far wider knowledge, and took a far keener personal interest in ecclesiastical appointments. 'No branch of Asquith's activities as Prime Minister', his biographers record, 'interested him more than that which relates to ecclesiastical patronage and appointments.'[1] Again, Sir Roderick Meiklejohn, one of his Private Secretaries, testifies even more clearly:[2]

> On ecclesiastical matters there can have been few laymen as well informed as he. He was well acquainted with past ecclesiastical history, had heard from his youth up many of the chief pulpit orators preach, and was on terms of friendship with many leading ecclesiastics and knew about the personalities and characteristics of very many more. . . . It was my duty to put before him a short list of the persons considered most suitable for any particular post, and he weighed their respective claims with the most scrupulous care and, while he was always ready to receive the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, with whom he was very intimate, it was invariably on his own unbiased selection that a name was submitted to the King.

The accuracy of this statement is fully borne out by the similar evidence in Archbishop Davidson's letters. And there can be no doubt that Mr. Asquith was the most thorough and best informed of all the Prime Ministers with whom Randall Davidson had to deal in this sphere during his Primacy. He took a special interest in the academic record of those proposed for consideration[3]—and was quite remarkably alive to the importance of the

[1] *Life of Lord Oxford and Asquith*, J. A. Spender and Cyril Asquith, II. 378.

[2] Ibid., II. 378–9.

[3] Writing on April 9, 1913, Mr. Asquith sent the Archbishop a list of thirteen

University posts, and the needs of the time, as to which he had exceptionally good sources of information.

Mr. Asquith, like other Prime Ministers, desired to keep a balance in the different schools of thought on the Bench. But he also had his difficulties. In 1911, five vacancies occurred in the Southern Province (Winchester, Southwark, Oxford, Salisbury, Birmingham); and one in the Northern (Ripon). The Northern Province at that time had a considerable majority of evangelical Bishops: and Dr. Lang, who had been appointed Archbishop of York in 1909, hoped for a change in this 'excessive preponderance'. But the five vacancies in the Canterbury Province had none of them been filled by Evangelical appointments. And an Evangelical for this turn was inevitable:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. H. H. ASQUITH Oct. 5, 1911.

Ripon is, I agree, a real difficulty for you in view of recent admirable nominations which, as I gather, make you feel it to be difficult to nominate another Bishop just yet who belongs to the non-Evangelical school. And yet, you know *per contra* how utterly swamped the Northern Province is with 'Evangelical' Bishops in the party sense of a misused word. Durham[1] and Liverpool[2] and Carlisle[3] and Newcastle[4] and Manchester[5] and Sodor and Man.[6] Men of mark but all of them lacking in any wide sympathy with other forms of Churchmanship than their own. In the South we should (or *I* should) welcome such men as Liverpool or Durham—for we lack them sorely, and if only it were say, Hereford or Gloucester or Bristol or St. Albans or Lichfield or Bath and Wells, which was now vacant and not Ripon I should be all in favour of a decided Evangelical if a good enough man can be found.

In the North they do need to have the 'stronger Churchmanship' side strengthened. It is hard on the Archbishop of York to be made to look like an extreme High Churchman, merely because of the contrast with that big group.

The Archbishop, however, appreciated the Prime Minister's difficulty and tried to help him. But the number of Evangelical

Bishops in 1895 (Benson, Temple, Westcott, Ellicott, Durnford, Ridding, Stubbs, Creighton, Wordsworth, Talbot, Basil Jones, Jayne, Percival) as 'an *aperçu* of how things stood about twenty years ago': 'Without any wish to disparage the scholarship of the present Bench', he says of these thirteen, 'it is to be observed that the whole of these (except perhaps Durnford) were Headmasters, Professors or Dons.'

[1] Dr. Moule [2] Dr. Chavasse. [3] Dr. Diggle.
[4] Dr. Straton. [5] Dr. Knox. [6] Dr. Drury.

Churchmen who had the necessary power of leadership was not large. He consulted, amongst others, the distinguished Evangelical Churchman, Bishop Ingham (Secretary of the Church Missionary Society), and his reply is significant:

BISHOP INGHAM *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

October 7, 1911.

It was a great responsibility to have been admitted to your confidence yesterday at Lambeth on matters so important to the good government of our Church!

The incident has powerfully impressed me with the truth of your words—that there are really so few leaders in what are known as the Evangelical ranks. . . .

The Bishop then gave a list of half a dozen names of those 'who are now, or will be in the near future, fairly representative of our side of things in the Church'. The Archbishop sent three others forward. In the end Dr. Drury, Bishop of Sodor and Man, was approved. The Evangelicals retained a majority among the Northern Bishops for a further nine years. But nothing is clearer, as one reads the large correspondence between the Archbishop and Mr. Asquith, than that the Prime Minister had unusual means of judging, and was extremely well informed—making independent inquiry where necessary—and that he desired to give to the Church as Bishops, in close consultation with the Archbishop, the best men he could find.

In December 1916, Mr. Lloyd George became Prime Minister, and remained at the head of the Government until 1922. In the handling of ecclesiastical affairs, no greater contrast could be imagined. Mr. Lloyd George had but scanty knowledge either of the conditions of Church life or of Church leaders. He had the assistance of one leading Churchman, Canon Pearce[1] of Westminster, who had helped Mr. Asquith in the smaller ecclesiastical appointments (like the less important crown livings), and beyond

[1] There was an excellent instance of the Archbishop's humour, and unfailing readiness in an awkward situation, when Canon Pearce was nominated in 1919 by Mr. Lloyd George to the bishopric of Worcester. Canon Pearce came to consult the Archbishop, with whom he was on excellent terms. He said that he had one great difficulty about the right answer to the Prime Minister's proposal. He had (he told the Archbishop) read all the files at 10 Downing Street relating to recent episcopal appointments, including all the Archbishop's letters, and never once had the Archbishop mentioned his name as a possible Bishop! The Archbishop, without a moment's hesitation, put his hand on Canon Pearce's shoulder, and replied, 'My dear Pearce, you were always in the background!'

doubt Canon Pearce wielded considerable influence. But, apart from Canon Pearce's help, Mr. Lloyd George had no such facilities for obtaining information as his predecessors had enjoyed. He was also much more interested in the preaching ability of the men proposed for high office in the Church than in their academic record.

An earlier chapter has described the controversy raging round the appointment of Dr. Henson as Bishop of Hereford. The Archbishop, as we have seen, would have preferred another appointment—but, while pointing out the difficulties which Dr. Henson's nomination might arouse, he did not reject the proposal as one that ought not to be made. The sequel, however, was interesting.

Mr. Lloyd George—so runs a Memorandum by the Archbishop dated February 24, 1918:

> admits quite frankly that he has no time for it [ecclesiastical appointments], or adequate knowledge, and is not at all averse to the idea of getting some advice regularly given by those who can be regarded as representative Churchmen.

Accordingly, a suggestion was made with perfect courtesy to Mr. Lloyd George by certain Church members of Parliament, who informed the Archbishop. They (Mr. Laurence Hardy, Sir Arthur Boscawen, Sir Robert Williams, Lord Wolmer, and two or three others) urged that it was unfair upon a non-Churchman to expect him to decide ecclesiastical appointments unaided. Mr. Lloyd George met the plea with unexpected welcome. A breakfast followed; and, after some further conference, the general principle of consultation between the Prime Minister and selected Churchmen was agreed. The Archbishop, however, pressed upon the M.P.s concerned that the consultation ought to be very informal. Certain names were suggested, three laymen, two clergy. The Archbishop in his Memorandum of March 3, 1919, wrote:

> But I pressed that they ought to be consulted, if at all, independently, and not as a committee; that the Prime Minister should not feel bound to consult all of them on every occasion, and that what passed between him and them should be regarded as wholly private, and therefore that they should not be regarded as men holding a sort of office of a representative kind. Their *raison d'être* and status would be simply this, five men whom Churchmen in

the House of Commons recognise as suitable persons to whom individually the Prime Minister might turn so as to keep himself in touch with Church opinion. With all this Boscawen agreed, and he undertook to represent it to his friends. I pointed out my fears that the whole arrangement might drift into too formal a character, which would be almost wholly mischievous, and would be fair neither to the Church, nor to me, nor indeed to the Prime Minister himself.

The Committee met occasionally, but was not in practice very much used, and gradually faded away.

A little earlier (May 1918), in view of the Hereford controversy, a joint committee of Canterbury Convocation had been appointed 'to consider various proposals for the giving of more effective expression to the mind of the Church either previously to such [Crown] nominations or before they became final'. The Joint Committee sat for a year and a half, and in February 1920 recommended as follows:

That his Grace the President be requested to approach the Prime Minister and ask his consent to a plan whereby a Standing Committee of representative Churchmen might be empowered to bring before him the names of persons suitable for bishoprics, and might regularly be consulted by him before the submission of names to the Crown for nomination to such appointments

This proposal was rejected by the Lower House, and the following Resolution was passed:

That his Grace the President be requested to approach the Throne in order to secure that the two Archbishops should be officially consulted by the Prime Minister before the submission of names by him to the Crown for nomination to any diocesan bishopric.

When the plan of a Standing Committee was brought before the Upper House (February 13, 1920), an amendment was moved to agree with the Resolution of the Lower House. The Archbishop defined his attitude both to the plan of the Standing Committee and to the word 'officially' as follows, 'purposely with reserve and caution':

This is a very difficult and delicate subject to discuss, and perhaps it is a peculiarly difficult and delicate subject for me to discuss, for more reasons than one. If I may say so, I think that the only mistake in the suggestion now made is the laying of emphasis, in asking for a Committee, on the *official* character of the advice that

is given. The moment that you get that, you take away the responsibility from those on whom it rests, and suggest that it shall be shared with others in a very undefined way. If there is a great desire that consultation shall take place and that people shall be better satisfied than they are, that is one thing; but it is a rather different thing from what is proposed. As matters at present stand —I need not say it to your lordships, but those outside do not all understand it—the theory is that the State, represented in former days by the personal voice of the Sovereign, and nowadays by the voice of the people spoken through the Prime Minister, shall itself have a large share in nomination to episcopal office. The Prime Minister is the one person who, as the representative of the nation, can speak on behalf of the nation, and he can speak where the Sovereign cannot speak with a personal voice. The theory is that the nation is speaking through the Prime Minister, and is nominating the person whom the spokesman believes to be the person best fitted to serve the nation in ecclesiastical office, and then comes in the duty of those on whom the ecclesiastical responsibility rests. I quite agree with the Bishop of Hereford that there is a good deal of exaggeration in speaking as if there was something heroic in the action of a Chapter, or of an Archbishop, in deciding that a nomination shall be resisted. The Archbishop has very large responsibility ultimately, and I have myself stated publicly in print what I feel as to the really definite responsibility resting on the shoulders of an Archbishop in such a case as that which we are considering. If the responsibility was exercised in a way which meant defiance to Crown authority, I do not think it would react personally on the Archbishop, but I think it would react on the constitutional position of the Church in this country, and would involve some change in its relationship with the State. I think the fact of that possible contingency is, in itself, a protection against occasion being given by the Prime Minister for the Archbishop to object. The Archbishop would not be a mere automaton in dealing with a case, and that fact, I think, is known. If there is a great desire to make sure that consultation is taken with those whom the Church is supposed to trust, or does trust, a Resolution to that effect would be quite harmless; but, if the consultation is made obligatory and official, I think that it must diminish the responsibility which rests on the shoulders of those who at present bear it. The original Resolution prepared by the Committee would, I think, be open to challenge in a great many ways, but the Resolution of the Lower House removes many of the drawbacks and difficulties which I feel stand in the way of passing the other Resolution. I can only myself accept this proposal in the sense

that it is desired that I shall take means of conveying the wish that is felt, but if the interpretation put upon the Resolution is that it is obligatory, I cannot accept it.

The Archbishop deliberately laid great emphasis on the particular responsibility of the Prime Minister in relation to ecclesiastical appointments,[1] for he felt that this particular responsibility could not be transferred either to a committee or to any other individual, or (as was once or twice suggested, though not by a Prime Minister) to another member of the cabinet. The amendment, with the word 'officially' omitted, was passed: and the Resolution thus adopted was sent to Mr. Lloyd George on February 21, 1920, who replied:

RT. HON. D. LLOYD GEORGE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

February 21, 1920

I thank you for your letter, enclosing a copy of the Resolution which was passed at the recent Session of the Convocation of Canterbury. As you are aware, it has been my invariable practice, since I became Prime Minister, to invite your counsel, which you have at all times been kind enough to give me, upon all important appointments in the Church. Certainly in this case of Diocesan Bishoprics my recommendations to His Majesty have only been made after careful and anxious consultation with yourself, and in the case of Sees in the Northern Province with the Archbishop of York also. It is also within your knowledge that I have in regard to all higher appointments taken the further step of seeking the opinion of a number of prominent Churchmen representing all shades of opinion. Whilst the Resolution therefore may appear to the public to partake of the nature of a criticism of the present procedure, it is in reality an expression of approval of the course

[1] The responsibility of the Prime Minister is illustrated by the following story, reported by the Archbishop in a full account of a dinner party at which he, Mr. Gladstone, John Morley, Jack Tennant, Mrs. Asquith, Mrs. Gladstone, and Mrs. Drew were present in Mr. Asquith's house Mr. Gladstone 'told a story to Melbourne's credit (adding that it was, he thought, the only discreditable thing he had ever heard of that man of saintly dignity, Archbishop Howley). The story was this. Before Hampden was nominated to Hereford, Lord Melbourne had consulted Archbishop Howley who had recommended the appointment. Then Howley took fright and afterwards in the House of Lords joined the other Bishops in attacking the Government for doing it. When Melbourne rose to speak, he had in his pocket Howley's letter of recommendation, but he did not refer to it, and when asked privately why he had not, he said he had no right to shelter himself in such a manner from the responsibility which was his as a Minister of the Crown.' (June 28, 1895.)

which I have adopted. You do not ask for, and I could not assent to, an action which would derogate from the well-established responsibility which rests upon Ministers of the Crown in respect of the advice which it is their duty to tender to His Majesty, but in seeking the benefit of your co-operation, and that of the Archbishop of York, I am glad to know that I am acting in accordance with the wishes of Convocation. I need hardly say that I gladly welcome such assistance, for I am deeply conscious of the vital importance of ensuring that the highest offices, upon whose functions much of the influence and power of the Church necessarily depends, shall be filled by those best qualified for the responsibility attaching to them of making the Church a great spiritual force in the life of the nation.

The Prime Minister's letter did in fact state his practice: and the practice continued to the end of his period of office. At the same time there is little doubt that the troubles of February 1918 had made him far more anxious to avoid further controversy, and as a means thereto very ready to consult the Archbishop. He persisted in his wish for Bishops with oratorical gifts, and was somewhat suspicious of headmasters. The Archbishop put the other side to a common friend, for communication to Lloyd George. In the particular instance, the Archbishop's wish did in fact prevail: but the letter is given because of its wider bearing:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* ——

12 March, 1921.

Am I right in gathering from you that the Prime Minister has expressed to you his personal opinion on the general question of what is at present needed with regard to appointments to the Episcopate, and that he feels rather strongly that the present Bishops lack a little the sort of forcefulness of personal appeal which is specially needed at the present hour in England—i.e.—that we need men who will have the power of ready speech and arresting the attention of hearers and, if one may use the word, forcing upon them the truths of religion in a way that they cannot but attend to? With all this I am largely in agreement. I think we want such men more than ever we did, and I also think there is at present a lack of that particular sort of gift among many of our leading ecclesiastics, and not least among us Bishops. Be it remembered, however, that we have been trying to meet that difficulty in recent appointments. . . . But I want to put in a caveat. Important, indeed vital, as that power is among our ecclesiastics if they are to

do their work properly, I am not certain that it is chiefly wanted among the Bishops. Some Bishops we ought to have who can sway a popular audience by the force of eloquent appeal, but the making of pulpit appeals is not the chief duty of Bishops. They have to administer the whole life of a vast organisation, and it would in my judgement be as wrong to choose a Bishop simply because he has that electric power of swaying an audience as it would be to choose a Home Secretary because he was an admirable Trafalgar Square orator. The Home Secretary has a great many things to do besides his oratory. Still more is this true of Bishops. . . .

Again, it is said—We don't want men who as schoolmasters or otherwise have shown their power of influence. We want men who will by their burning words quicken people's pulses and fire their enthusiasms. To say this is, I think, to forget that a Bishop's power in the Church is largely his indirect power—i.e.—he can, if he is a man of original thought, forceful University influence, personal glamour, and intense power of sympathy, attract young men to take Orders in the Church of England. See how this was done by men like Lightfoot and Westcott—neither of them orators, but both of them men who drew to the North of England the best type of younger men to ordain them as clergy and set them going with enthusiasm in the great cities. . . .

The power of popular oratory by itself will no more constitute a good Episcopate than it would constitute a good Cabinet.[1]

A further and milder controversy arose in 1921 on an interesting point. The Bishop of Salisbury (F. E. Ridgeway) died in May 1921. The Archbishop set his heart on securing the appointment of Dr. Donaldson, Archbishop of Brisbane. Mr. Lloyd George agreed, and a cablegram was sent out to Australia, through the Governor of Queensland. On June 3, Archbishop Donaldson cabled back to ask the Archbishop of Canterbury whether acceptance would involve his return from Brisbane before the meeting of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania, in October. The Prime Minister wished to insist that Dr. Donaldson must either return to take up his

[1] By a curious coincidence, on the day after the writing of this letter, Mr. Silas McBee, a thoughtful American well known in religious circles on both sides of the Atlantic, reported at Lambeth a conversation between himself and two eminent French Roman Catholic scholars, P. Batiffol and Grandmaison. Mr McBee asked them if they had any message for the Archbishop of Canterbury. They thought for a moment, and then Grandmaison said, 'Tell him to make more Bishops like Lightfoot.' Batiffol agreed and added Chase—to which Grandmaison replied, 'Let us also add Gore!'

duties in Salisbury almost at once, or refuse the offer—and so informed the Archbishop. This put the Archbishop on his mettle.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. D. LLOYD GEORGE

13th June 1921.

You sent to me on the 3rd June a telegram from the Governor of Queensland saying—'Please communicate following from Archbishop of Brisbane to Archbishop of Canterbury. Offer received. Would acceptance involve movement before General Synod October?' This means that Archbishop Donaldson wished to know my view as regards the date when his work at Salisbury must begin. It appears to me that this enquiry on the part of Archbishop Donaldson was exactly right. You will not think me disrespectful if I say that, while of course it rests with the Prime Minister on behalf of the Crown to nominate to a vacant See, it rests with the Archbishop to decide at what date he is to take up his work in the new office. Supposing the man to be not yet a Bishop, it is for the Archbishop to decide when he will consecrate him, and when he is to begin his work. This is absolutely right, because the Archbishop administers the See during the vacancy and is responsible for its due care. I have taken very great pains about the care of the Diocese of Salisbury. An admirable Bishop is doing the work under my Commission, and in the peculiar characteristics of the Diocese of Salisbury, which I need not here discuss, I have no reason to think that any detriment will arise by the technical vacancy continuing through the Autumnal weeks, when the rural areas are not very amenable to rounds of Episcopal ministration....

Looking then at all the circumstances, I venture with the utmost respect to urge that you should let Donaldson be informed that, in the Archbishop of Canterbury's judgement (for which he has asked) he may, after accepting the post, remain until the Synod. But, as I have said, I am willing, if you feel a difficulty about this, to telegraph myself to Donaldson giving him my personal advice.

I know you well enough to believe that you will not regard me as discourteous in having thus told you plainly how the matter strikes me. I have very grave responsibilities in these matters. I accept them and try to carry them to the best of my ability. One of them relates to the date at which men duly nominated can, under my authority, take up the work assigned to them. I have given to the point in this particular case abundant thought, and I am quite convinced that I am advising rightly, and am ready to accept full responsibility for so doing.

Mr. Lloyd George immediately gave his consent in the following letter:

The Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd George *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

Criccieth, 14th June, 1921.

In urging that Archbishop Donaldson should be asked immediately to take up his duties as Bishop of Salisbury, I was only apprehensive of the criticism, and, as it appeared to me, the legitimate criticism, which might ensue from delay, that the important diocese of Salisbury had been left without a shepherd 'except a provisional one' for a period extending over several months.

Your experience and authority in these matters, however, are paramount, and, if you think there is nothing in that criticism, I am willing to defer to your counsel, and, although the appointment is not yet made, and will not be made, until I have actually signed the recommendation to the King, I am prepared to do so at any moment following the course which you recommend. But kindly let me know what your final view is on the subject. I am only sincerely anxious to discharge to the best of my ability one of the greatest responsibilities entrusted to me as Prime Minister, and one to which I have always given, even when burdened with immense anxieties, the most concentrated care. I have always realised how much the spiritual well-being of England depends upon the choice of the right men for these exalted and sacred functions.

So all was well.

Mr. Bonar Law was Prime Minister for less than a year (October 1922–May 1923). On the first occasion on which the Archbishop saw him about any appointment (November 30, 1922), that of Dr. Headlam to the see of Gloucester, he found him very friendly. Indeed Mr. Law volunteered the promise that he would always consult the Archbishop about appointments, though naturally he would not undertake always to agree.

In 1923, Mr. Baldwin succeeded. He held the office for two periods, 1923–4; and again 1924–9. In the first of these periods, he had an exceptionally large number of bishoprics to fill. With regard to them all, he put himself in close touch with Archbishop Davidson; and paid great attention to his views. Consultation was constant. One of the most interesting appointments made by Mr. Baldwin, at the Archbishop's urgent request, was that of Dr. Frere to Truro. There is a long and important correspondence between the Archbishop and Dr. Frere on the question

of acceptance. Here it is sufficient to print a single paragraph from the Archbishop's letter of August 28, 1923:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. DR. W. H. FRERE

August 28, 1923.

It is not lightly that I have pressed upon the Prime Minister the conclusion I had reached after quiet consultation with Ebor, with Winton, and with others. For a long time past I have felt strongly that the Church had been suffering from the fact that among Diocesan Bishops there was no-one who could speak with responsibility on behalf of what is called, however inadequately, Anglo-Catholicism, and yet be able to regard these questions largely, sanely, and with the equipment of scholarly knowledge. Men who can do this can certainly be found. But that is not enough. We need someone whom the Prime Minister can fairly be urged to nominate, as a man who carries the confidence of Churchmen generally, whether they are of his school or not. It would be both futile and unfair were I to urge the Prime Minister to nominate to the Episcopate some admirable men whose virtues and capacities I myself know, but who would be neither known nor trusted by the rank and file of Churchmen of all schools. There is one man who does possess the qualifications which—when I think it all out before GOD—seem to me to be essential, and you are the man. This is no fad of mine, as you must know well. It is the view, so far as I can judge, of all those whom you would specially trust or who have a special claim on your attention. I have acted with a deep conviction in what I have done, and I unhesitatingly believe that I am right.

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was Prime Minister for less than a year (January to November 1924) while Dr. Davidson was Archbishop. He did not know the Archbishop before, and it was at dinner in Lord Parmoor's house that they first met and discussed the general question of ecclesiastical appointments.

The Archbishop, in a letter to his host, again emphasized the Prime Minister's personal responsibility with regard to nominations, a responsibility which could not properly be handed over to any other individual, or any committee:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. THE LORD PARMOOR

February 1st, 1924.

My own view of the matter, and I think you share my opinion, is this: nothing must be done which will weaken in any degree the

responsibility of the Prime Minister in regard to these nominations. Nothing must happen which would allow a notion to become current that the Prime Minister had handed over his responsibilities to other people. I perfectly understand that he has no intention of doing so, but I am anxious that in whatever is done the facts should be made clear. Next (and here I am sure both you and the Prime Minister will agree with me) the independence of the Crown in the matter must remain obviously unimpaired. I suppose that, as a matter of fact, the Sovereign has always taken a rather more independent position of personal 'say' with regard to ecclesiastical appointments than with regard to other appointments, though the ultimate responsibility rests essentially with the Prime Minister.

I should therefore express the position somewhat thus: the Prime Minister's nominations to the Crown must be based on adequate information which he has obtained in such way as he thinks best. The procedure he follows in obtaining that information is of his own planning and carrying out, and the Crown has, so to speak, no direct concern in it, but simply receives from the Prime Minister advice which is based upon the Prime Minister's own enquiries. The Prime Minister may courteously tell us privately that the procedure he means to follow is the consulting of the two Archbishops and some others, but, if I may say so, I think that the Sovereign should have no *official* cognizance of this, but should simply receive the nominations as coming from a well-informed Prime Minister. What you told me as to the present Prime Minister's probable choice of advisers seems to me a very sound plan, but it ought, in my judgement, to be an unofficial, not an official, plan. I would of course co-operate to the utmost of my power in helping the Prime Minister in the matter. I hope I have now put the matter fairly before you.

It was quite clear to the Archbishop that Mr. MacDonald wished to exercise his responsibilities in the best interests of the Church—and Mr. MacDonald showed that he was eager to receive and consider the Archbishop's advice. He might indeed, and on occasion did, feel a wish that the appointments of bishops did not fall to the lot of a jaded politician like the Prime Minister; but, having the duty to perform, he fulfilled it to the best of his power, and with the same impartiality as his predecessors. Some of his colleagues in the Labour party were at first perturbed because he did not appoint clergy who had served the Labour party in their parishes; but he soon made it plain that service to the

Labour Party was an insufficient qualification for the office of a Bishop—and that some of the clergy who had been good Labour men were not in fact in possession of the experience or special abilities required for the government of a diocese.

Mr. MacDonald's principal appointment during his first term of office was that of Dr. Barnes as Bishop of Birmingham.

CHAPTER LXXIX

THE MALINES CONVERSATIONS

I have heard say, that when cardinal Lorrain saw our Prayer-book in Latin, or in French, he should answer, that he liked well of that order, 'if', saith he, 'they would go no further'. Sept. 16th, 1572. *The* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* LORD BURGHLEY. (*Correspondence of Archbishop Parker.*)

To frame a common confession of faith, or liturgie, or discipline, for both Churches, is a project never to be accomplished. But to settle each so that the other shall declare it to be a sound part of the Catholic Church, and communicate with one another as such; this may easily be done without much difficulty by them abroad, and I make no doubt but the best and wisest of our Church would be ready to give all due encouragement to it. ARCHBISHOP WAKE *to the* REV. W. BEAUVOIR, Feb. 14th, 1717–18.

I

In October 1921, the Archbishop received a letter from Lord Halifax informing him of a visit which he was proposing to pay, in company with the Abbé Portal, to Cardinal Mercier at Malines. Lord Halifax was eighty-two, and Fernand Portal sixty-six. They had been associated thirty years before, as already described,[1] in an unsuccessful mission to Archbishop Benson about Rome and Anglican Orders. They had not met for many years, and it was now proposed by Portal that they should visit Cardinal Mercier together, and talk of the Reunion of Christendom. Lord Halifax welcomed the idea with enthusiasm, and at once wrote to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York for a letter of introduction to the Cardinal. In this letter he hoped that they would also state their own great desire for the healing of the divisions of Christendom, and their readiness to promote conferences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome to that end. The Archbishops consulted, and a letter was written by the Archbishop of Canterbury. It was the easier for him to write, as he had already sent the Cardinal a copy of the Report of the Lambeth Conference 1920, and the Appeal to All Christian People, which his Eminence had cordially acknowledged, as himself an ardent advocate of unity. 'May God', the Cardinal said (May 21, 1921), 'hearken to the prayers we con-

[1] See p 229 f.

tinually offer for the union of all Christian believers, and crown with success your efforts to attain their goal.'

But the Archbishop's commendation was very guarded. He said:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* CARDINAL MERCIER

12 October, 1921.

Lord Halifax does not go in any sense as an ambassador or formal representative of the Church of England, nor have I endeavoured to put before him any suggestions with regard to the possibilities of such conversations as might take place between your Eminence and himself. Anything that he says therefore would be an expression of his personal opinion rather than an authoritative statement of the position or the endeavours of the Church of England in its corporate capacity. I cannot but think however that you would find a conversation with him consonant with the thought expressed in Your Eminence's letter to me of May 21st, and of the visions set forth in the Lambeth Conference Appeal.

The visit was duly paid, and the Cardinal received Lord Halifax and Abbé Portal with the warmest sympathy. But when Lord Halifax asked the Cardinal if he would consider the possibility of conferences between Anglicans and Romans, his Eminence was a little astonished. 'Why do you not address yourselves first', he asked, 'to the English Catholic authorities?' Lord Halifax replied 'Because their disposition is against it' (*l'état des esprits s'y oppose*). After reflection the Cardinal agreed, and said that if Lord Halifax came to Malines with two trusted and competent theologians prepared informally to discuss the situation, he would gladly receive them, and if necessary go himself to Rome and talk the matter over with the Pope.

On his return to England, Lord Halifax made a report to the Archbishops, and, on his own responsibility, invited two distinguished theologians to go with him very quietly to Malines in December. The two men were Dr. Armitage Robinson, Dean of Wells, and Dr. Walter Frere, Superior of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield. The former was a churchman who leaned to no party, the latter was Anglo-Catholic in his sympathies. The whole event was kept most private—and the Archbishop himself, except for knowing the bare fact, remained entirely outside.

This first Conversation at Malines was of an exploratory character—to see whether there was a case for the holding of conferences between Romans and Anglicans, with some real, though at first informal, encouragement from the highest authorities on both sides. It lasted three days (December 6–8, 1921). The Cardinal presided, and with him were his Vicar-General, Mgr. van Roey[1] and Abbé Portal, to meet the three Anglicans. The general basis of the conversation was (1) a Memorandum prepared by Lord Halifax dealing with the constitution of the Church, and the nature of the Sacraments, and (2) the Lambeth Appeal. The discussion was mainly theological, dealing in a preliminary way with the *maximum* common ground of agreement, and also with the difference between fundamental and non-fundamental dogmas. It was noteworthy that the question of the validity of Anglican Orders no longer proved the forbidding, if not fatal, barrier which it had been in Archbishop Benson's day. And the reason was that the statement contained in the Lambeth Appeal, intended for non-Episcopalians but capable of application to Rome, was felt to get over the difficulty. It ran as follows:

> If the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life.

It was a beginning full of hope—and both parties to the Conversation were agreed that there was plenty to encourage the holding of a conference, with some kind of sanction by authority.

II

Nine months, however, passed before any further move was made. Meantime, in February 1922, a new Pope had been elected, Cardinal Ratti, Archbishop of Milan, as Pius XI. He was well known to Cardinal Mercier, and believed to be deeply interested in Christian unity.

In September 1922, Cardinal Mercier told Lord Halifax that their exchanges of view had been approved at the Vatican, which would like them continued. But under what authority?

[1] Afterwards Cardinal van Roey, Archbishop of Malines.

Lord Halifax hoped that the Cardinal's initiative would be sufficient authority on the Roman side to justify the English Archbishops in naming their spokesmen. But the Archbishops were clear that this was not enough. The Archbishop of Canterbury said privately at the time (October 31, 1922) that an authoritative request from the Vatican, or at least an authoritative endorsement of Cardinal Mercier by the Vatican, was indispensable. If Mercier died, it would be perfectly possible for the Vatican to disclaim all responsibility for Mercier's action with the observation that he was certainly 'a very good man, but a little weak in his old age'. If, however, the Vatican were committed, it would be a very different matter. He and the Archbishop of York were ready to encourage the Conversations, but on certain conditions. The Archbishop wrote to Lord Halifax:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* VISCOUNT HALIFAX

30 October, 1922.

I could not lend myself to giving authoritative 'mission' to spokesmen of the Anglican Church for conferring with spokesmen of the Church of Rome unless there be an authorisation on the part of the Vatican corresponding to that which is given from Lambeth. It is not for me to prescribe the exact manner in which that authorisation should be conveyed—whether by a letter from His Holiness the Pope, or the Cardinal Secretary of State on his behalf, or otherwise. But it must emanate from the centre and not from any ecclesiastical leader, however distinguished he be in person or in office. If any one goes from England, as sent by me or by the Archbishop of York and myself, to take part in such conference, those with whom he confers must hold credentials not less authoritative. I repeat that it does not follow from this that what such emissaries might agree to say would be binding upon those who send them or upon the Church at large. They would go to confer and to make suggestions—nothing more. The suggestions would have to be considered by those whose responsibility is of a central kind. I feel it necessary to make this clear at the outset of any new discussions or arrangements which may be in contemplation.

Cardinal Mercier was determined to see the matter through, and succeeded in securing the necessary authorization from the Vatican. He told Lord Halifax. The Archbishop asked that

the Cardinal should write direct to him—'A three cornered correspondence, though in some cases useful, is never quite satisfactory; it has always an element of possible misconception and mistake' (December, 24 1922). The following letter was the result:

CARDINAL MERCIER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Malines. 10 January, 1923.

I am aware that Lord Halifax has kept your Grace informed of the private conversations ('informal') which were held at Malines from the 6th to the 8th December, 1921, between three Anglicans, Lord Halifax, Dr. Armitage Robinson and the Rev. W. Frere, and three Catholics, l'Abbé Portal, Mgr. Van Roey, Vicar General, and the Archbishop of Malines, with the object of promoting, if possible, the reunion of the Anglican Church with the Church of Rome.

Those conversations have seemed to you matters of such grave importance that you have desired still further to enforce that importance.

The Lambeth Conference, over which you presided, has already proclaimed its desire to search out means which may further the realization of the prayer for unity so expressly uttered by our Divine Saviour. You have therefore welcomed the renewal of the conversations begun at Malines in December 1921, and have been willing to add to their weight by being ready to name persons who should take part in them.

On our side we have the pleasure of being able to inform you that His Eminence the Cardinal Secretary of State has been authorised to inform me that the Holy See approves and encourages such conversations and prays God with all its heart to bless them.

If you are able to name as your delegates the three persons with whom we have had a first exchange of views, and possibly to add to them others selected by yourself, we should, on our side, be ready to name an equal number of friends to collaborate in our effort for reunion.

So arranged, the fresh conversations, without being authoritative, would be invested with more importance and weight.

I should esteem it a pleasure and an honour to offer to all these gentlemen, those on your side as well as on ours, at such a date as we might arrange, a simple but cordial hospitality.

Accept, my Lord, the expression of my highest regard and religious consideration.

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* CARDINAL MERCIER

Lambeth Palace. 2nd February, 1923.

I am now able to write to Your Eminence in reply to your important letter of January 10th, for which I have already thanked you.

I note with great interest the assurance which Your Eminence is authorised to transmit from the Cardinal Secretary of State 'que le Saint Siège approuve et encourage [les] conversations, et prie de tout son cœur le bon Dieu de les bénir'.

This enables our arrangements to go forward with the knowledge that the position of the members of the Church of England who take part as your guests in the discussions to which Your Eminence invites them, corresponds to the position accorded to the Roman Catholic members of the group, and that the responsibilities, such as they are, which attach to such conversations are thus shared in equal degree by all who take part in them.

With regard to the persons, and the number of persons, who are thus to meet, I think I am not mistaken in believing that, although Your Eminence is graciously willing to receive, if it be really requisite, one or two others in addition to the three who attended before, Your Eminence would on the whole prefer that, for the present at least, we should content ourselves with Lord Halifax and the Dean of Wells and Dr. Frere, the three representatives who enjoyed the privilege of Your Eminence's hospitality on the former occasion, the informal Conference thus consisting of six persons. With this opinion I cordially agree. Should the conversations be prolonged, and should those who confer express a wish for the addition of others to the number, I should of course be willing, like Your Eminence, to give attention to such request.

As regards the subjects of discussion, the Archbishop of York and I are in agreement in thinking that it would be better on all accounts that those who take part in the conversations should themselves arrange beforehand the subjects or headings for conversation, as any agenda otherwise arranged might unduly limit rather than facilitate satisfactory discussion.

I presume I am right in understanding that the arrangements as to date of meeting and any other particulars will now be in the hands of Your Eminence and Lord Halifax.

I need not assure Your Eminence how cordially I unite in the prayer to which expression is given on the part of the Holy See that the blessing of God may rest upon these conversations.

There were rocks ahead for both Cardinal and Archbishop.

The Abbé Portal told Lord Halifax that Cardinal Bourne (to whom Cardinal Mercier had shown Cardinal Gasparri's authorization embodied in the letter just given) had already indicated his disapproval—and that the conflict of rival influences would soon begin at Rome. And the Archbishop, apart from other difficulties, had the growing anxiety of the Prayer-Book controversy, and the fear lest any rash act, in even a tentative conversation with a representative of Rome, should wreck the revision. The Archbishop indeed was exceptionally cautious. In strict confidence he informed the Bishops of what was commencing—and not all of them approved. He annoyed Abbé Portal by the emphasis which he laid, when speaking in Convocation in February 1923, on the increasing connexions between the Church of England and the Eastern Orthodox Church, through the recent recognition of Anglican Ordinations by the Patriarch of Constantinople. More disappointing still, he steadily set his face against any addition to the personnel of the Anglican members of the Second Conversation, due to be held at Malines in March. The Cardinal, after reading the carefully phrased letter announcing this refusal, felt constrained to speak of 'la grande réserve des deux archevêques de Cantorbéry et d'York'.

The caution was necessary—for it was from this, the first semi-official conversation, that the document concerning the *pallium* emerged, with the signatures of Anglicans as well as Roman Catholics, which so greatly disturbed the Archbishop. Moreover, while the Anglicans regarded the Archbishop of Canterbury as the chief of a great Christian communion allowing them to meet the representatives of the Head of the Roman Church, the Roman Catholics, except Portal, could not get rid of the idea, at least at first, that the proper analogy for the Anglican approach to the question of Reunion with Rome was the return of the prodigal. The same six persons met at Malines for this second Conversation (March 14 and 15, 1923) as had met in 1921. But the Anglicans now came with the friendly cognizance of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Romans with the knowledge of the Holy See. Archbishop Davidson had written out certain points which he wished to be remembered on the Anglican side of the debate, such as:

> Don't detract from the importance of the XXXIX Articles. Don't budge an inch as to the necessity of carrying the East with us in

ultimate Reunion steps. Bear constantly in mind that in any admission made as to what Roman leadership or 'primacy' (?) may mean, we have to make quite clear too that which it must not mean—i.e. some of the very things which the Cardinal's Pastoral claims for it.[1]

As a matter of fact, however, the memorandum which formed the basis of discussion, prepared by the Anglicans, dealt not with doctrine but with possible methods of a practical kind by which, supposing a reasonable measure of agreement on doctrinal matters were reached, the Anglican Communion as a whole might be brought into union, more or less complete in the first instance, with the Holy See. This leaving aside of dogmatic controversy surprised the Cardinal, as he afterwards confessed, but he agreed to the wishes of the Anglicans, who, after the preliminary doctrinal discussions of their previous visit, desired to explore the important questions of jurisdiction.

By way of introduction to the second Conversation, a good deal was said by the Anglicans about the geographical and numerical extent of the Anglican Communion in 1920, as compared with the condition of the Church of England in the sixteenth century, when, before the Reformation, there were only twenty-one Bishops occupying English and Welsh sees. The chief problems which would now arise, if the Anglican Communion were to be united as a world-wide communion with the Church of Rome, would be the relation of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Holy See—the authority of the Pope in connexion with the Anglican Communion and its Bishops—the position of the existing Roman Catholic hierarchy in England—and the retention of certain characteristic Anglican rites and customs. In the Memorandum which had been prepared by the Anglicans it had been suggested that possibly a grant of the *pallium* by the Pope to the Archbishop of Canterbury might serve as an act of

[1] e g 'When, on Monday, February 6th, about noon, wireless telegraphy conveyed to all the nations of the world the news that a Pope, yesterday still unknown to the majority, had ascended the seat of Peter, under the name of Pius XI, three hundred million people instantly acclaimed Cardinal Ratti as their Chief and Father. In the intimacy of their conscience and in their full personal independence, they paid him the complete homage of their faith, and the submission of their intellect, will, and filial affection, ready to accept death if need be, rather than to infringe, I do not say one of his commands, but the least of his wishes.' From Cardinal Mercier's Pastoral Letter to his Diocese on the Papacy and the Election of H.H. Pius XI, printed in *A Call to Reunion* by Viscount Halifax, 1922, p. 28.

recognition which would thus determine the relation of the latter to the Holy See.

There was a good deal of discussion and division on the Memorandum submitted by the Anglicans. In the end each side agreed to submit a statement on the points debated to their respective authorities.

The French statement put the fundamental proposal in a clear and challenging form:

The French Statement

Cette fois,[1] la question examinée par nous revient à ces termes: Suppose que l'assentiment des esprits soit accompli sur le terrain doctrinal, dans quelles conditions pourrait s'opérer l'union de l'Église Anglicane à l'Église Romaine?

La préoccupation dominante de l'Église Anglicane est de garder, dans la mesure du possible, son organisation et sa hiérarchie actuelles, son rite, sa discipline.

Puisqu'il s'agit non d'un retour de personnalités isolées à l'Église de Rome, mais d'un retour collectif, cette préoccupation est toute naturelle.

Il est naturel que l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry, considéré par les évêques, par le clergé, par les fidèles de l'Église Anglicane, comme leur chef, soit considéré aussi comme devant continuer à leur égard l'exercise de son autorité.

Moyennant cet exercise, les rites et la discipline seraient suffisamment maintenus. L'entrée en masse dans le giron de l'Église Romaine serait ainsi facilitée. Certaines mesures, d'ailleurs, pourraient avoir un charactère temporaire.

Alors, la question fondamentale qui se pose paraît être la suivante:

Le Saint-Siège approuverait-il que l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry, acceptant la suprématie spirituelle du Souverain Pontife et le cérémonial jugé par lui nécessaire à la validité de la consécration de l'Archevêque, fût reconnu comme le Primat de l'Église Anglicane rattachée à Rome?

Le Saint-Siège consentirait-il à accorder à l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry et aux autres métropolitains le pallium comme symbole de leur juridiction sur leurs provinces respectives?

Permettrait-il à l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry d'appliquer aux

[1] i.e. the second Conversation, March 13–15, 1923. For the text of these statements, and for the full minutes and other documents, see *The Conversations at Malines, 1921–5*, Original Documents edited by Lord Halifax. Philip Allan, 1930.

autres évêques Anglicans le cérémonial de validation accepté par l'Archevêque?

Permettrait-il enfin à chaque Métropolitain de confirmer et de consacrer à l'avenir les évêques de sa province?

Tant que cette question primordiale n'aura pas été résolue, il nous serait malaisé de poursuivre nos négociations. Si elle était résolue affirmativement, la voie serait aplanie qui pourrait nous conduire à l'examen de questions ultérieures d'application.

We accept the above for submission to the respective authorities.[1]

Halifax.	✠D.-J. Card. Mercier.
J. Armitage Robinson.	E. Van Roey, vic. gén.
Walter Howard Frere, C.R.	F. Portal, p.d.l.M.

The English statement, which was more reserved, ran as follows:

The English Statement

The Anglican representatives being in hearty agreement with the statement drawn up by His Eminence desire on their part to sum up the position in the following terms.

As a result of the recent conversations at Malines it was agreed by those who were present that, supposing the doctrinal differences now existing between the two Churches could be satisfactorily explained or removed, and further supposing the difficulty regarding Anglican Orders were surmounted on the lines indicated in the Lambeth Appeal, then the following suggestions would form a basis of practical action for the reunion of the two Churches.

1. The acknowledgement of the position of the Papal See as the centre and head on earth of the Catholic Church, from which guidance should be looked for, in general, and especially in grave matters affecting the welfare of the Church as a whole.

2. The acknowledgement of the Anglican Communion as a body linked with the Papal See in virtue of the recognition of the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Metropolitans by the gift of the Pallium.

3. Under the discipline of the English Church would fall the determination of all such questions as:

The English rite and its use in the vernacular,
Communion in both kinds,
Marriage of the clergy.

4. The position of the existing Roman Catholic Hierarchy in

[1] In the original text the words '*We accept . . . authorities*' are in the handwriting of Viscount Halifax.

England with their Churches and congregations would for the present, at any rate, remain unaltered. They would be exempt from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, and, as at present, directly dependent on the Holy See.

Accepté pour être soumis aux autorités respectives.[1]

✠D.-J. Card. Mercier, arch. de Malines.
E. Van Roey, vic gén.
F. Portal, p.d.l.M.

Halifax.
J. Armitage Robinson.
Walter Howard Frere, C.R.

The two documents were brought home to England. In haste, on the last morning, its authors signed each document before they separated, the Anglicans adding their signatures to the French statement as attesting its correctness as a document, and the Romans similarly attesting the English statement. The first sight of the statements, and especially of the three Anglican signatures on the French statement, filled the Archbishop of Canterbury with alarm. And the Dean of Wells, bringing the documents from Malines to Lambeth on March 16, and failing clearly to explain the difference between the signing and the attesting, was a good deal disturbed by his Grace's dismay. The Archbishop knew something of the latent feeling in England about Papal supremacy—and he saw at once what disastrous use could be made of such a proposal to give the *pallium*. The *pallium* was originally a cloak, made of the wool of lambs fed at the church of St. Agnes outside the walls of Rome, embroidered with four crosses and laid for a night on the tomb of St. Peter. In itself the history of the *pallium* represented the growth and extension of papal claims. Originally granted by the pope as an honour without further significance (and even worn by bishops), it was then restricted to metropolitans. The oath to the Papacy with which it was later associated first made an appearance in the days of Gregory VII (Hildebrand); and from the eleventh century onwards the insistence that it must be sought in person and the requirement that before reception the recipient should take an oath of obedience to the Pope gave occasion to represent the possession of it as requisite for the execution of the office. Finally, the papal lawyers, extending the claims of jurisdiction, claimed

[1] In the original text the words '*Accepté . . . respectives*' are in the handwriting of Cardinal Mercier.

to deprive the candidate not merely of metropolitical but even of diocesan jurisdiction until he had complied with the requirements. The *pallium* as received by Augustine of Canterbury from Gregory the Great was therefore very different in significance from that received from Hildebrand and his successors by the later archbishops in England.[1]

Whatever practical arrangement might be derived for determining future relationship in the field of administration, it was essential, in the Archbishop's judgement, that the great doctrinal issues which divided England and Rome should be considered *first* and in some measure solved. The Archbishop, therefore, wrote a long letter to the Dean of Wells (which he hoped that the Dean would send to the Cardinal). This letter, he directed, must be kept inseparably with the other papers, as recording his own view of the situation. The Dean referred to it afterwards, with a chuckle, as an instance of the Archbishop's method of insurance by memoranda against posthumous misunderstanding! After reference to the origin of the conversations and the difficulties 'which do not to my eyes grow less' he wrote thus:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* DEAN OF WELLS

19 March, 1923.

I take no exception whatever to your plan of discussing first some of the administrative questions you have dwelt upon, provided it is kept always in mind that there are great outstanding questions of a doctrinal sort which would require deliberate discussions and some measure of settlement before administrative problems would even arise.

I should personally place among the foremost of these the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church as to the position, the jurisdiction, and the powers of the Papal See. The deep significance of that matter may very easily be slurred over in common talk by admitting as an historical and practical matter of so-called general knowledge the 'primacy' of the Bishop of Rome. In certain senses this is an indisputable historical fact. But as used by Roman Catholics his primacy means a great deal more. Though the Vatican Council emphasised and increased what we deem the false doctrine of the Pope's independent and autocratic status as sole Vicar of Christ, the claim had of course been made for many centuries. Its recognition is virtually, and is now even technically,

[1] See J. P. Whitney, 'The National Church and the Papacy', pp. 40–4, in *The Anglican Communion*, ed. H. A. Wilson (London, 1929).

de fide. It therefore affects in the widest way, both doctrinally and administratively, the whole question of the relation of the Church of Rome to the rest of Christendom. It bears upon almost every problem that can come up for discussion. If we are bound—as I certainly believe we are—to discard as untrue the theory that the Bishop of Rome holds *jure Divino* in the Church of Christ a position of distinct and unique authority, operative everywhere, and perhaps even—though here I speak with reserve—that, directly or indirectly, it is through that channel alone (at all events in the West) that the Ministerial Commission can be rightly or validly exercised, there is an obvious inappropriateness in discussing other Church questions until that fundamental question has been brought to a clear issue. I have not tried to express myself in technical terms, and the words I have used may be open to legitimate criticism. But I hope that I have, for the purpose of this letter, made my meaning sufficiently clear.

There are also, as your conversations have shown, large differences between us, with which the question of Papal status is only indirectly concerned, and these would call of course for full and far-reaching discussion. I refer, for example, to such questions as the dogma of Transubstantiation, or the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin: and of course there are others. But the point I have referred to lies so clearly *in limine* that I would urge you, when you next meet, (and I hope your conversations will be resumed ere long) to let it be placed in the arena of your deliberations with a view to some sort of definite statement on either side. Such statements may of course in the first instance be provisional only. But the question is so vital a one that it is really essential to the whole.

At the same time he did not rule out the whole possibility of the proposal brought him by the Dean:

I have given you my view of the situation as disclosed in the memoranda with signatures appended. It is a situation full of difficulty and calling for the utmost circumspection and caution, but it calls also for quiet perseverance, and the gates towards a pathway which may lead unionwards are certainly not peremptorily closed. Subject to what I have said as to the attainment of agreement on the large *doctrinal* questions, I am ready to say that the suggestions which the two Memoranda contain are well calculated to furnish the basis for future discussion and conference.

This letter greatly disturbed Lord Halifax, whose 'enthusiasm (so the Archbishop declared) enabled him to override the really

grave questions which lie at the root of the matter'. And it cannot be denied that the Archbishop's alarm was encouraged by Bishop Gore:

BISHOP GORE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

March 19, 1923.

I am only writing to say that the concessiveness of our delegation to Malines, apparently at the first Conference and certainly at the second, seems to me more disastrous and perilous the more I think of it. It astonished me to hear from the Dean what he was prepared to admit as to Roman supremacy, and that he is prepared to contemplate the (conditional) reordination of the Anglican clergy from top to bottom.

The Archbishop wrote also to the Cardinal:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* CARDINAL MERCIER

24 March, 1923.

I have now seen the Archbishop of York, and I am in a position to write further to Your Eminence with regard to the recent conversations at Malines.

The Archbishop of York unites with me in thanking Your Eminence for the kindly care you are taking in this whole matter, and for the clearness with which you have set forth the position taken by yourself, and by those with whom you act, as regards certain fundamental questions, doctrinal and administrative.

We clearly understand the wish which those who represented the Anglican Church expressed, that attention should be given at this early stage to the administrative questions relating to the course of practical action which might conceivably be followed if an agreement had, after discussion, been provisionally reached on the large doctrinal matters which underlie the whole. It was right that these practical matters should not, even at this early stage, be left wholly in the air. They must be reduced to more or less definite form.

I do not want at this stage to say of any proposal of a merely administrative sort whether it is or is not out of the question. For it would be necessary first to know what the administrative act implies. The obtaining of that knowledge will, I hope, be the task of the further conferences.

I do not doubt that Your Eminence will agree with me in thinking that, after all, the really fundamental question of the position of the Sovereign Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church must be candidly faced before further progress can be made. The

ambiguity of the term 'primacy' is well known to us all. It has an historic meaning which can be accepted without difficulty. If, however, it is understood as implying that the Pope holds *jure divino* the unique and solemn position of sole Vicar of Christ on earth, from whom as Vicar of Christ must come directly or indirectly the right to minister validly within the Church, there ought to be no delay in discussing that implication and expounding its essential bearings. For it would not, in my judgement, be fair to Your Eminence or to others that I should encourage further discussion upon subordinate administrative possibilities without expressing my conviction that such a doctrine of papal authority is not one to which the adherence of the Church of England could be obtained. I say this simply for clearness' sake, and not as meaning that I desire these conversations to end. There may be explanations forthcoming on Your Eminence's part of which I have no knowledge. If such there be, it would certainly be well that the discussions should go on.

I have explained to my three Anglican friends what I feel upon this anxious and difficult matter, and have encouraged them to look forward to a resumption of the conferences. So great is the importance of this matter and its issues, that no effort on the part of any of us should be spared which may contribute towards the ultimate attainment of Unity within the Church of Christ.

It might be possible to augment to a small degree the numbers of those who take part in further deliberations. Such addition would have obvious difficulties of its own. But on this, and on any other points, I should of course be most anxious to hear further from Your Eminence to whose Christian courtesy we owe so much.

CARDINAL MERCIER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

The Archbishop's Palace, Malines. 11th April 1923.

Your kind letter of 24th March has reached me safely, but a ten days absence from Malines has prevented me from replying to it immediately.

Please accept my thanks for it, and find herewith the reflections which it has suggested to me.

It is very gratifying to me to learn that the Archbishop of York and yourself have taken note of the memoranda which your three delegates have brought back from Malines; that you have both given them a sympathetic reception; and that you both wish for the continuation of the conferences inaugurated at Malines.

Since the first conference, in December 1921, it has seemed to us that we ought at once to concentrate our attention on the fundamental question of the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

Lord Halifax, who suggested to me this meeting at Malines, and his two companions, were in agreement with my Vicar-General, with the Abbé Portal, and with myself on this point.

But then, when, this year, there came to us, from Dean Robinson and his two colleagues, the memorandum for discussion in the course of our second conference, I was surprised to see that the projected conversation deviated from the original doctrinal point of view, and invited us to consider questions of a rather more practical and 'administrative' kind.

Since our sole desire was to comply with the appeal of the loyal and generous souls who had of their own accord come to meet us, we felt that we ought, without making any objections, to agree to the proposition which was put before us. Also, these administrative questions, perhaps of secondary importance, ought none the less, sooner or later, to be submitted to the examination of the authorities and, in addition, the memorandum of the Dean of Wells contained the formal declaration that the solutions which should be given now to these disciplinary questions, would not be put into practice until the day when agreement should be reached in the realm of doctrine.

That is to say, my dear Lord, that I share your opinion and that of the Archbishop of York, when you shew yourselves anxious to bring back the conversation to what we call with you 'the large doctrinal matters which underlie the whole'.

I believe, nevertheless, that I am voicing the deep desire of all the members of the Conference in expressing to you here a wish: Since, as a matter of fact, 'administrative' questions have formed, at the request of your delegates, the object of our second conference, and that the two groups face to face have pledged in the examination of these questions their responsibility at the same time personal and collective, would you not feel yourself able to let us know your opinion and that of your colleague of York on the conclusions to which our conference has come, and which are to be found recorded in the report of the meeting and in the two memorandums which your delegates have had the honour of placing in your hands?

You will agree, in fact, my dear Lord, that if we were able to reciprocate to the two Archbishops of Canterbury and York the compliment which they have had the kindness to address to us with gratitude 'for the clearness with which we have set forth the position taken by ourself and by those with whom we act' the two groups engaged in the conference would take up their task again with more assurance and on firmer ground.

Having said that, in all frankness and in the interest of the cause

in which we are collaborating, I come readily to the 'fundamental' question of the position accorded to the Sovereign Pontiff in the Roman Catholic Church.

The logical train of our conferences, as well as the mutual duties of loyalty on the part of the members who meet there, oblige us to take up again this examination of the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, successor of Peter, defined as a dogma of the catholic faith by the Vatican Council.

Our third conference, which like you I hope may be soon and, to a certain extent, enlarged, will assume then the task of studying this doctrine more thoroughly, and will apply itself, in accordance with your desire, to making more precise its significance.

Meanwhile, I make it my personal duty to tell you what I believe to be the Roman Catholic doctrine on the special point about which you wish to question me.

You ask me if the Primacy accorded to the Sovereign Pontiff signifies or entails this consequence, that alone, by divine right, the Pope is the Vicar of Christ on earth, in this sense that from him alone derives, directly or indirectly, all legitimate power to exercise validly a ministry in the Church: 'If the term "primacy" is understood as implying that the Pope holds *jure divino* the unique and solemn position of sole Vicar of Christ on earth, from whom as Vicar of Christ must come directly or indirectly, the right to minister validly within the Church.'

Certainly, the Pontiff of Rome is, in a special sense, the Vicar of Christ on earth, and the piety of the faithful is accustomed to bestow on him this title by choice. But Saint Paul states that all the apostles are the ministers of Christ: '*Sic nos existimet homo ut ministros Christi.*' The Roman Liturgy, in the Preface to the Mass for Apostles, calls all the apostles the 'Vicars' put in charge by the eternal Shepherd of the pastoral direction of his work: '*Gregem tuum, pastor aeterne, non deseras, sed per beatos apostolos tuos continua protectione custodias: ut iisdem rectoribus gubernetur, quos operis tui Vicarios eidem contulisti praeesse pastores.*' Still more, of the simple priest in the exercise of his ministry, we say readily that he is the representative of Christ, 'another Christ', '*sacerdos, alter Christus*'. If he did not occupy the place of Christ, '*vices gerens Christi*', '*Vicarius Christi*', how could he truthfully say of the Body and of the Blood of our Saviour; '*Hoc est Corpus* meum: *hic est calix Sanguinis mei*'; how could he, in remitting sins, which God alone can absolve, say: '*Ego te absolvo*', '*I* absolve thee'?

The ordinary application of the title 'Vicar of Christ' to the Sovereign Pontiff does not involve therefore as a consequence, that *alone* the Bishop of Rome possesses powers coming direct from Christ.

The powers of the Bishop refer for one part to the Body, real, historical, of our Lord Jesus Christ—'Power of Order'—for the other part, to his mystical Body—'Power of jurisdiction'.

The power of 'Order', power of consecrating the Body and Blood of our Saviour in the Holy Eucharist, power of conferring on someone else the fulness of the priesthood, including in that the ability to transmit it with a view to perpetuating the Christian life in the Church, was given by Christ to all his apostles. It belongs fully to the bishops, their successors, inalienably; no human authority whatever could break its validity.

Is it not well known, for example, that the Church of Rome recognises the persisting validity of the Orders and Sacraments in the Eastern Orthodox Church, which, nevertheless, has been separated for a thousand years from the Roman Primacy?

The power of 'jurisdiction', power of ruling the Church, the mystical body of Christ, belongs by divine right to the episcopate, that is to say to the bishops, successors of the apostles, in union with the Sovereign Pontiff.

The episcopate, regarded as the whole institution of Government, is of divine right and it would not be in the power of the bishop of Rome to abolish it.

The power of 'jurisdiction' devolved upon each bishop is also of divine right; it is ordinary and immediate within the limits of the diocese assigned to the bishop by the Sovereign Pontiff.

The peace and the unity of the Christian Society demand, in fact, that at the head of the Government of the Church there should be a supreme authority, itself ordinary and immediate, over the whole Church, over the faithful and their pastors;[1] to this supreme authority belongs the prerogative of assigning to each bishop the portion of the Christian flock which he is called to rule in union with the Pontiff of Rome and under his authority.

The bishop's power of jurisdiction over his flock is of divine right but when the theologians ask how this divine origin ought to be interpreted, their counsels are divided.

One party holds that this power of jurisdiction comes immediately from God, like the power of 'Order'. According to this conception, the Pope nominates the bishop, assigns to him his subjects, but the jurisdiction over these subjects comes from God, without human intermediary. This opinion, in the words of Benedict XIV, has on its side solid arguments, *'validis fulcitur argumentis'*.

[1] *'Si quis dixerit Romanum Pontificem . . . non habere plenam et supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam . . . aut hanc ejus potestatem non esse Ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias, sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles, anathema sit.'* *Conc. Vaticanum Sess. IV*, Cap. III.

But, he adds, to this opinion is opposed another, according to which the jurisdiction comes from Christ, as principal source, but is granted to the bishop through the intermediary of the Roman Pontiff. According to this conception, episcopal consecration gives to the bishop the qualification for jurisdiction, but the actual complete jurisdiction is dependent on the mandate of the Sovereign Pontiff.

This opinion, says Benedict XIV, seems to have on its side better arguments of reason and authority: '*rationi et auctoritati conformior videtur sententia.*'[1]

No further decision, which commands universal assent, has settled the controversy.

Neither does the *Codex juris canonici* edited by the Pope Benedict XIV, the word of which is law in the Catholic Church, settle it. It sums up in these words the general doctrine of the Roman Church concerning the episcopate: '*Episcopi sunt apostolorum successores atque ex divina institutione peculiaribus ecclesiis praeficiuntur quas cum potestate ordinaria regunt sub auctoritate Romani Pontificis.*'[2]

This universal authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, say the Fathers of the Vatican Council, ought not to be considered by the bishops as a menace or a danger. It is, on the contrary, for the authority of the bishop over against his flock, a support, a strength, a protection. '*Tantum abest, ut haec Summi Pontificis potestas officiat ordinariae ac immediatae illi episcopalis jurisdictionis potestati, qua Episcopi, qui positi a Spiritu Sancto in Apostolorum locum successerunt, tanquam veri pastores assignatas sibi greges, singuli singulos, pascunt et regunt, ut eadem a supremo et universali Pastore asseratur, roboretur et vindicetur.*'[3]

More than once, in the course of my episcopal career, my experience has confirmed the truth of this conciliar declaration.

But this is not the time for me to enlarge on this subject. I must confine myself to replying briefly to the question about which your valued letter has engaged for the moment my attention. The conference which we shall, shortly, please God, have occasion to resume, will have to examine more closely the question which surpasses all the others in importance both christian and social, of the Primacy of the Pope.

I hope that you will not think it unfitting that in bringing to a close these lines, I should express to you the feeling which is prompted in my heart by my love for our Saviour Jesus Christ, my love for his Church: We are engaged in collaborating for the re-establishment of peace in the world by the drawing together

[1] *De Synodo diocesana*, Lib. I, Cap. IV, n. 2.
[2] Titul. VIII, Cap. I, *de episcopis*, Can. 329.
[3] *Conc. Vat. Sess. III*, Cap. III.

of the souls baptised in the same sheep-fold, under the crook of the same shepherd, '*ut fiat unum ovile et unus pastor!*' Let us pray with all our heart unceasingly for one another for the realisation of this great ideal of unity for which Christ prayed and suffered and gave his life. Let us quicken ourselves with Christian power and with the spirit of charity, in order that among us all may be fulfilled the prayer of our holy Liturgy: '*Ut et ea quae agenda sunt videant et ad agenda quae viderint, convalescant*'

Please accept, my dear Lord, and convey to your revered colleague, the Archbishop of York, the assurances of my respectful esteem and of my religious zeal.

P.S. Allow me to make you a present of a Pastoral letter relating to the Encyclical *Ubi Arcano Dei* of His Holiness Pope Pius XI, and an attempted translation of this weighty document.

The Archbishop acknowledged the letter, but the correspondence with Lord Halifax and others shows that he was full of questions; and the Cardinal frankly said to Lord Halifax:

CARDINAL MERCIER *to* VISCOUNT HALIFAX

April 24, 1923.

Speaking quite confidentially I may and ought to tell you that in my opinion the danger at the present moment is lest the Archbishops should be unwilling to take in hand the fundamental question at issue and the question of opportunity and of its application.

They are the guides of their flocks, and they ought to form clear ideas and personal convictions as to the line of their spiritual government That done, there will be time to ascertain how to induce others to accept what their conscience will have told them is the truth and the end to be pursued.

At length the Archbishop sent the following reply:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* CARDINAL MERCIER

May 15th, 1923.

I owe apologies to Your Eminence for delay in replying further to your very important letter, dated 11th April, for which I briefly thanked you on April 13th. During these weeks my work has been even exceptionally onerous, and it has been difficult to find time for other than urgent correspondence.

I have now considered with great care all that Your Eminence was good enough to write in the letter of 11th April, and I have

had opportunity also of taking counsel with the Archbishop of York, as well as with the Dean of Wells.

In the light of your letter and of these conversations, I desire to assure Your Eminence that we perfectly understand how it was that in the two Conferences at Malines the course of proceeding was followed which you have described to me. After recounting the order of proceeding, Your Eminence asks 'Ne jugeriez-vous pas pouvoir nous faire connaître votre appréciation et celle de votre collègue de York sur les conclusions auxquelles notre conférence a abouti et qui se trouve consignées dans le procès-verbal de la réunion et dans les deux memorandums que vos délégués ont eu l'honneur de déposer en vos mains?' The difficulty we find in expressing an opinion about these conclusions is this:—

The administrative suggestions are not only hypothetical in themselves (depending as they do on the condition that some measure of general agreement should first have been reached upon the large doctrinal question we have referred to), but the actual suggestions as they stand can only be interpreted aright if we know what the words imply; and this knowledge we cannot have until the preliminary discussions have resulted in some positive statement. To take an example of what I mean, an example which I select because it is obvious and simple, I find in the Memorandum drawn up by the Roman Catholic Members of the Conference the following suggestion for consideration:

'Le Saint Siège consentirait-il à accorder à l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry et aux autres Metropolitains le pallium comme symbole de leur juridiction sur leurs provinces respectives?'

It is impossible to express an opinion upon this suggestion without a clear knowledge of what is meant or implied by the giving of the pallium. I should feel it to be impossible to express even provisional assent to such a suggestion until it has been made clear:

(1) whether the Act of the Holy See in giving the pallium as a symbol of jurisdiction did or did not imply that the recipient was recognized as being already the holder of Valid Orders, and,

(2) whether the Act of the Archbishop in receiving the pallium did or did not imply an acceptance of the doctrine that his jurisdiction must, if it is to be valid, be conferred by the Pope. It is of course obvious that these questions would require careful discussion, involving the consideration of large problems, both doctrinal and historical. In this connexion, I note with the utmost interest the opinion expressed by Your Eminence:

'La conférence que nous aurons, s'il plait à Dieu, bientôt, l'occasion de reprendre, aura à examiner de plus près la question,

qui prime toutes les autres en importance chrétienne et sociale, de la Primauté du Pape.'

Your Eminence has been good enough to set out with admirable clearness in the same letter the distinction which must be borne in mind between Questions of Order and Questions of Jurisdiction. And I have purposely taken as an example of my difficulty one question only, a question belonging to the subject of jurisdiction. There are of course very many other large and far-reaching problems belonging to every branch of the subject, and it would, I hope, be possible to deal with some of these when the Conferences are resumed.

My point to-day is simply to make clear to Your Eminence why it is that I cannot at present meet the desire which you express when you say 'Ne jugeriez-vous pas pouvoir nous faire connaître votre appréciation . . . sur les conclusions', etc.

It has probably been an excellent thing to set forth examples in the form of suggestions, as to some of the practical and administrative details which might hereafter emerge if the greater matters had received solution, and I find no difficulty in saying that if upon the large preliminary questions both of Order and Jurisdiction a really satisfactory agreement had been reached, the actual process of outward arrangement suggested in the signed paper might well form the subject of friendly and hopeful consideration. To make such a statement, however, at this juncture, would seem to me to have little significance while the underlying questions of a fundamental character remain quite unsolved. Your Eminence has explained to me that on some of those great questions there are different, and it would seem rival, theories of interpretation which have a place, more or less authoritative, within the Church of Rome, and, if the discussions go forward, as I hope they may, in further Conferences, it would be of supreme interest to us to understand whether both sets of opinion are now permissible among you and may be taught without breach of loyalty. But all this lies in the future, and I am not asking Your Eminence for an answer now to such enquiry. I thank Your Eminence for the generous readiness with which you have been willing, notwithstanding the responsibilities of your great office, to write and speak with so much freedom upon the solemn and difficult points of controversy which have emerged during the discussions. My sole desire at this moment is to make it clear that there must be further discussion upon the great question underlying the series of suggestions formulated at Malines, and that until preliminary elucidation has been given to it I am not in a position to say more than I have said.

In again thanking Your Eminence for your unwearied kindness in this grave matter, I desire to express my concurrence in what you have said as to the advantage of some addition, when the Conference is resumed, to the number of those who take part in it. I should like to invite Bishop Gore or another of our leading theologians to associate himself with the Dean of Wells and with Dr. Frere, and I hope I am not mistaken in thinking that this would be welcomed by Your Eminence.

It is I think obvious that no advantage would arise from our making public at present anything which has passed in the conversations at Malines. Such partial and fragmentary statement as would alone be possible would, I think, inevitably lead to misunderstanding. If I find it to be desirable to make a brief reference in general terms to the fact of our having taken advantage of your gracious invitation to Malines, I would venture to submit beforehand to Your Eminence a copy of anything which I propose to say.

The reply was not very satisfactory to the Cardinal, who told Lord Halifax that 'the writer seems to me to be refraining from expressing his mind. His words in spite of himself betrayed an uneasiness which inevitably communicated itself to others.' (July 10.)

The Archbishop's uneasiness was increased when the Bishop of Zanzibar, as president of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, telegraphed the respectful greetings of 16,000 Anglo-Catholics to the Pope humbly praying that the day of peace might quickly dawn. The Archbishop had already written to Lord Halifax strongly dissuading him from a public meeting on the subject of Reunion with Rome. It had been proposed that the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Burge) should take the chair. But the Archbishop maintained his objections.

When Lord Halifax suggested the Bishop of Zanzibar in his place, the Archbishop replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* VISCOUNT HALIFAX

13 July, 1923.

I am afraid that I should feel even more apprehension about the meeting under those conditions. To invite people to attend such a meeting would be, in my judgement, to open the door to discussions which I should regard as being not only inopportune but mischievous, as they must quite inevitably lead to misapprehension about what has passed, about what is now happening, and about

what might now be encouraged or expected. If I felt this strongly, as I did when I read your letter, I feel it far more strongly now when the Bishop of Zanzibar has, to the consternation of all sorts of reasonable men, compromised things by his action in telegraphing to the Pope on behalf of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, without even telling the Bishop of London, as its President, or Dr. Frere and others who are so largely responsible for the Congress and its well-being. I yield to no one in my personal regard for the Bishop of Zanzibar, but I do look upon him as a source and centre of real danger to the Church at present owing to the unguarded way in which he writes and speaks. I have seen several people who were in the Albert Hall last night, and there is not one of them who has not told me of the disquietude caused by some of Bishop Weston's words.

Lord Halifax replied with a distress he made no attempt to conceal. He said he would obey the Archbishop's wishes, but:

The VISCOUNT HALIFAX *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

July 17, 1923.

What causes my great trouble now is that, after reading Your Grace's letter to me of July 13 as carefully as I can several times, I cannot help seeing that I have misled the Cardinal as to Your Grace's real mind and wishes; nor can I conceal from myself, in view of the whole tenor of the letter, that Your Grace would be relieved if the present attempt to promote the reunion of the Church of England with Rome came to an end.

It is a most painful reflection that Cardinal Mercier should seem more anxious for that reunion, and more ready to consider methods by which it may be brought about, than Your Grace.

III

Meantime preparations went forward for a third Conversation. It was agreed that the number should be enlarged on either side. The Archbishop was most anxious to secure the help of Bishop Gore, who, though gravely pessimistic, agreed to go.

BISHOP GORE *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

31 July, 1923.

I think it is of such immense importance—with a view to your retaining your present position in real mental vigour as long as possible—that you should be relieved of any anxiety in whole or in part, that if you seriously believe my joining the party for Malines would relieve you, I cannot doubt that I ought to agree to go.

There was some talk of obtaining another Anglican, representing a moderate or evangelical point of view: but it came to nothing. In the end Bishop Gore and Dr. Kidd (Warden of Keble), the Church historian, were chosen. The Archbishop's own hesitations were abundantly evident throughout these months. A long memorandum is preserved in which he set out his doubts and difficulties. In the course of it he wrote:

August 19, 1923.

> There is, I suppose, no conceivable subject of controversy so inflammatory as the position of the Church of Rome in English, Scottish, or Irish life, and red-hot Protestants on one side, or intractable and uncompromising Papists on the other, would instantly distort and misrepresent, however unintentionally, any broken or isolated facts which might reach them. This would have the result not merely of bringing to an abrupt and perhaps fiery close any attempt to reach a roadway towards reconciliation, but it might, not unnaturally, arouse suspicion among different sections of our own Churchmen. Far easier, perhaps I ought to say far safer, it would be to let the matter severely alone and refuse to take any steps whatever upon so uncertain or treacherous a quagmire. Yet to take that course would mean the deliberate turning of a deaf ear to the little whisper of tentative enquiry or approach which reaches us from the Roman side. That I am determined I will not do. Of course it will be said that we cannot entertain any strong hopes of ultimate success attending any effort at present to bridge a chasm due to, or indicative of, fundamental differences as to modes of faith and worship. But I will not attempt to estimate the chances of success. I cannot consistently with the obligations, first, of our common Christianity, and, next, of the special resolves and hopes to which the Lambeth Conference gave expression three years ago, refuse to participate in any genuine and pious endeavour towards reaching a goal which ought not in the nature of things to be unattainable by Christian men who believe in the reality of Our Master's Prayer and in the present day guidance of God the Holy Spirit. So, if our Roman Catholic friends are ready to co-operate, try we must and will.

The memorandum referred to the importance, at this stage, of facing fundamental matters:

> The position and authority of Holy Scripture, the meaning and authority of Tradition, the existence or non-existence of a Supreme Authority upon earth, a Vicariate of Christ, and what it means

as regards both doctrine and administration: then further, the introduction of such dogmas as that of the Immaculate Conception, or again, and in another field, the definite teaching of the Church of Rome as to Transubstantiation and the attendant or consequent doctrines and usages. . . . If, when the representatives next meet, they will thus put the first things first in discussion, as they have always been first in their thoughts, then the deliberations which have already taken place may prove to have been wholly advantageous. If, however, it should appear that there are great doctrinal questions (or even great administrative questions like the claim of unchallengeable papal autocracy) upon which no modification or explanation is possible, I can myself see very small gain in continuing discussions which would be foredoomed to failure. For it ought to be made clear on the Anglican side, beyond possibility of doubt, that the great principles upon which the Reformation turned are our principles still, whatever faults or failures there may have been on either side in the controversies of the sixteenth century. It would be unfair to our Roman Catholic friends to leave them in any doubt as to our adherence, on large questions of controversy, to the main principles for which men like Hooker or Andrewes or Cosin contended, though the actual wording would no doubt be somewhat different to-day. What those men stood for, we stand for still, and I think that in some form or other that ought to be made immediately clear.

Lord Halifax tried to reassure the Cardinal—but His Eminence could not but be aware of the Archbishop's reserve. In a strictly personal letter to Lord Halifax he made this comment upon it:

CARDINAL MERCIER *to* VISCOUNT HALIFAX

Sept. 10, 1923.

Ma pensée n'est pas du tout de me retirer; au contraire, j'ai le vif désir de reprendre et de poursuivre nos conversations, même dans un cercle élargi. Mais il ne me paraît pas possible que les *Autorités* ecclésiastiques soient engagées d'un seul côté.

L'Archevêque de Cantorbéry attend, garde le silence, s'abstient. Plusieurs personnes, qui le connaissent, disent en parlant de lui: 'He is cautious, very cautious'.

Si nous voulons collaborer à des conversations qui ne soient pas purement 'individuelles', il importe que l'autorité ne se retranche pas, d'un côté, dans le réserve, presque l'abstention, tandis que, de l'autre côté, elle serait invitée à s'avancer toujours davantage. Pour qu'il y ait rencontre fraternelle, il faut qu'elles s'avancent l'une vers l'autre.

What Cardinal Mercier failed to observe was the far greater reserve of the Pope, who never emerged from the background on the Roman side; while the Archbishop of Canterbury, on the Anglican side, did emerge. The Archbishop saw the Anglican emissaries at Lambeth before they went to Malines, and called on a few advisers (the Bishop of Ripon,[1] Canon Storr, Canon Quick, Dr. Jenkins) to discuss the programme with him. He explained the points, and quoted various documents in elucidation.

The third Conversation took place at Malines on November 7–8, 1923. The Roman Catholics were the same as before, with the addition of two French scholars, Monsignor Pierre Batiffol and Père Hippolyte Hemmer. The discussion was wholly confined to the position of St. Peter, on the basis of full memoranda prepared beforehand by theologians of both sides. It was recognized by the Anglicans that St. Peter was the accepted chief or leader of the Apostles in the New Testament, and that he was so accepted because he was treated so by our Lord: but the Anglicans maintained that the power given to St. Peter in Matthew xvi, while so given to him as chief leader of the apostolic company, was fulfilled to all the twelve:

> so that all constitute the foundation of the Church, all have the keys of the kingdom, and all have the authority to bind and to loose. St. Peter's special position, therefore, we hold to have lain, not in any jurisdiction which he alone held, but in a leadership among the other Apostles.

The Anglicans after some discussion expressed their readiness to say:

> that the sayings of the Gospel—notably the *Tu es Petrus* and the *Pasce agnos*—express a prerogative of Peter as the foundation of the Church and the principle of its unity.
>
> We consider that the events of history have thrown light on these texts which has brought out more clearly their true significance.
>
> The Vatican Council defines as of the Catholic Faith the primacy of universal jurisdiction conferred on Peter, grounding itself on the two texts *Tu es Petrus* and *Pasce oves*. It declares that the denial of the primacy is contrary to the plain sense of Holy Scripture as the Catholic Church has always understood it.
>
> The Council does not indicate the numerous testimonies which prove the tradition in the interpretation of the texts, and which are to be found in the patrology and ancient Christian literature.

[1] Dr. Drury.

The question, however, to be faced was in their view 'what constitutes primacy?' And 'what is the relation of the Pope to other Bishops?' The Anglicans agreed:

> That he has a primacy among all the Bishops of Christendom; so that, without communion with him, there is in fact no prospect of a reunited Christendom.
>
> That to the Roman See the churches of the English owe their Christianity through 'Gregory our father' (Council of Clovesho, A.D. 747) 'who sent us baptism' (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *anno 565*).

The third Conversation gave pleasure to all who attended—and Bishop Gore expressed himself charmed with the gracious entertainment and wise chairmanship of the Cardinal. It was not so sensational as the second, but it reached a greater measure of agreement on doctrinal matters, and secured the admission that the doctrine underlying the Papal claim might be further probed.

The next question to be considered was how far the public could be taken into the confidence of the promoters of the Conversations. It was felt that complete silence was dangerous, yet the manner and the amount of communication involved difficulties. In the end, the Archbishop decided to issue at Christmas a Letter to the Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion, informing them generally of the results of the Lambeth Appeal, and giving a large section to the Malines Conversations. He drafted a letter and circulated it to the Anglican members of the Conference and also to Cardinal Mercier. There were several criticisms, all of which the Archbishop took well. The Cardinal secured certain modifications in the reference to the authorization by the Vatican, and he also expressed a wish for a warmer and more religious conclusion. Lord Halifax pointed out what he considered the difference in tone between the first part of the letter dealing with the Protestant bodies, and the second part dealing with Rome, and he could not refrain from a general criticism of the final document:

The VISCOUNT HALIFAX *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

29 December, 1923.

I wish also that the letter contained some acknowledgment that the statements of Anglican theologians of the sixteenth and

seventeenth centuries are not the only statements the rulers of the Church of England have to consider. I wish also very much that it had contained a sentence or two which would have appealed to the heart. The heart and the imagination are more compelling forces than any which appeal only to the head. I fully recognize the need of emphasizing the reality of the difficulties that stand in the way of reunion, but if the balance is to be kept true, it should surely be redressed by allusion to the glory of the vision which would be presented by the reunion of the Church of England with the Church of St. Gregory and St. Augustine, if it should please God in His good providence to allow that reunion to be helped forward by our means. Would not such an utterance have put the matter in a light that would have disarmed criticism? I venture to enclose to Your Grace the copy of a note I made at Malines, which may serve to illustrate the difficulties which may arise from the attenuated account contained in Your Grace's letter. They are difficulties which might conceivably make it necessary, in order to avoid misunderstanding, that some supplemental account should be given of the conversations at Malines.

Your Grace is to forgive me for what I have ventured to say in this letter. I have many misgivings about sending it, but it is not the first time that I have had to trust to the generosity and forbearance of the *alterius orbis Papa*, who, I know, would wish that what is felt should be expressed, and would be sure that in saying 'I should esteem it the greatest misfortune for the English Church, were he not here to guide its fortunes', I am speaking from the depths of my heart.

It is unnecessary to print the full text of the Archbishop's letter here, for the facts which it records have been related above in an ampler form. The section dealing with Malines began by recognizing the special difficulty which Rome presented, and also Dr. Davidson's full sense of his responsibility:

The Archbishop of Canterbury *to the* Archbishops *and* Metropolitans of the Anglican Communion

Christmas, 1923.

You will agree with me in regarding that subject as separate from other reunion problems, not only by the history of centuries of English life, but by present-day claims and utterances. And the plain fact confronts us that in relation to that subject there exist both at home and in the overseas Dominions, passions, dormant or awake, which are easily accounted for, but which, when once

aroused, are difficult to allay. I have myself been repeatedly warned that to touch that subject is unwise. Men urge that 'even if the opportunity be given' it is easier and safer to let it severely alone. That may be true, but you and I are party to the 'Appeal to all Christian People', and I, at least, find it difficult to reconcile that document with an attitude of apathy or sheer timidity as to our touching the Roman Catholic question. Not only are we pledged to the words and spirit of the 'Appeal' itself, but we have before us what was said on the subject by the Committee of the same Lambeth Conference in 1920. We there express our readiness to welcome any friendly discussion between Roman Catholics and Anglicans for which opportunity may be given [1] I have no right to say that the utterances of the Lambeth Conference have influenced Roman Catholic opinion, but I am certain that they have increased our own responsibilities in the matter.

It stressed the importance of the historic Anglican position:

I found, as I anticipated, that our visitors to Malines were not likely to forget what the historical Anglican position and claims have been in the past, as set forward for example by the great theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—a position which we have no thought of changing or weakening to-day. It seemed to me to be fair to the Roman Catholic members of the Malines Conference, now augmented by the addition of Monsignor Batiffol and the Abbé Hemmer, that the firmness and coherence, as we believe, of our Anglican doctrine and system should be unmistakably set forward.

And it defined the limitations of the proceedings:

There has not yet been time [since the third conference] to weigh adequately the record of the conversations which took place, still less the unsolved differences which they exhibit, but I may say at once that, as was inevitable, the discussions are still in a quite

[1] The words are as follows: 'Your Committee feels that it is impossible to make any Report on Reunion with Episcopal Churches without some reference to the Church of Rome, even though it has no Resolution to propose upon the subject. We cannot do better than make our own the words of the Report of 1908, which reminds us of "the fact that there can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition". But we realize that—to continue the quotation—"any advance in this direction is at present barred by difficulties which we have not ourselves created, and which we cannot of ourselves remove". Should, however, the Church of Rome at any time desire to discuss conditions of reunion we shall be ready to welcome such discussions.'

elementary stage, and that no estimate, so far as I judge, can yet be formed as to their ultimate value. Needless to say, there has been no attempt to initiate what may be called 'negotiations' of any sort. The Anglicans who have, with my full encouragement, taken part, are in no sense delegates or representatives of the Church as a whole. I had neither the will nor the right to give them that character. This is well understood on both sides. They have sought merely to effect some re-statement of controverted questions, and some elucidation of perplexities. And to me it seems indubitable that good must in the Providence of God ensue from the mere fact that men possessing such peculiar qualifications for the task should, in an atmosphere of good-will on either side, have held quiet and unrestrained converse with a group of Roman Catholic theologians similarly equipped. No further plans are yet prepared, but it is impossible, I think, to doubt that further conversations must follow from the careful talks already held. At the least we have endeavoured in this direction, as in others, to give effect to the formal recommendation of the Lambeth Conference that we should 'invite the authorities of other Churches to confer with [us] concerning the possibility of taking definite steps to co-operate in a common endeavour . . . to restore the unity of the Church of Christ'

The Letter aroused a storm of controversy. Both the Archbishop and the Cardinal were the victims of attack. Resolutions from many societies were forwarded to Lambeth denouncing the Archbishop's betrayal of the Protestant religion. And it is interesting to observe, in view of later developments, that one of the first critics was Sir William Joynson-Hicks.

The substance of Sir William Joynson-Hicks's letter is sufficiently shown by the following extract from the Archbishop's public reply:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. SIR WILLIAM JOYNSON HICKS

January 28, 1924.

I think you take much too circumscribed and even petty a view of the great fact in our contemporary religious life that we are solemnly trying in the faith and fear of God to press upon the Christian people of our time a bolder and truer view of what Christian unity means, as something for which our Divine Lord prayed on the last evening of His earthly life. It is this endeavour 'to meet the demands of a new age with a new outlook' which finds

expression in our 'Appeal to All Christian People'. You, as I gather, would rule as out of consideration any idea that we should contemplate the possibility of a united Church of Christ on earth. For you deem it to be clear that the distinctive teaching of the Church of Rome is immutable. If it is once admitted that certain distinctive doctrines of that Church are falsified by their lack of Scriptural foundation, an opinion which I presume we all hold, we must, according to your view, as you deem them to be immutable, leave it so, and take no steps, except perhaps as private individuals, to understand better the position which Roman Catholics take, or to explain to them our own. You would wish this to hold good even if there be a readiness on the part of prominent Roman Catholic leaders and theologians to converse with us on the subject with a view to the removal of possible misunderstandings or confusions. The result to which such conversations are directed must, in your view, precede the conversations. Such is not my view of what is desirable. I do not believe it to be Our Lord's Will that I should say—'We will discuss our differences with those Protestant theologians to whom our doctrines seem mistaken. We will discuss them with theologians of the Eastern Churches, but we will not, even when encouraged to do so, discuss them with theologians belonging to the Church of Rome. The members of that Church are ruled out, unless, prior to any conversation on the subject, they begin by admitting their errors and withdrawing from the position for which they contend.'

He made a more formal rejoinder to the critics in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation, on February 6, 1924. Two passages may be quoted. After describing again the origin of the Conversations, arranged 'almost fortuitously', he said:

Though I had no responsibility with regard to this, it is doubtless the fact that had I desired to do so I might, so to speak, have stamped out the very suggestion of such a conversation taking place, however informally; or at least I might have refused to know anything whatever about it. Such action on my part—and this seems to me to be self-evident—would have belied the Appeal which the Lambeth Conference had made in the widest possible terms 'to All Christian People' for the furtherance of a wider unity of the Church of Christ on earth. It would, further, have been contrary to every principle which I have entertained in religious matters. I have always believed that personal intercourse is of the very highest value for the better understanding of matters of faith or opinion whereon people are in disagreement, however wide or

even fundamental the disagreement may be. To me the quenching of smoking flax by the stamping out of an endeavour to discuss, thus privately, our differences, would, I say it unhesitatingly, have seemed to be a sin against God.

And again:

. . . there have been no negotiations whatever. We are not at present within sight of anything of the kind. Cardinal Mercier emphasizes this as strongly as I do. There are whole sentences about it in his Pastoral. They were private conversations about our respective history and doctrines and nothing more. The critics of our action urge that before any such conversation can be rightly allowed to take place we ought to insist that the Church of Rome must confess the error of its doctrines and repudiate the Declaration about Anglican Orders. I think your lordships will agree with me when I say that to describe the conversations as being useless or harmful unless we secure a preliminary surrender shows a fundamental misconception of what is meant by the sort of conversations which can be held to elucidate our respective positions. Where should we be, my lords, if, in all matters of controversy, conversations were to be pronounced useless or hurtful unless the conclusion or even conversion which on either side is hoped for has been already secured?

He repeated, for the statement had been questioned in Rome, that the Vatican had cognisance of the Conversations exactly corresponding to the cognisance extended by himself.

The Cardinal also had to defend himself from attack, in a letter to his Clergy. He gave the facts, referring to the 'de-Christianization of the masses, and the swiftness with which the failing of faith in the supernatural leads to the denial of all religion'. He pointed out the private character of the conversations:

Our discussions were thus in no sense 'negotiations'. To negotiate, it is necessary to hold a mandate and, neither on one side nor on the other were we invested with a mandate. And I, for my part, had asked for no such commission; it was enough to know that I was acting in agreement with the supreme Authority, blessed and encouraged by It.

We set to work, inspired by a like desire for mutual understanding and brotherly aid, firmly resolved to banish the spirit of barren controversy.

Obviously, the disagreement of both sides on several fundamental questions was notorious; we all knew that. But we also

knew that if truth has its rights, charity has its duties; we thought that, perhaps, by dint of open-hearted converse, and the intimate conviction that in a vast conflict centuries old, all the wrongs were not on one side; by a precise enunciation of certain controverted points, we might break down preconceptions, dispel ambiguities, smooth the way along which loyal souls, aided by grace, might discover, if it pleased God, or recover, the truth.

As a matter of fact, at the close of each of our three meetings, we all felt closer to, more trustful towards, one another, than at the start. Our guests told us so; wrote it to us; we said as much to them, and I am happy to repeat it here.

Need I add, nevertheless, that neither my friends nor I, when essential questions were mooted—such as the Primacy of the Pope, defined by the Vatican Council, which was the first and the last to be moved—did we give away, in a wild craving for union at all price, one single article of our Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Creed.

He also rebuked the critics in England who had criticized the Conversations as being inopportune 'because they think it is wise to let the separated Churches go to complete decay', and ineffective 'because individual conversion only must be sought for'. And he explained what it was that made him take the opportunity so unexpectedly presented:

For the whole world, I would not that one of our severed brethren should have the right to say that he knocked trustfully at the door of a Roman catholic bishop, and that this Roman catholic bishop refused to open it.

A great nation was, for more than eight centuries, our beloved sister; this nation gave the Church a phalanx of saints whom to this day we honour in our liturgy; astonishing reserves of Christian life have been maintained in its vast empire; from it numberless missions have gone out far and wide; but a gaping wound is in its side. We catholics, kept safe, by the grace of God, in the whole truth, we weep over the criminal sundering which tore it away, four centuries ago, from the Church our Mother; and forsooth there are catholics who would that, like the Levite in the parable of the Good Samaritan, a catholic bishop should pass his way, superbly unfeeling, and refuse to pour oil in this gaping wound, to tend it, and try to lead the invalid to God's House whither God's mercy calls him.

I must needs have pleaded guilty had I been so cowardly.

So far as other Churches with which a rapprochement was in

any way proceeding were concerned, it is of interest to note that the Free Church members of the Joint Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen, meeting regularly at Lambeth, were reassured after a conversation with the two Archbishops. One Free Churchman indeed went so far as to say that he did not see how the Archbishop could have acted otherwise. It is equally interesting to observe that the Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory, writing to the Archbishop in June 1924, when thanking him for a copy of his letter to Metropolitans, used these words:

> The recent efforts for fraternal communion with the Church of Rome appear to us also to be such a righteous and godly endeavour.

IV

The question soon arose of a further Conversation. The Archbishop was definitely in favour of postponement, while the Cardinal and Lord Halifax desired greater speed. Already the shadow of the Prayer Book controversy appeared in the background, as may be seen from the following letter:

The Rt. Hon. Lord Hugh Cecil *to* Viscount Halifax

22 May 1924.

> I do not quite agree with you about going on with the Malines conversations in October. My reason is one with which you are familiar, that the Malines conversations are a dangerous complication while the Prayer Book controversy is going on. I am afraid I think that controversy very formidable, and that serious mischief might easily be done if it took a wrong turn. Unquestionably, if there were a conference at Malines in October, great alarm and dissatisfaction would be caused among the whole Evangelical party at a moment when it is most important that they should be soothed and tranquillized.

Cardinal Mercier did not understand such complications. In fact, as his own friends said, there was a certain simplicity about him which sometimes landed him in difficulties which might have been avoided, in other fields, as when he intervened unwisely in Ireland and had a clash with his own Walloon Clergy as well as with the English Roman Catholics. As M. Portal put it, 'His greatness was likely to be better recognized in the next world than it is in this.'

It was natural, therefore, that he should be disappointed, and think that all the warmth was on the Roman Catholic side. There was a great deal of warmth in the breast of Lord Halifax, and it was difficult for the Cardinal to realize why the Archbishop could not rise to the same temperature. Lord Halifax wanted the Archbishop to invite the Pope to express his views on the subject of corporate reunion, but the Archbishop refused to take such an initiative, to the disappointment also of the Cardinal. In writing to Lord Halifax a little later, the Cardinal could not refrain from saying:

CARDINAL MERCIER *to* VISCOUNT HALIFAX

6 March, 1925.

In proportion as the Sovereign Pontiff, and the Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican, affirm with increasing distinctness their confidence in our humble efforts, and thus indirectly disavow certain oppositions of the English Roman Catholics, it would seem as if on our side the nearer hopes of re-union seemed likely to be realised, the more sensitive the good Archbishop of Canterbury seems to grow as to his responsibilities to his own people, and to desire to put off, rather than to hasten, the definite bringing together of both sides.

The fourth and last Conversation took place at Malines in May 1925, with the same membership as before. There had been similar preparation of memoranda beforehand on either side. The main subject discussed was that of the relation of the episcopate to the Holy See, resumed from the previous occasion. It was claimed by the Romans that the Pope had a supremacy over the whole of the Church. The Vatican decree of infallibility was mentioned,[1] and the Anglicans felt obliged to reply

[1] Vatican Decree of Infallibility: *Si quis itaque dixerit, Romanum Pontificem habere tantummodo officium inspectionis vel directionis, non autem plenam et supremam potestatem iurisdictionis in universam Ecclesiam, non solum in rebus, quae ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quae ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiae per totum orbem diffusae pertinent; aut eum habere tantum potiores partes, non vero totam plenitudinem huius supremae potestatis, aut hanc eius potestatem non esse ordinariam et immediatam sive in omnes ac singulas ecclesias sive in omnes et singulos pastores et fideles, anathema sit.* Conc Vatican *Pastor Aeternus*, Caput III, ad fin.

Itaque Nos . . . docemus et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est, cum omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate

that it was this supremacy which constituted so grave a difficulty. It was, however, agreed by the Roman Catholics that a union between the Church of England and Rome would assist in bringing about instances and forms of decentralization useful to the whole Church. In the course of the discussion a warm recognition was given by the Cardinal to the reinforcement which the Church of England would bring to the Roman Church if union came about. Bishop Gore had already emphasized the fact that the Church of England and the Orthodox Church and the Protestants preserved certain spiritual elements belonging to the original Christianity of the New Testament, and also in accord with what was best in modern critical and democratic movements, elements which had been more or less eliminated by the Roman Church: and the Dean of Wells had spoken of the logical completeness of the Latin system as a very terrifying thing.[1] There was also a discussion on the distinction between what was *de fide* and what was not *de fide*: the Anglicans claiming that the basis of faith in any union should be the Oecumenical Faith of the Councils, with a tolerance of diversity determined by the distinction between what was *de fide* and what was not *de fide*.

The most interesting part of the discussion, however, was based

pollere, qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit; ideoque eiusmodi Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae irreformabiles esse. Ibid., Caput IV, ad fin.

From *Pastor Aeternus* (Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi): Mansi. *Collectio Conciliorum*, tome 52, col. 1330 et seq., *Collectio Lacensis Conciliorum recentiorum*, tome VII, col 482 et seq.

[1] '*At Malines, 19 May 1925* [A note by Dean Robinson, shown only to the Abbé Portal] These are logical conclusions deduced from certain premises. We distrust logical conclusions *as such*. Moreover we don't admit *all* the premises.

'Further we see that the resulting system has issued in isolating the Latin element in Christendom, which has pursued its own course of development The Greek element and the Anglo-Saxon element have come to be practically ignored, and the development has been what we now see and cannot possibly accept as final. We are crying out for a larger, more comprehensive, conception of the Catholic Church.

'We feel that under Providence we exist to bear this witness Our position can perhaps hardly be understood except by ourselves It is a protest for mental liberty—a protest against settling things by logical deductions in a world in which there is more than logic.

'We are a very unruly element from the ecclesiastical point of view. In a complete and comprehensive Church we should have our place and no more. We should be a stimulus to thought and movement but our eccentricity would be counterbalanced by other elements. Our exclusion is bad for ourselves (though we may not think it), and it is certainly bad for the Church as a whole.'

on a private paper not previously circulated, read by the Cardinal as the work of a canonist, furnished to him from Rome.[1] It was anonymous. Its title was 'L'Église Anglicane unie non absorbie'. It called attention to the long history of the Church of England and the special position of the Archbishop of Canterbury, drawing the conclusion that an Anglican Church *absorbed by* Rome and an Anglican Church *separated from* Rome, were both equally inadmissible. The really historical formula was 'The Anglican Church united to Rome'. The memorandum proposed in brief that the Anglican Church should be under a Partiarch, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who could receive his investiture from the successor of St. Peter by the historic imposition of the *pallium*: that it should have its own rites, liturgies, canon law, discipline (including a non-celibate clergy), subject only to the indispensable link of subordination to the Universal Church of which the centre of unity was at Rome. The memorandum was not discussed in any detail, though it aroused the deepest interest. It may well prove to be not the least enduring result of Malines.[2] The conversation, after its reading, returned in the main to the programme which it had set before itself concerning questions of doctrine.

The subject of doctrinal discussion was a paper by Bishop Gore entitled 'On Unity with Diversity',[3] together with a paper written in reply to Bishop Gore by Monsignor Batiffol.[4] The discussion waxed hot at times without ceasing to be friendly. Bishop Gore put the root difficulty in the dogmatic field as follows:

> I write as an Anglican who has not the slightest desire to submit himself as an individual to the Roman authority, but with all his heart would desire to see his own Anglican communion, and the

[1] The canonist was Dom Lambert Beauduin (of Amay).

[2] This important Memorandum deals in detail with questions of jurisdiction. When it was published by Lord Halifax in 1930, with other Original Documents as *Annexe XIII*, Cardinal van Roey stated in the *Libre Belgique* that Cardinal Mercier made certain reserves. Lord Halifax therefore wrote a letter to *The Times* which appeared on February 27, 1930, and included the following words, 'Cardinal Mercier entirely approved of Dom Beauduin's paper, otherwise he would not have read it. But, if further proof be needed, Dom Beauduin has already replied to his critics in *Irenikon*, 1927, p 150, where he publishes a letter of Cardinal Mercier's praising his work and saying that it is sure to do good.'

[3] *Concedit* (*Cyprianus*) *salvo jure communionis . . . diversum sentire.* Aug. *De bapt.* iii. 5. See for the full text *Recollections of Malines* by Walter Frere, 1935, pp. 110–19.

[4] For full text see *The Conversations at Malines, 1921–1925*, Original Documents, Lord Halifax, 1930, pp. 263–87.

communion of the Orthodox Churches, reunited to the Holy See of Rome. The at present insuperable obstacle to such reunion, in either case, is the demand for submission, as to *de fide* dogmas, to certain doctrines, which, as claiming to be part of the essential faith, seem to us to conflict with history and with truth. I must speak with simple frankness. It seems to us illegitimate to yield that faith which we give to the fact of the virginal conception of our Lord, or His resurrection, or His ascension, to the immaculate conception of Mary. The former group of accepted facts rest upon original witness and good evidence: the latter on nothing that can be called historical evidence at all. But to believe in a *fact* on the mere ground of *a priori* reasoning as to what is suitable, without any evidence of the fact, seems to us to alter the fundamental character of the act of faith. It also makes with the other doctrines just specified, a claim for the authority of the church, as centralized and absolute, which the ancient church never made. It frees it from all those restrictions of universal agreement and unvarying tradition and scriptural authority—which in our judgment make the fact of faith rational. It seems to us quite clear that the existing Roman demand, as we understand it to be made, is and remains quite unacceptable.

Thus the two essential problems, both of discipline—including jurisdiction (in the Canonist's Memorandum)—and of doctrine (in Bishop Gore's paper), were both faced with great frankness, and the Conversations thus reached the climax which was possible at the moment.

Before the meeting closed, the following document was read. It had been drawn up by the Anglicans in conference among themselves:

Some considerations following on the discussion about relations between the Pope and the Bishops.

The Church is a living body under the authority of the bishops as successors of the Apostles: and from the beginnings of Church History a primacy and leadership among all the bishops has been recognized as belonging to the Bishop of Rome. Nor can we imagine that any reunion of Christendom could be effected except on the recognition of the primacy of the Pope.

But while we think that both the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican Churches would be prepared to recognize such primacy, we do not think it likely that they would be ready to define it more closely.

However, the following points may be usefully stated:

1. The authority of the Pope is not separate from that of the episcopate; nor in normal circumstances can the authority of the episcopate be exercised in disassociation from that of its chief.

2. In virtue of that primacy the Pope can claim to occupy a position in regard to all other bishops which no other bishop claims to occupy in regard to him.

3. The exercise of that primacy has in time past varied in regard to time and place: and it may vary again. And this adds to the difficulty of defining the respective rights of the Holy See on the one side, and of the episcopate upon the other.

This was, as it turned out, the last conference to be held. The Roman Catholics, said Bishop Gore, showed a surprising concessiveness in matters of organization, but were adamant on dogmatic issues. He deprecated any plan of going to Malines again. The Archbishop of Canterbury, however, after reflection, decided in favour of continuing. His letter to the Cardinal gives a summary of the whole discussion:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* CARDINAL MERCIER

Lambeth Palace. 1st August, 1925.

Following upon my recent letter to Your Eminence, in which I asked permission for a short delay owing to the stress of work, I am now glad to be able to assure Your Eminence that I have read attentively the papers and memoranda relating to the last group of Conversations at Malines. I cannot when thus writing refrain from again thanking Your Eminence for the unbroken courtesy and kindness with which you have facilitated during these years the Conversations which have attracted, both in England and on the Continent, an attention due in large measure to the personality and kindness of Your Eminence.

Looking back now along these years to the beginning of the matter in 1921, I am increasingly persuaded that the gatherings under Your Eminence's roof at Malines have been fruitful of good. Whatever misunderstanding may at first have arisen in England has now I think been largely or wholly removed from the minds of thoughtful and well-informed men. The mere fact that such Conversations after long centuries during which they would scarcely have been possible, should now have taken place must I think be a source of thankfulness.

I have given close attention to the Memoranda and *procès verbal* of the meeting in May and I have compared these with previous records and memoranda relating to the earlier meetings. The

question obviously arises whether the Conversations have now reached a stage when a longer interval for consideration is desirable or whether they should be speedily resumed, and if so at what date. Articles or notices in the Belgian Press which have been sent to me appear to indicate that Your Eminence favours the idea of resuming the Conversations at an early date, whether for a single gathering to sum up what has already been said, or with a view to a series of further meetings. If such is Your Eminence's wish, it is certainly desirable that it should be acceded to, and this accords I think with what is felt by the Anglican Group which has taken part in the Conversations.

It seems to me that what will then emerge is that explanations have been given of exaggerations or misunderstood phrases current both popularly and in theological literature as to what in England is called Popery and as to what in Roman Catholic circles is summed up as Protestantism. Recent discussions have (if I may use the figure) built piers which would be useful if we were able to construct the bridge. The arches, however, remain unconstructed, and in honesty I am bound to say that I do not at present see the vision of their taking any substantial shape.

The meetings under Your Eminence's care have undoubtedly brought about a better and more sympathetic understanding, on either side, of the position occupied by the other. The documents which have passed, and the records of the Conversations place this, to my mind, beyond doubt. While I rejoice to say this, I dare not in honesty adopt the phrase suggested by Your Eminence that we have made 'progress in agreement'.

In studying the papers before me, I do not find any indication of a readiness on the part of those whom Your Eminence associated with yourself at Malines to show or suggest the possibility of any modification by re-statement or otherwise of what are commonly regarded as irreducible doctrinal requirements to which expression has been given. The same may doubtless be said of the views expressed by the Anglican ecclesiastics who have shared in the Conversations. I am far from criticizing, still less blaming, either group on that account, but I feel bound to say that I think the ordinary members of our respective Churches would be misled, were I now to present the position as one in which there was evidence of any nearer agreement upon the fundamental questions at issue.

I go back along the story of the four Conversations. In the first, there was a general discussion of subjects so fundamental and far-reaching as The Nature of the Church, The Doctrine of the Sacraments, and The Authority attaching to Holy Scripture. These

discussions naturally raised questions rather than handled them with any thoroughness. They were basic questions, and were among those referred to when, in the Lambeth Appeal to All Christian People, words were used to the effect that there must be agreement on fundamentals before discussion of details can be fruitful.

The second 'Conversations', deliberately dealt with administrative possibilities which might become practicable if on the doctrinal basis agreement had been reached.

At the third 'Conversations' those conferring rightly went back, as I ventured to urge they should, to the great doctrinal question of the position of the Papacy, which is now an article *de fide* in the Roman Catholic Church. The question was dealt with on the ground of the New Testament and in connexion with the history both of the Early Church and of the Sixteenth Century.

At the fourth, the recent 'Conversations', attention was still fixed in the main on this outstanding question of the Papacy and the place it has held and holds in the history of the Christian Church.

I need not remind Your Eminence that on all these questions there was not merely verbal discussion, but that literary contributions of the most valuable kind were made available. I have myself studied both the record of the Conversations and the material furnished to aid them. Your Eminence will I think agree with me when I say that they afford no evidence of a departure on either side from the doctrinal principles which you or we maintain.

A question necessarily arises as to the next step which can usefully be taken. I share the opinion of Your Eminence that those who have met under your presidency should meet again. I take it for granted that at such a meeting an attempt would be made to formulate some statement (or perhaps two statements emanating from the two sides in the discussion) both as to the matters on which misunderstandings may have been removed, and as to the points which still remain obdurately outstanding as unremoved obstructions. It would be misleading were these latter to be treated lightly or described in general terms only. I am inclined to think that we require both a somewhat fuller statement of the kind I have indicated, for the use of those who have been conferring, and also a briefer and more general statement capable of being usefully made public. So far I venture to hope that we should all be in agreement. It corresponds with what Your Eminence said on the last occasion at Malines, when you advocated the preparation of some brief statement and deprecated, as I also deprecate, the

publication of the documents which have been used. A short statement for publicity ought, however, to make mention of the subjects I have above referred to as having been under discussion during these years.

A further question arises, whether, as some of my friends certainly desire, there should be fresh discussion of some of the doctrinal difficulties which have remained unresolved—for example, the Doctrinal Decrees of the Council of Trent might possibly be considered. The question, however, of this further discussion is one which I should like to leave for the consideration and decision of those who take part in the Conversations.

May I, in conclusion, recur to the thought to which I have more than once given expression during these years. The vision which we set before ourselves in issuing the Lambeth Conference Appeal to All Christian People was a very wide one embracing Christians throughout the world. It was a vision (I quote the words) 'of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all "who profess and call themselves Christians".... To all other Christian people whom our words may reach we make the same appeal. We do not ask that any one Communion should consent to be absorbed in another. We do ask that all should unite in a new and great endeavour to recover and to manifest to the world the unity of the Body of Christ for which He prayed.'

The difference between Your Eminence's view and my own, where it exists, may be not so much a difference of faith or charity in dealing with the same problem, as a difference in our conception of what the problem is and what its solution involves.

Even Lord Halifax was pleased with what the Archbishop had written, and reported the Cardinal as remarking 'It is not what we could have hoped, but it might have been worse (*moins bon*)'. The Cardinal himself made a long reply later, proposing a fifth meeting for January, though confessing to a certain uneasiness at the diminution of confidence which he noticed in the letter of the Archbishop. He begged him not to give way to the solicitations of either 'the inveterate optimists' or the 'obstinate pessimists' which, as in both their flocks, demanded the one an immediate success, the other an immediate abandonment:

CARDINAL MERCIER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

October 25, 1925.

But do you not think it would be weakness on our part if we gave way to their solicitations? We have responsibilities which

they do not have and do not understand. Our situation imposes upon us the duty to consider the general situation from a higher standpoint, according to standards more deeply supernatural. We have graces in virtue of our position for directing consciences and acting with authority.

The Cardinal expressed his agreement with the proposal to make a statement on the conclusions which both sides had reached in common, but did not favour a statement of disputable points:

> Negative conclusions, whatever they may be, would inevitably provoke polemics in the press, reawaken ancient animosities, and accentuate divisions, thus harming the cause to which we have resolved to devote ourselves.

The Archbishop replied at some length:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* CARDINAL MERCIER

Old Palace, Canterbury, 9th December 1925.

Your Eminence has I fear been for some time past expecting a letter from me following upon what I wrote to you on October 29th. Your experience I know corresponds to my own as to the difficulty which urgent daily duties interpose in the way of writing our important letters on the larger and more general questions of our time.

It gives me real satisfaction to know that, on Your Eminence's hospitable invitation, the interrupted 'conversations' are to be resumed at Malines on January 25th. The fact that this is so, and that I have been in touch with our Anglicans who will be with you on that day, renders it I think unnecessary that I should now write at any length in continuance of our recent correspondence. I have, as Your Eminence I believe knows, taken care that your very important letter of October 25th should be quietly considered by those who share in the 'conversations'. They all, I think, agree with Your Eminence in desiring that next month some record should be compiled of what has already taken place, and the Dean of Wells is already occupied in the preparation of a summary account of it. This will, as I understand, be submitted for Your Eminence's consideration before it is discussed in the gathering at Malines.

I have myself considered with the utmost care the opinion expressed by Your Eminence about what should be contained in, or omitted from, any published record. Unless I misunderstand you, your opinion is that the record, while it tells of the endeavour,

successful as I hope, to remove or diminish misunderstandings upon several points of difference between us (points which though important are really minor), should make no reference to the larger and more fundamental question or questions upon which no approach towards agreement has been made or appears possible. I refer specially to the vital question of the Papacy. I of course realize that upon questions such as the rights of Diocesan Bishops and the source of their authority or upon the varieties of rule or usage which may be permissible in Uniat Churches (to mention only two examples out of many), there has been, and there may increasingly be, removal of mutual misunderstanding, and for this reason among others I believe the Malines 'conversations' to have been wholesome and profitable. But prior to all these, and far outweighing them in importance, stands the fundamental question —Is there, or is there not, a Vicar of Christ upon earth, who possesses *jure divino* a distinctive authoritative position in relation to the whole of Christendom?

Upon that great question, if it has in its largest aspect been discussed at all, there has been, so far as I know, no approach to agreement, and that fact must beyond question be set forth clearly in any record which is made public.

I claim to know something about the Church and People of this Country, and I have no hesitation in saying that to publish a record or summary of the discussions without making outspoken reference to that great unremoved mountain of difficulty would be worse than useless. The outcry which would immediately arise would certainly retard instead of promoting the cause for which we care—the cause of removing misunderstandings and contributing to the wider reunion of Christendom.

It is possible that I may have misunderstood Your Eminence, and that you would share my opinion that, in anything that is to be published, the position upon the point I have mentioned must in a few words be made clear. Granted that this is done, I rejoice to repeat to Your Eminence the assurance that in my belief some record of what has taken place may suitably be made public, and by promoting the preparation of such a record Your Eminence will add yet another to the services which you have by your generous action rendered to the whole Church of Christ at this juncture in its history.

The Cardinal replied on December 22, 1925. He had been ill, and his health was giving ground for anxiety. He agreed generally that some intimation of the divergence between Romans and Anglicans, especially as to the Primacy of the Pope, was inevit-

able, but the precise character of the statements to be issued would have to be discussed.

A few days later, news came that the Cardinal was worse and that the Conversation would have to be postponed. The Archbishop was kept informed of the progress of the illness. It soon became clear that the Cardinal could not live, and Lord Halifax went out to say farewell. On January 21, 1926, the Cardinal wrote his last letter to Lambeth:

CARDINAL MERCIER *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Archevêché de Malines Bruxelles: Le 21 Janvier, 1926.

Monseigneur,

Dans l'épreuve que la Divine Providence m'a envoyée ces dernières semaines, ce m'a été un reconfort sans pareil de recevoir la visite de notre vénéré ami Lord Halifax.

J'ai appris par lui le désir persévérant d'union qui vous anime; et suis heureux de cette assurance qui me fortifie à l'heure présente.

'Ut unum sint,' c'est le vœu suprème du Christ, le vœu du Souverain Pontife; c'est le mien, c'est le vôtre. Puisse-t-il se réaliser dans sa plénitude.

Les temoignages de sympathie que Votre Grandeur a bien voulu me faire transmettre m'ont vivement touché; je vous en remercie de grand cœur, et prie Votre Grandeur d'agréer les assurances de mon religieux dévouement.

✠ D. J. CARD. MERCIER, Arch. de Malines.

Two days later he died. The Archbishop at once dispatched a telegram to Canon Dessain, the Cardinal's secretary:

23rd January 1926.

We receive with sorrow the intimation that the earthly life of the venerated Cardinal Archbishop has reached its close. We thank God with you for the long years of devoted and heroic service and for his untiring effort in the cause of unity and peace.

V

With the passing of the Cardinal, the main inspiration of the Conversations came to an end. The news of his death had reached the Archbishop while he was absorbed in a long session of the House of Bishops on Prayer Book revision, now reaching a closing and difficult stage. That subject was destined more and more to occupy the foreground of Randall Davidson's thoughts,

and it is not to be wondered at if, in the circumstances, he showed himself a little unwilling to throw fresh hostages to fortune. He had not been happy about the draft of the statement which was to be discussed at Malines, even after he had expressed his criticisms to the Anglicans severally; and he told Dr. Kidd that he feared lest the document when published should look like 'truckling to the Roman See'. But on the Cardinal's death, the difficulties connected with any report or reports became very clear. Lord Halifax had one report which he wished to publish. The other Anglicans had another. It was uncertain what the Romans would do. Mgr. van Roey was a little later appointed Archbishop of Malines. This seemed hopeful, but there were bitter blows to the cause of *rapprochement* to follow. The Abbé Portal died on June 19, 1926—an irreparable misfortune. On October 25, 1926, a fifth conference was held at Malines under the new Archbishop's presidency, but simply for the purpose of drawing up a Report. Two Reports were discussed, an Anglican and a Roman, and a desire was expressed that both should be issued, the one supplementing the other, the Roman particularly emphasizing the points of agreement. The results were communicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the question of publication became more urgent. In December 1926 Lord Hugh Cecil wrote to the Archbishop, after reading the draft:

LORD HUGH CECIL *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

December 11, 1926.

I return the pamphlet which I have read with the deepest interest. From the general point of view of Christian unity I think its publication will in the long run do a great deal of good: but *any* publication about Malines will frighten some people just now—though there is little to cause reasonable alarm in this. The really striking thing is the concessions the Romans seem ready at least to consider: I expect the Ultramontanes will be extremely angry. But, as I said, what people fear is that Malines is meant to lead to our all 'going over to Rome' as a body. And any reminder of Malines is therefore unfortunate, just while Prayer Book revision is going on. Apart from that the fears would not matter and would soon disappear. But some Protestants will now certainly think and say that Malines and P.B.R. are two parts of the same conspiracy. It would have been better to put off the publication till P.B.R. is over, but I suppose that is now hardly possible.

In February and March, the all but final text of the Revised Prayer Book was published. On Easter Day, Cardinal Bourne went to York and delivered an elaborate attack on the Church of England. On April 30, the Archbishop wrote the following letter to the Bishop of Truro:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF TRURO

30 April, 1927.

I have to-day your important letter of yesterday about the Malines publication. It came opportunely, for I have been troubling my mind rather sorely on the subject during the last few days. Various things have combined to concentrate attention on the subject of our attitude towards Rome. The controversy between Cardinal Bourne and the Bishop of Durham is, as you have perhaps seen, occupying almost the whole of the 'Tablet', and the 'Record', and other similar publications have been ventilating the matter with vigour. The conversations I have had with Members of the Government and leading M.P.s about the Parliamentary atmosphere on the Prayer Book question are not altogether re-assuring. The Prime Minister had a talk with me about it yesterday. I am to address such Members of the House of Lords as care to attend a Meeting convened by Salisbury, Beauchamp, Haldane, Asquith (Oxford), Parmoor, and the Lord Chancellor, and one or two more, on May 12th, and to speak about the Prayer Book and answer questions. The 'Record' has a sermon preached by young Chavasse, at Oxford, to which a good deal of attention is certain to be given. A good deal of the excitement or disquiet among unecclesiastical people turns on the Roman question.

In these circumstances there can be no doubt that the publication just now of our Malines paper will be eagerly used by men of the honest Inskip school to strengthen their hands in the speeches they are going to make at Meetings in London and in the Provinces.

There was, at the same time, a great hesitation on the Roman side as to the publication of their version of the proceedings. Yet in Lord Halifax's view it would have been most undesirable to publish the English version alone. A change had taken place in the official Roman attitude. The Archbishop became all the more anxious to postpone, until the Prayer Book Measure had been through the ordeal of Parliament, and in the end he persuaded Lord Halifax both to acquiesce in the postponement,

and also to publish nothing himself. He agreed out of respect for the Archbishop, though he had, he said, no sort of interest in the passing of the Prayer Book. The Prayer Book Measure was rejected by the House of Commons on December 15, 1927.

Further delay of the Report was seen to be impossible, and on January 19, 1928, it was published to the world.[1]

The Report itself expressed the hope that further conversations might be held to elucidate the statements which had been made, and to help in the removal of misunderstandings. The Archbishop of Canterbury, as we have seen was not very clear that further conference would prove of value. But it was Rome that brought the Conversations to an end. A new spirit was now dominant in the Vatican, and there was no Cardinal Mercier to stand forth as the champion of a *rapprochement*. On January 6, 1928, Pope Pius XI, who had on March 24, 1924, expressed his satisfaction and gratitude for these very conferences to the Sacred Consistory, launched his Encyclical, *Mortalium Animos*, in which he repeated the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy in unmistakable terms, and condemned many Churches and many movements towards unity. The *Osservatore Romano* (quoted in *The Times*, January 21, 1928) definitely announced that the Conversations were to cease. To Cardinal Mercier they had been, as he wrote to the Dean of Wells, the great consolation of his life. To the Archbishop of Canterbury, so much more cautious, they were a matter of deep interest, but not without their embarrassing side. Of their effect on the Church as a whole, who can speak? There has been progress in understanding, in charity, in desire. So far as the longed-for *rapprochement* was concerned, the fundamental difficulties remain unsolved. But channels of thought and methods of study have been started, from which perhaps in later days some great gain may result.

[1] *The Conversations at Malines, 1921–1925.* Published in English and French.

A FOOTNOTE IN VERSE

(*With apologies to A. A. Milne, 'Punch', Jan. 23, 1924, p. 81.* W. F. N.)

H. H. Hensley Hensley
Hereford and Dunelm
Took great
care of the Church
though he was not at th' helm.

H. H. Hensley, Hensley
said to the Church, said he,
you must never be seen
on the way to Malines
without consulting me.

Armitage Armitage, Robinson, Gore,
Halifax, Frere and Kidd
were sometimes seen
on the way to Malines
though they tried to be hid.

Herbert Herbert Hensley Hensley
said to the Arch, said he.
What the dickens you mean
By this game at Malines
is more than I can see.

R. R. Cantuar
said to H. H. D.
I mean that we mean to
be seen at Malines,
so please leave that to me.

Armitage Armitage, Robinson, Gore,
Halifax, Frere and Kidd,
are constantly seen on the
way to Malines
and no longer try to be hid.

W. F. N.

CHAPTER LXXX

THE GENERAL STRIKE

> Hold your hands,
> Both you of my inclining, and the rest·
> Were it my cue to fight, I should have known it
> Without a prompter.
>
> SHAKESPEARE, *Othello*, I. II.

FEW actions in the whole of his life created so much stir, or aroused so much surprise, as the Appeal from the Churches, which the Archbishop issued during the General Strike of May 1926. It was the first time in English history that a General Strike had been declared; and its issue was watched with the keenest interest not only in England, but all over the world. Communists and Fascists alike, and the colonies of all schools of political thought, followed its progress with enthusiasm, contempt, or dismay. The General Strike arose out of a dispute in the mining industry. On March 10, 1926, the Coal Commission under Sir Herbert Samuel presented a unanimous report. Amongst other things it recommended that the coal subsidy (it amounted to £10,000,000) paid by the State should cease on April 30; that costs of production must be reduced, which meant a reduction of wages, subject to safeguards to the worst paid men; and that the industry should be reorganized. On March 24, the Government announced its acceptance of the Report, provided the miners and owners accepted it too. The miners and the owners were unable to come to terms. A deadlock ensued—the owners offering new wages settled by districts, which the miners declared impossible of acceptance. The Industrial Committee of the Trades Union Congress agreed with the miners, and told the Prime Minister, Mr. Baldwin, that the whole Trade Union movement would be obliged to stand by the miners till the end against such acceptance. A conference of both sides with the Prime Minister, on April 22, produced no result. The new wage offers, as the owners called them—'lock-out notices' in the eyes of the miners—had by now been posted by the owners, to take effect on April 30. A special Conference of about 1,000 Trade Union delegates meeting in London on April 29, endorsed the action of

its Committee, and desired negotiations to continue, provided the new wage offers or lock-out notices were withdrawn. There was no withdrawal—and on April 30 a complete national stoppage of the coal industry took place. On May 1, a Royal Proclamation declared a state of emergency; and the same afternoon the General Council of the Trades Union Congress decided to order a General Strike to begin at midnight on May 3, if the notices to the miners had not been withdrawn. The Prime Minister, in spite of the threat, continued negotiations. But, just before midnight on Sunday, May 2, when he heard that strike notices had already been issued and that some compositors in the *Daily Mail* office had refused to print in the Monday paper certain sentences with which they disagreed, he brought the negotiations to an end. At midnight on Monday, May 3, the General Strike began.

We now turn to the Archbishop. In a Memorandum of May 23, 1926, he wrote:

> During the last week of April the possibility of a General Strike had been in everybody's mind and I had discussed it very fully with many people, notably with Hugh Cecil at Clovelly, and with Baldwin himself, in at least one interview. . . . On Thursday 29th, I lunched with Asquith and there discussed with him and Birrell and Sir Donald Maclean the possibility of a Strike.

On Saturday May 1, he dined at the Royal Academy:

> Notwithstanding the fact that it had been announced by the Trade Unionists that a Strike would be called for Monday night May 3rd, people seemed for the most part to believe that it would be averted. The Sunday papers were on the whole hopeful, and in the evening we learned by wireless that the Prime Minister was at that hour (9.30) receiving the T.U.C. leaders. On Monday morning, therefore, the depression was all the greater when we learned that the Prime Minister's negotiations had broken down and that the strike would go forward.

He had more talk with some Churchmen and others on May 3, heard the Prime Minister's pronouncement in the Commons, and dined at Mr. Runciman's that evening.

On May 4:

> I went from there [a missionary meeting] to the House of Lords, where Salisbury, Haldane, Parmoor, and Asquith spoke. Asquith excellent—very strong about the iniquity of the Strike.

On May 5, he spoke himself in the House of Lords, and made it perfectly clear that in his view the Government was only doing its duty in using all its resources to bring the Strike to an end:

> As regards the Strike itself [he said] I do not think that among thoughtful people there is very great difference of opinion as to its unwisdom and its mischievousness. . . . [This Strike is] so intolerable that every effort is needed, is justifiably called for and ought to be supported, which the Government may make to bring that condition of things as speedily as possible to an end. The thing does not seem to me really to bear discussion or to admit of argument, so obvious do the facts seem to be.

At the same time he expressed the belief that the real motive behind the General Strike was a fear that, unless the strike had been called, efforts would be made to lower the standard of living for poorer people in all industries. Therefore he pressed for further efforts for a settlement:

> I hope [he concluded] that every possible effort will continue to be made, even as I say with the risk of an apparent illogicality, to reach a solution on the part of those who have done so much already to carry the matter through. We want to see that they are undaunted in face of the present perplexity, as they have been persevering and untiring in their efforts hitherto.

On May 6, the Bishops of London and Southwark, with Dr. Scott Lidgett and a strong deputation of Nonconformists, came to Lambeth, and issued an appeal, transmitted by the B.B.C. and published in the press on May 7, asking for prayers and assuring Christian people that they were 'anxiously considering possible ways by which Christian opinion may be brought effectively to bear towards the solution of the grave problems of the hour'.

On Friday, May 7, after rejecting a proposal brought from Liverpool to back a big special fund (apparently started by a rich capitalist) to take the place of the subsidy for men returning to work, the Archbishop had a long interview with a group of Churchmen and Nonconformists about issuing a conciliatory appeal. Those present included the Bishops of Ripon and Southwark,[1] Canon Woodward, Rev. E. S. Woods, Dr. Scott Lidgett, Dr. R. F. Horton, Rev. H. Carter, and the Rev. P. T. R. Kirk; and, while it was taking place, the Archbishop was called out to

[1] Dr. E. A. Burroughs and Dr. C. F. Garbett.

see a coal-owner, Lord Londonderry, who wished to help. There was a keen discussion about the character of the appeal. Should it be trenchant? Should it demand conciliation and retreat, independent of the withdrawal of the strike? Should the owners be asked to withdraw their notices? Should the Government be pressed to continue their subsidy? All or any of these? And which should come first?

> Finally we agreed upon using the words 'Simultaneously and concurrently'.

It was then arranged with the B.B.C. that the Archbishop should broadcast the appeal that night.

> Then I went to the House of Commons. I first saw Ramsay MacDonald, who was enthusiastically in favour of the appeal exactly as we had drafted it. He thumped the table and said, 'It is inspired, for it puts the thing exactly in the right way—only would you not make the withdrawal of the Strike No 1 instead of No. 3 in your suggestions?' I replied that I was certain we should all agree with this. We had only given it a lower place for the sake of him and his friends.

He next went to the Prime Minister's room; but, as the Cabinet was sitting, could only get at him through a secretary, who went to and fro:

> Baldwin entirely approved of the appeal except for the words 'simultaneously and concurrently'. He thought he must himself adhere to his declaration that the complete withdrawal of the strike must precede the beginning of negotiations by him. It was awkward having to speak to him through a secretary, but we did it.

While the Archbishop was consulting Ramsay MacDonald and the Prime Minister, his chaplain (Rev. F. D. V. Narborough) went to see Cardinal Bourne:

> During my absence from Lambeth that afternoon, Narborough called at Cardinal Bourne's with a copy of the Appeal, asking for his concurrence. The Cardinal was out, but on his return he caused a message to be sent expressing his agreement with the document, but asking (like Ramsay MacDonald) that the withdrawal of the Strike should be the first of the three suggestions.

The form in which the Appeal stood, as finally approved by the

Archbishop, the President of the Free Church Council, Cardinal Bourne, and the others named above, was as follows:

The Crisis. Appeal from the Churches

After full conference with leaders of the Christian Churches in this country the Archbishop of Canterbury desires to make public the following expression of considered opinion:—

Representatives of the Christian Churches in England are convinced that a real settlement will only be achieved in a spirit of fellowship and co-operation for the common good, and not as a result of war. Realising that the longer the present struggle persists the greater will be the suffering and loss, they earnestly request that all the parties concerned in this dispute will agree to resume negotiations undeterred by obstacles which have been created by the events of the last few days. If it should seem to be incumbent on us to suggest a definite line of approach, we would submit, as the basis of a possible Concordat, a return to the status quo of Friday last. We cannot but believe in the possibility of a successful issue. Our proposal should be interpreted as involving simultaneously and concurrently—

(1) The cancellation on the part of the T.U.C. of the General Strike;
(2) Renewal by the Government of its offer of assistance to the Coal industry for a short definite period;
(3) The withdrawal on the part of the mine owners of the new wages scales recently issued.

7th May 1926.

All was thus ready for the Archbishop to broadcast the appeal that night. Suddenly, however, a message came from the B.B.C. that the permission was withdrawn. The Director-General, Mr. Reith, a personal friend of the Archbishop, rang up to say that, on reading over the words of the appeal, he felt that to broadcast it would 'run counter to his tacit arrangement with the Government about such things'. But on being challenged by the Archbishop, 'Then you have had a hint from Downing Street not to accept the Appeal for broadcast', Mr. Reith replied, 'No. Downing Street knows nothing about it. I am speaking entirely on my own responsibility.' He also assured the Archbishop that a letter which the Archbishop had just received from Lord Gainford, who happened to be a coal-owner and was Chairman of the B.B.C., objecting to certain crucial points in the Appeal, had nothing to do with the refusal.

The message, therefore, was not broadcast that night. The Archbishop, however, wrote the following letter next day to Mr. Reith:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to* J. C. W. REITH, ESQ.

8th May 1926.

I feel it my duty to write to you about what happened yesterday. I have no wish to raise difficulties, still less to make formal complaint, but I am honestly puzzled as to what the position is. It would have been quite unsuitable to discuss it yesterday on the telephone when you were communicating with me in the afternoon.

The position is that yesterday morning the authorities of the Churches in England, not sitting formally but carrying the imprimatur of the two Archbishops, several Bishops, the Leaders of the Free Churches, and all, in short, who could be got together to represent what may be called official Church opinion in this country, agreed upon a statement which they desired me to put forth in their names. Cardinal Bourne has expressed his full concurrence in it. It was fully believed, indeed rather taken for granted, that it would be possible for this to be done by a broadcast message from your headquarters, and I was willing to go myself and say it in order to give additional weight. You, or I suppose your Committee, decided, when you saw the words, that this could not be done, though you had up to that time welcomed my speaking at so grave an hour. You will see how serious a matter this is. It is impossible to tell what may be the further developments of the Strike problem. Are we to understand that if the Churches desire to put something forth their grave utterance must be subject to the approval of its wording by the Broadcasting Committee, and that without such approval we are confined, as we were yesterday, to utilising the scraps of publicity available by means of the few newspapers which have their limited circulation? I ask because it is impossible to foresee what may be the developments of the Strike question during the next week or fortnight, and I do not want to hold out erroneously such expectations as were entertained yesterday by the Church leaders throughout the country that a message which we wished to make public may, as yesterday happened, be declined by the Broadcasting Authorities. I am of course conscious of the difficulties which confront you in these matters and the great responsibility which rests upon the Broadcasting Committee for wise arrangements at such an hour. I am asking for elucidation of the situation for my own information and that of my friends to whom, of course, I have had to say that

the Broadcasting Authorities declined to let the Message of the Churches be made public yesterday through your Agency.

I purposely say nothing about any opinion entertained personally by the Prime Minister, or about the letter from Lord Gainford which reached me in the afternoon, as you have assured me that these had nothing to do with the decision to which you came.

A further point I ought to mention. You are, I know, arranging that my address to-morrow night in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields is to be broadcast. Am I to understand that in the view of your authorities I should be precluded from making any reference to the publication in to-day's papers of our Joint Message?

The whole matter is of such importance that I must know before speaking to-morrow how things stand. If you desire to see me I shall be at home between 2.30 and 4.30 to-day. This would give time to communicate with St. Martin's.

Pray understand that I write all this in the friendliest way and with a genuine desire to co-operate in all that is really right.

An interview followed the same afternoon:

At three o'clock on Saturday, May 8th, 1926, Mr J. C. W. Reith called to discuss the incident of the British Broadcasting Company in declining yesterday to let me give out from Savoy the Churches' Message. The matter has evidently distressed him terribly, and he certainly squirmed somewhat at what I said in my letter this morning about the Churches being refused a hearing at a great historic juncture. But he repeated again what he had frequently told me before about the great danger of the B.B C. being commandeered by the Government and made a mere Government agency.[1] He said that Birkenhead and Churchill were eager for this, but that Baldwin had resisted it because of his confidence in the power shown by Reith and his friends of managing the matter wisely. He thought that if the Churches' utterance of yesterday had been broadcast it would have accentuated the trouble and weakened Baldwin's hands in resisting his colleagues. It evidently distressed him greatly to say this and to have had to act as he had acted. The responsibility is his, not a Committee's, and Gainford had nothing whatever to do with it; nor had he heard anything from the Government. He quite saw the almost intolerableness of the position as I had sketched it—namely, that the Churches

[1] A clause in the Licence of the Company from the Postmaster-General made it lawful for the Postmaster-General to take possession of all broadcasting stations 'if and whenever in the opinion of the Postmaster-General an emergency shall have arisen in which it is expedient for the public service that His Majesty's Government shall have control over the transmission of messages by the licensed apparatus'. The Postmaster-General, May 1926, was Sir William Mitchell Thomson.

should be muzzled at a time when they ought to be speaking to the Nation, but he appeared to me to realise the difficulty of his own position. It would of course be easier for him to let the Government commandeer the B.B.C., but he thought it would be harmful in the public interest.

The importance of the refusal was accentuated by the fact that the B.B.C. was at that time the main, and often the only, source of news about public events all over England.

The Appeal was, however, printed in *The Times*, which managed to survive in a diminished form. But it was refused a place in the official journal—the *British Gazette*—edited by Mr. Winston Churchill from the *Morning Post* offices.

Once the text was out, an immense excitement was created. The excitement was increased when it became known that the Appeal had been suppressed by the B.B.C., and also by the *British Gazette*.

Messages and telegrams came pouring in to Lambeth, and there were many offers to circulate the message on the Archbishop's behalf; but the Archbishop refused to sponsor such circulation, being content to have spoken and let others distribute as they pleased. There were, as was inevitable, plenty of objections. Amongst those whom the Archbishop saw was Col. Lane Fox, the Minister of Mines (May 8):

His object was to point out that in his view the utterance to-day published on behalf of the Churches, suggesting simultaneous action on the part of the parties concerned, was harmful and might be gravely detrimental to the cause of peace. We were asking, he said, impossibilities and suggesting that the Government should weaken the declaration it had made that it was impossible to deal with the Unions until the ground had been cleared by the calling off of the Strike. The Government go that length in view of all that has been said and of all that they feel, and it would be very unfortunate if the Church were to insist as a bounden duty upon negotiations being attempted until the Strike was cleared away.

Col. Lane Fox was also fearful of what the Archbishop might say in his sermon to be broadcast from St. Martin's-in-the-Fields the next evening (Sunday):

But I reassured him quite definitely about to-morrow's Sermon to the effect that I should not think of trying in a Sermon to deal with

the economic question, even to the small extent that we tried to deal with it in our utterance. My object would be a spiritual one and an assurance that the Church was alive and awake to what is happening, and that its leaders were doing their best.

The sermon was preached to the immense invisible audience, and followed the lines just sketched.

On Monday more interviews followed with all sorts of people, politicians and others. That afternoon Mr. Lloyd George raised the question of the Appeal in the House of Commons, and commented strongly on the refusal of publication by the B.B.C. and the *British Gazette*. The intervention of the Archbishop beyond doubt had made a profound impression on all classes—not least because, as Mr. Lloyd George said in his speech, the Archbishop 'is known to be a very wise, a very cautious man, who certainly has never been guilty of any charge of impetuous interference in business not his own'. The impression made in the Labour world as a whole was astounding—for they felt themselves to be receiving sympathy and support from a quarter where (mistakenly enough) they had least expected it. But there were others who objected that the Archbishop's action was a grave embarrassment to the Government which, they said, it was the first duty of all citizens at such a juncture to support. In many circles the Archbishop's attitude was unfavourably compared with that of Cardinal Bourne, who on Sunday at High Mass in Westminster Cathedral issued a very decided pronouncement that the Strike was 'a sin against the obedience which we owe to God . . . and against the charity and brotherly love which are due to our brethren'. As a matter of fact, as we have seen, Cardinal Bourne had given his name (though the Archbishop never published it) to the Appeal for conciliation. The following encounter at Westminster with a Conservative M.P., Sir Joseph Nall, shows the strength of the feeling:

Nall was very angry with me for our message and thought with Major Kindersley, who was with him, that we had done great harm and that the Church would suffer discredit. They were very outspoken, but quite reasonable too. I showed them that they did not really understand what had passed and assured them that I was quite unrepentant about the message, believing it to have done good. They amused me by saying, 'What a contrast—your attitude and that of Bourne'. I asked, 'Are you aware that Bourne wholly

approved of all that we said and himself suggested some of the words we had inserted?' This staggered them and amazed them. I think they felt a little abashed.

Whatever may be urged about the duty of supporting the Government as such at all costs in the time of a General Strike, it must be remembered that there were two views of the nature of the strike, and as men held one or other they tended to be against or for conciliation. One party said that it was a revolution, an attack on the constitution. The other claimed that it was simply an industrial dispute. The latter was the claim of the Trades Union Council itself, which incidentally returned a cheque of many thousands of pounds to the All Russian Central Council of Trades Unions. But Mr. Baldwin met the claim by the remark that 'their method of helping the miners is to attack the community'. The Archbishop would not have differed from Mr. Baldwin in his view of the attack on the community. He had condemned it already in the House of Lords. But when Mr. Baldwin said, 'The general strike must be called off absolutely and without reserve. The mining industry dispute can then be settled', the Archbishop declared that the calling off of the strike must be 'simultaneous and concurrent' with steps for settling the mining dispute. The Archbishop did not want the issue to be one of 'victory' and 'defeat'—with the sore memories which it was bound to leave. He was conscious of mistakes on sides other than that of the miners and the Trades Union Congress, and wished to do what he could to help the Prime Minister 'to weld together again all the family thus disordered'. He went to see the Prime Minister:

Interview at 12 o'clock on Tuesday, 11th May 1926 at Downing Street with Mr. Baldwin whom I had asked to let me call.

I was afraid that he might be drifting into the same position as other people and regard me as hostile to him and his whole policy and as having raised an antagonistic flag which I was prepared to nail to the mast, and to regard him as stupidly hostile that he did not conform to what our Appeal on behalf of the Churches had said. I told him that was not my position and that we had very deliberately come to the conclusion we had formulated as a suggestion for the Government to consider, but that the responsibility must now be his as to whether or not they turn our suggestion down and go forward on what they believe to be a sounder and more excellent line. I pressed on him that the responsibility must be his and that we had definitely said our say. I showed him that

I appreciated his difficulties as well as my own. I found him perfectly friendly about it and appreciative of our difficulties and he repeated more than once that he thought I had done all that was possible for me to do in issuing that Appeal, and he told me what I had not before known, that it was to be broadcasted an hour later.

I took the opportunity of pressing a little upon him the distrust we have in the truculent and fighting attitude not of himself but of some of his colleagues. He did not in the least deny it and spoke of his difficulties as hourly very great. He took on the whole a rather more sanguine view of the situation from the Government point of view than I should be prepared to take at the present moment. We parted in the friendliest way.

Many factors contributed to the termination of the strike. Such were the speech of Sir John Simon, and the judgement of Mr. Justice Astbury, on the illegality of the action taken, in breach of contracts, by the strikers; the Government's meeting of the general situation, and the rallying of the public in unprecedented ways to its support; and the general good humour and common sense of the people. But there can be no doubt that the Archbishop's appeal wrought a real change in the atmosphere—and in particular had a very great influence on the attitude of the working classes.

On May 12, following unofficial but very important discussions between Sir Herbert Samuel and the General Council of the Trades Union Council, the General Strike was terminated by the Council. There were no conditions; but the Prime Minister immediately promised to do his best to bring about the resumption of the negotiations between miners and owners. Mr. Baldwin had prevailed; but in prevailing he begged that there might be no recriminations, and 'that the whole British people should not look backward but forward, and resume their work in a spirit of co-operation and goodwill'. The Archbishop wholeheartedly endorsed the Prime Minister's appeal, in a message made public the following day. He also wrote a personal letter to the Prime Minister, saying how much he had been impressed by the combination of firmness, persistent conciliatoriness, and solid practical counsel which he had shown; and expressing his sense 'of the value and strength—I would say the *Christian* spirit—of your leadership of the nation in a very difficult hour'. Mr. Baldwin replied:

The RT. HON. STANLEY BALDWIN, *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

23rd May 1926. 10 Downing Street, Whitehall, S.W. 1.

I cannot tell you how I value your most kind and generous letter.

We are not yet through these troublous times but such appreciation as yours is a great encouragement and will help me to face the future with serenity.

Thank you from my heart.

Among great numbers of other letters received by the Archbishop from M.P.s, Professors, Free Church leaders, Bishops, were the following:

SIR HENRY CRAIK *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

5A Dean's Yard, Westminster. 12 May 1926.

Few letters in my long life of 80 years have caused me more pain than this—addressed to one of my oldest friends, and to one who certainly came after none of my friends in the regard and reverence in which I have always held him. But Your Grace's last pronouncement has struck a grievous blow at that regard and reverence. You ask me to express my agreement with your pronouncement. Were I to do so, I would, in my judgement, commit not only an error, but a grievous crime.

By this post I have written to convey my deep admiration to Principal Martin of the U.F.C. for his courageous letter in the *Scotsman* of May 10th. You may imagine my feelings, in sending these two letters after all that I recall in the past.

PROFESSOR GILBERT MURRAY *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Yatscombe, Boar's Hill, Oxford. 20th May 1926.

May I, now that the crisis is over, send a line to thank you for the magnificent lead which you gave to the forces of peace throughout the Strike. As you know, many of us in Oxford helped you as best we could, but it was through your action that the whole movement had its authority and force.

I do not think I have ever known such a manifestation of the spirit of peace and goodwill rising through the whole nation and triumphantly asserting itself. And certainly the Church led the conscience of the country.

Please do not answer: you must be overwhelmed with letters.

The BISHOP OF DURHAM *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Auckland Castle, Bishop Auckland. June 9, 1926.

. . . Your Grace knows that I regard with great apprehension the present tendency to centralize government in the Church of England, a process which is tending to destroy the independence of the Diocesan Bishops and to reduce them to mere deputies of the Primate, a position which conflicts with the authority of episcopal office, with the traditions of the Church of England, and with the primary condition of sound administration. I certainly for one, can not, and will not accept such a position. In the particular instance of the General Strike, the normal difficulty was greatly increased by the gravity of the issue at stake. Your Grace knows how strongly I feel on the national character and responsibility of the Church of England. Surely that character and that responsibility did require at such a crisis as the General Strike created, a clear and imperative call to fundamental civic duty. What could be more unfortunate—I might almost say grotesque—than a procedure which made it possible for Cardinal Bourne to become the mouthpiece of national sentiment and civic duty—a role which belongs pre-eminently to the National Church, and therein conspicuously to the Primate. As to the practical mischiefs which have followed and will follow Your Grace's action, I have no doubt whatever. On this point of course, opinions will vary, and the value attached to them will vary. That the clear and vital issue which the General Strike presented, has been in many minds obscured, cannot, I think, be doubted, nor yet that a great impetus has been given to the tendency, already dangerously active, of many parochial clergymen—and they often the least equipped with knowledge or character—to substitute for religious teaching, a declamatory, sentimental socialism as far removed from sound economics as from Christian morality. . . .

I have been following closely during these weeks of compulsory inactivity, the course of events, and I should fasten upon the speeches of Mr. Baldwin and Lord Grey as beyond comparison the wisest and best worth consideration. It seems to me very unfortunate that the weight of the National Church should not be frankly placed behind statesmen (since God has been good enough to give them to us) whose utterances are both patriotic, and in the best sense, Christian. . . .

Your Grace will make allowance for the circumstances in which I write, and believe that amongst so many things which at this time perplex and sadden me, there is none which does so more than the inability under which I labour to applaud and support the

public course which Your Grace adopts. But you are as magnanimous as you are wise, and will compassionate my folly, while you condone my independence.

RT. HON. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD, M.P., *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Upper Frognal Lodge, Hampstead, N.W. 12th May 1926.

I am afraid you are having to suffer for the fine Christian stand you have taken, but will you give me the great pleasure of allowing me, as one who has striven from the beginning for peace . . . to thank you for what you have done and to assure you that it contributed greatly to the events of this day? You had the support of earnest minded Christians of all sects and of no sect, and I hope you have much consolation of soul to reward you.

On May 13, members of the Trades Union Council, including Mr. Ben Turner and Miss Margaret Bondfield, came to Lambeth to thank the Archbishop, and to plead with him to use his influence against victimization.

In spite of the calling off of the General Strike, the coal stoppage continued for nearly seven months. But the Archbishop took no further part in the dispute, except to make an announcement in the Church Assembly in July with regard to the attitude of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners—very large owners of mining royalties—as trustees for an immense number of poorer incumbents. He said that in the previous March the Estates Committee and the royalty owners as a body made it known to the Government that if the Government deemed it desirable in the interests of the whole country that the royalties should be acquired by the State, the Commissioners, together with other royalty owners, raised no objection to such a plan. Later in the summer a number of Bishops and Free Church leaders, led by the Bishop of Lichfield, took an active part in further negotiations with the miners, even going so far as to frame a Memorandum of Terms which, though accepted by the Miners' Executive and a Delegates' Conference, was rejected by the Prime Minister, and on August 11 by the miners themselves on a ballot vote by districts. The Archbishop was kept informed of the progress of the proceedings, but took no part in them himself. Indeed, he was not specially pleased that the Bishops should engage in the detailed work of finding a precise economic solution. He stood up strenuously—as

he wrote to the Bishop of Lichfield on August 9—for the duty of Church officers as such to be prominent on the side of conciliation and peacemaking. But he said:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* BISHOP OF LICHFIELD

August 9, 1926.

What I dread, and I find that others dread (notably dear old Bishop Talbot, who has always been on the Liberal side), is that in a short time we shall find it stated that the arrayed forces consist of the Church plus the Miners on the one side and the Government on the other side—a hopelessly unreasonable statement, but one which is certain to be made. If you can devise modes of preventing this the gain will be great. I am not in the least afraid of opposing a Government when I am certain of my own ground and that they are wrong, but if the forces were rallied into the opposite camps I have described I should feel it difficult to say where my allegiance lay.

CHAPTER LXXXI

THE ARCHBISHOP AND BISHOP BARNES

. Then said the cardinal to them, 'Is this Dr. Barnes your man that is accused of heresy?' 'Yea, and please your grace; and we trust you shall find him reformable, for he is both well learned and wise.' 'What! master doctor,' said the cardinal; 'had you not a sufficient scope in the Scriptures to teach the people?' . . . And Barnes answered, 'I spake nothing but the truth out of the Scriptures, according to my conscience, and according to the old doctors.' And then did Barnes deliver him six sheets of paper written, to confirm and corroborate his sayings. The cardinal received them smiling on him, and saying, 'We perceive then that you intend to stand to your articles and to shew your learning.' 'Yea,' said Barnes, 'that I do intend, by God's grace, with your lordship's favour.'

JOHN FOXE, *Acts and Monuments*, vol. v, pp. 416 ff.

ON Thursday morning, October 20, 1927, the public was startled by reading in the Press an open letter from the Bishop of Birmingham to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The purpose of the letter (so the Bishop told the Primate) was to give vent to certain reflections upon an interruption to the service in St. Paul's Cathedral on the previous Sunday, when the Bishop was preaching. It was a curious way for a Suffragan to address his Metropolitan, but it had the great advantage, from the writer's point of view, of securing the widest possible public for his views. Moreover, the succession of utterances of which it formed the centre were peculiarly embarrassing not only to the Archbishop but to all those responsible authorities in the Church who desired to see the last stages of Prayer Book Revision happily fulfilled. It can hardly be doubted that the Bishop's action at this juncture, whatever its intention, had the effect of heightening the fears of Low and Broad Churchmen and generally strengthening the adversaries of the Revised Prayer Book.

The Bishop of Birmingham had long been known as a militant liberal Churchman. He was a mathematician and a scientist, and an outspoken champion of the evolutionary view of the origin of man; and he claimed a freedom to remodel Christian theology on that basis. He was also a most decided opponent of distinctively Anglo-Catholic teaching about the Sacraments; and his opposition to certain important proposals with regard to the revision of the Order of Holy Communion was widely known.

On Sunday, September 25, 1927, preaching in Westminster Abbey, he made a vigorous pronouncement on the first of these points. Taking as his text the recent Presidential Address to the British Association by Sir Arthur Keith, he proclaimed in trenchant terms the necessity of accepting the biological doctrine of evolution. He accepted the evolution of man, 'possibly a million years ago from a tangle of apes', and greeted the gorilla as man's first cousin. He added that the Darwinian discovery and its triumph had destroyed the whole theological scheme, dependent on the story of the creation of Adam and Eve and their fall. The sermon aroused a good deal of attention, mainly, it must be supposed, from the vigour of the style in which the Bishop's thoughts were expressed, as well as the pungency of his references to Christians (unlike himself) obsessed by 'traditional theology'—for the thoughts were by no means new or unfamiliar in themselves. A fortnight later (October 6), at a lunch-hour service at Birmingham, he delivered an address on Sacramental Teaching. In language which was bound to cause offence, he derided the doctrine of the Real Presence. He said that there were men and women to-day whose sacramental beliefs were not far from those of the cultured Hindu idolater. 'They pretend that a Priest using the right words and acts can change a piece of bread so that within it there is the real presence of Christ. The idea is absurd and can be disproved by experiment.' He also, in the spirit of the most naïve materialism, expressed his readiness to believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation, 'when I can find a person who will come to the Chapel of my house and tell me correctly whether a piece of bread which I present to him has undergone the change for which believers in transubstantiation contend'. This address was bitterly resented by multitudes of Churchmen. On Sunday, October 16, as Dr. Barnes was preparing to preach in St. Paul's Cathedral, a leading Anglo-Catholic incumbent of the London diocese, Canon Bullock-Webster, appeared with a large body of laymen and made a public protest against his false and heretical teaching about the Sacraments of the Holy Catholic Church. He appealed to the Bishop of London to inhibit the Bishop of Birmingham, and to the Archbishop of the Province to try him. After making his protest, Canon Bullock-Webster celebrated what he called a 'Reparation Mass' in the Church of St. Michael Royal, hard by.

Such was the painful scene—the 'interruption in the service'—and such were the causes which led the Bishop of Birmingham to address his Open Letter to the Archbishop.

In the letter, the Bishop referred to his experience as Master of the Temple—and the 'wistful agnosticism' of his congregation, 'probably the most intellectual in England'. He told of his wide reading and plain speech—his teaching 'positive and unreported', and referred to a sermon, preached when the British Association met at Cardiff in 1920, which 'travelled round the world and brought me over a thousand letters'. This was in comment on his statement that 'one cause of weakness of the Church has arisen from the apparent determination of religious teachers to ignore scientific discovery, though all competent biologists accept man's evolution from an ape-like stock'. He then went on to declare that 'the second main reason for the present alienation of educated men and women from the Church of England is the growth of erroneous sacramental doctrines during and since the War'. He maintained that he was upholding the traditional sacramental doctrine of the Church of England, while his critics held to the sacramental errors which that Church repudiated. He reaffirmed his statement that the doctrine of transubstantiation was untrue, referred again to the impossibility of discriminating by spiritual discernment between consecrated and unconsecrated bread, and after declaring 'No man shall drive me to Tennessee or to Rome', ended thus:

The BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

> I invite Your Grace to consider what steps can be taken to help those of us who are giving of our best to fit the Church to be in the future the spiritual guide of an educated nation. This letter, of course, calls for no public reply.

The Archbishop saw the letter for the first time in the Press, though a telegram from the Bishop had warned him that a letter was coming. In spite of the fact that it had not called for a public reply, His Grace sent an immediate answer to the Bishop of Birmingham. It was very courteous, it showed a real sense of humour and dignity, but it was of a kind (said a writer at the time) to give Dr. Barnes very small and cold comfort. It was as follows:

The Archbishop of Canterbury *to the* Bishop of Birmingham

Lambeth Palace, S.E. 22nd October 1927.

I have read with great care your open letter to myself published two days ago. You will not doubt my condemnation of the unseemly incident in St. Paul's Cathedral which you have taken as an occasion for writing to me. Not by action of that sort can the cause of truth be reasonably set forward.

But, speaking generally, I think that you mistake what it is that has evoked from cultured men, with scientific and philosophical as well as theological knowledge, vehement reprobation of some of your recent utterances. With regard to these I have probably received, publicly or privately, more communications than any one except yourself.

I do not attach great weight to the denunciations of what I have heard described as 'the gorilla sermons'. I believe that you overrate the adherence of thoughtful people to Creation theories of fifty to a hundred years ago, and I scarcely think that among those who listen to you there are a great number who hold the opinions which you satirize. For myself, at least, I can say that your position on the biological question, in outline and so far as I understand it, is one with which I personally have been familiar for more than fifty years. Believe me, this teaching, however admirable, is to most of us not novel, and I do not think that those who hear you on the subject with interest and advantage would recognise themselves as 'wistful agnostics'. As far as I can judge, it is not on what you have said with regard to that branch of science or theology that the attention of thoughtful men has been centred. It is too familiar. You may, I am certain, dismiss, my dear Bishop, the fear that anyone in England desires to lead or drive you either to Rome or to Tennessee.

The words which give rise to the sort of indignation I refer to are the words which you use in dealing with the Sacrament of Holy Communion. It is on what you have said respecting Sacramental doctrine that intelligent and large-minded Churchmen, lay as well as clerical, have approached me day by day.

I have an intense dislike to the use of the daily Press for the discussion of such subjects. I purposely refrain from trying in such a letter as this to discuss the profound and life-giving doctrines involved, but, of course, I am more than ready to go into the matter with yourself at any time should you so desire. But your open letter forces me, however reluctantly, to some reply. Formally and publicly you invite me 'to consider what steps can be taken to

help those of us who are giving of our best to fit the Church to be in the future the spiritual guide of an educated nation'. That is a large and difficult matter, needing time and care, but I can say at once that in my judgment one of the first steps is to secure the scrupulous use of the most careful language possible in dealing with doctrinal matters of deep solemnity which affect the devotional thoughts and prayers of Christian people. That duty, obligatory upon every Christian teacher, is peculiarly incumbent upon us Bishops, who have to weigh the effect of our words upon all sections of the great body to whom we desire to be Fathers in God. We promised on our consecration day 'to be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word', and while, as you have truly said, 'smooth unctuous platitudes' are not enough, yet in all the range of our duties there is none which calls more clearly for the exercise of tender and fatherly carefulness in word and act.

Now in your open letter to myself you assure me that what you have been lately doing, and have been denounced for doing, is as 'a Bishop of the Church of England' to 'uphold its traditional Sacramental doctrine' and to 'affirm'—as we all affirm—that 'the doctrine of Transubstantiation is untrue'. Do not suppose me to be unmindful of our duty to stem whatever trend there is that way. The duty is clear. But when I turn to the Birmingham sermon which aroused criticism I find that the statement you make to me fails to describe fairly what you there said. In your natural and legitimate desire to denounce the few in the Church of England who hold or teach the doctrine of Transubstantiation you were led to speak of the Sacrament of Holy Communion in a way which—quite reasonably as I think—gives real offence to the great body of devout Churchmen and Churchwomen, and not least to those who are able to give scholarly as well as reverent consideration to the Sacramental doctrines which our Church upholds.

I do not believe that you had any intention of wounding the souls of honest and faithful English Churchmen, but you ignore or belittle the position and teaching of those within our Church who stand in the tradition of such English Bishops as Andrewes or Ken or Wilson or, in our own day, Edward King or Charles Gore. Nay, more. Your words seem to me capable of being so interpreted as to include in reprobation or almost in contempt the position of the great mass of Churchmen who would associate themselves with the teaching of such leaders as, say, my own great masters Bishop Lightfoot or Bishop Westcott, or who have caught the devotional spirit of the hymns of Charles Wesley.

I prefer to think that if you re-read your Birmingham sermon in

the light of such criticism as your letter has drawn from me, you will feel that what I have said is not unfair.

You say in your letter that your teaching is 'positive and unreported'. Your Birmingham sermon, however, contains some such positive teaching. And as I read your words about the grace of Our Saviour's presence through the whole act of worship they leave me wondering whether, if you were to consider what are their implications, you would not find further cause to modify the width and scope of your negative and destructive statements.

We have all been impressed in these recent months by the self-restraint and the considerateness for others shown by many of the clergy and laity who have been foremost in our Prayer Book discussions. To the larger tasks which lie beyond these discussions we Bishops must lead the way. But we shall lead only if we walk 'with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, . . . giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace'.

The Bishop of Birmingham was unrepentant. He wrote another Open Letter on October 26, but he added little to what he had already said. The main part of his letter dealt again with errors of sacramental doctrine. He still spoke of his desire for 'experimental tests to be reverently carried out in a suitable place, which would show that no man, in his spiritual capacity, can distinguish consecrated from unconsecrated bread'. He emphasized his conviction that 'most of the irregularities which have crept into our Churches in recent years' had followed from these erroneous sacramental beliefs. The Archbishop gave no further public answer. The correspondence closed. But the controversy had added to the embarrassment attending the Church's spokesmen in defending the Revised Prayer Book in Parliament.

CHAPTER LXXXII

THE PRAYER BOOK

I will not dispute it here, what power a lay assembly (and such a Parliament is) hath to determine matters of religion, primely and originally by and of themselves, before the Church hath first agreed upon them. Then indeed they may confirm or refuse. And this course was held in the Reformation.

ARCHBISHOP LAUD, *Answer . . . to the Speech of Lord Saye and Sele, touching the Liturgy.*

It must be own'd, that this Bill hath met with very hard Fortune, and yet that doth not in the least diminish the value of it. MARQUESS OF HALIFAX, *Some Cautions offered to the consideration of those who are to chuse Members to serve for the ensuing Parliament.*

I

THE first public act of the Archbishop at Lambeth, after his enthronement, in 1903 had been to receive a deputation of over 100 Unionist M.P.s on ecclesiastical disorders. They came to him then in order to urge effective action against 'ritualism' in the Church of England. He agreed that 'the sands had run out', and that 'stern and drastic action' was required in the case of those men—very few—who were guilty of flagrant and definite illegality and disobedience. The result of the deputation, and of the contemporary agitation in the House of Commons, was the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, with its recommendations that Letters of Business should be issued to the Convocations for rubrical reform and for modification in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service—'with a view to their enactment by Parliament'.

It was the Archbishop's fate, twenty-five years later, at the end of his primacy, to witness the refusal of Parliament to enact the very measures which had been so long and carefully planned as a result of the Royal Commission. But before we describe the final scenes of the drama in the House of Commons in 1927 and 1928, we must go back to the closing stages of Prayer Book Revision in the Convocations.

Before the War, the general policy followed by the Bishops had been to confine the revision of the rubrics to comparatively small dimensions. The critical question then was that of Eucharistic vestments, and by 1914 there seemed fair reason to believe that

a way to answer it could be found. Besides this, there were the use of the *Quicunque Vult*, a few modifications in the occasional services, some cautious recognition of reservation 'for the sick person', a few not very important adjustments in the order of Holy Communion (involving no change of structure, or alteration in the Prayer of Consecration), and a measure of general enrichment.

With the War, however, there came a considerable change. The Eucharist became more and more prominent in the worship of Churchmen, and so more and more prominent in public discussions on the Prayer Book. The debate on Reservation in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation in 1917 (already described) marked a significant stage.[1] The debate in the same place in February 1918, accepting the proposals of the Lower House for an alteration of the central part of the Communion Service (refused in April 1915), was also significant. It was then that the question of an Alternative Order of Holy Communion first took a definite place in the Bishops' proposals for Prayer Book Revision. By October 1918, agreement on all matters except this had been practically secured, with the help of representatives of both Convocations; and the Archbishops were asked to call a special conference to deal with this single issue. Before the conference could meet, a Memorial was presented to their Graces, signed by nine Bishops[2]—six of them in the Northern Province—3,000 clergy, and 100,000 laymen, to protest against any such changes in the Communion Service. The Conference, however, produced an agreed solution, proposed by the Evangelical Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Drury) and the Anglo-Catholic Dr. Frere. It included an invocation of the Holy Spirit.[3] It was accepted by Canterbury Convocation

[1] See p. 811.

[2] Durham (Dr. Moule), Chester (Dr. Jayne), Liverpool (Dr. Chavasse), Manchester (Dr. Knox), Carlisle (Dr. Diggle), Sodor and Man (Dr. Denton Thompson), Llandaff (Dr. Edwards), Bath and Wells (Dr. Kennion), Chelmsford (Dr. Watts-Ditchfield).

[3] 'I.—That the Prayer of Humble Access be moved so as to follow immediately after the Comfortable Words.

'II.—That in the Prayer of Consecration the following words be added after the Words of Institution:—

'"Wherefore, O Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance before thee the precious death of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, looking also for his coming again, do render unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us. And we pray thee of thine almighty goodness to send upon us and

on February 11, 1920—when the Archbishop thus defined his own position, a position which he consistently maintained to the end:

> Speaking as to my own personal inclination, I should prefer to have no alternative Service at all, but I am loyally prepared to abide by the outcome of the Conference and to commend to the Church the acceptance of the proposal.

It was rejected by York Convocation, where the Bishops who had signed the Memorial had a clear majority in the Upper House.

With this single exception, both Convocations concurred with the rest of the Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer. And on April 29, 1920, both Archbishops and Prolocutors signed their Answer to the Royal Letters of Business with the Appended Schedules; the Schedules from Canterbury Convocation being set out as follows:

1. Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer as approved by the Convocation of Canterbury. April, 1920.
2. Table of Lessons, as approved by the Convocation of Canterbury. April, 1920.
3. The Prayer Book Psalter revised,[1] as approved by the Convocation of Canterbury. April, 1920.
4. The Athanasian Creed in a Revised Translation,[2] as approved by the Convocation of Canterbury. April, 1920.

> upon these thy gifts thy holy and blessed Spirit, who is the Sanctifier and the Giver of life, to whom with thee and thy Son Jesus Christ be ascribed by every creature in earth and heaven all blessing, honour, glory, and power, now henceforth and for evermore. *Amen*"

'III.—That the Lord's Prayer be placed after the Prayer of Consecration, prefaced by the words:—

> '"As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say, *Then shall the people join with the Priest, and say,* Our Father . . for ever and ever. Amen."

'IV.—That the Prayer of Oblation be not moved from its present position; that the rubric before it shall read, *Then shall be said one or both of the following,* and that the present rubric before the Thanksgiving be omitted'

[1] This was the Prayer Book Psalter revised in accordance with the proposals of a Committee appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury together with Amendments made by Convocation of Canterbury. The Committee was presided over by Bishop Jayne of Chester and reported in 1916 (S.P.C.K.).

[2] This was a translation made by a Committee, appointed by the Archbishop in 1909 (Chairman, Bishop John Wordsworth) at the request of the Lambeth Conference of 1908, and revised in 1917 under the Chairmanship of Bishop Robertson (S.P.C.K.).

The Archbishop officially communicated the Answer to the Home Secretary, who replied:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. EDWARD SHORTT

Lambeth Palace, S.E.1. 22nd May 1920.

It is my duty to transmit to you, as I do herewith, for submission to His Majesty the King, the Answer of the Convocation of Canterbury to the Royal Letters of Business on the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, to which our attention was directed in His Majesty's Royal Letter of Business.

Should legal effect be hereafter given to the recommendations we have made, I presume that the process followed would be that which is laid down in the recent Act of Parliament respecting Ecclesiastical legislation.

The RT. HON. EDWARD SHORTT *to the* ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

Home Office, Whitehall, S.W. 6th July, 1920.

I have the honour to inform Your Grace that I have laid before His Majesty the answers of the Convocations of Canterbury and York to the Royal Letters of Business on the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.

I agree with Your Grace that for the purpose of giving legal effect to the recommendations of the two Convocations the procedure to be followed should be that laid down by the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919, and I would suggest that steps should be taken by Your Grace to bring the proposals before the National Assembly of the Church of England.

II

It will be seen that procedure by means of the new Church Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919, was taken as a matter of course. This was natural because the Letters of Business had been originally issued, according to the Recommendations of the Royal Commission, 'with a view to enactment by Parliament'; and the Archbishop had expressly stated in the House of Lords, in the debate on the Enabling Act, that the revision of the Prayer Book would fall under its provisions. Moreover, the Church Assembly also contains its House of Laity, which was bound to be consulted, as the Archbishop had promised from the start. It was perhaps hardly expected, after the exhaustive deliberations in the Convocations—lasting fourteen years (1906–20) that the Church

Assembly would want to spend a further prolonged period on the same business. Even in 1918 Bishop Gore said 'the delay of our revision . . . is becoming a universal jest!' But so it was. The Church Assembly met for the first time for a brief two days in the summer of 1920—yet in the autumn (to quote Lord Hugh Cecil), with the zest and self-confidence of extreme youth, it appointed a committee of all three Houses to consider and report upon the Answers of the Convocations to the Royal Letters of Business. In June 1922 the Committee presented its Report, adopting the greater number of the Convocations' proposals substantially unchanged. But a warning note was struck with regard both to the Order of Holy Communion and to Reservation. Of the ten lay members on the Joint Committee, one, Mr. Athelstan Riley, an Anglo-Catholic, presented a Minority Report of his own dealing especially with the alternative Eucharistic Office, and five others, all Evangelical, printed a Note of objection to the proposals for Reservation. In October 1922, the House of Bishops introduced the Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure (N.A. 84) into the Assembly, simply attaching a Measure to the Committee's Proposals unaltered. General Approval was given in all three Houses, sitting separately, in January and April 1923, with three dissentients in the House of Bishops—Bristol (Dr. Nickson), Norwich (Dr. Pollock), and Worcester (Dr. Pearce); and for the next two years the Houses of Clergy and Laity, sitting separately, went steadily through the stage of Revision.

Had the members of the Assembly been left to deliberate on the proposals of Convocation by themselves, their task would have been comparatively simple. But from the moment when the Report of the Prayer Book Revision Committee (N.A. 60) was published in the summer of 1922, a torrent of rival proposals poured in from right and centre and left. The most valuable productions were severally known as the Green Book, the Grey Book, and the Orange Book. The first of these was a very thorough Anglo-Catholic presentation of a series of amendments by a Committee of the English Church Union; the second a series of alternative services and prayers, from a liberal point of view, with a preface by the Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Temple); the third consisted of scholarly pamphlets of a moderate English Catholic type, produced by the Alcuin Club. In addition to this, the floodgates of criticism, comment, and protest were already

opening. On October 20, 1925, when the House of Bishops began its own task of revision, the Archbishop stated that he had received 800 different memorials, most of them dealing with the Order of Holy Communion: including an important document from Cambridge University, praying for no change in that service; another organized by Bishop Knox and numbering 308,000 signatures, to a similar effect; and, not least important, a statement signed by nine diocesan Bishops[1] (June 13, 1925) that they were 'definitely opposed at the present time to any change being made in the Order of Administration of Holy Communion after the Creed, or to any alternative form of service'.

The revision stage began in October 1925, with a sitting in public, very much against the Archbishop's wish. But from January 1926 to the conclusion in 1927, the House of Bishops met privately at Lambeth Palace, where the drawing-room was transformed and placed at their disposal. The idea of Lambeth Palace being the meeting-place had been due to Mrs. Davidson, and beyond doubt made a very great difference to the harmony of the proceedings, with many Bishops staying in the house, and all meeting at meals:

> It not only softens asperities, but it gives opportunities for consultation and practical talk which, though only side dishes, contribute a great deal to the central fare. (Feb. 13, 1927.)

During the sessions (between forty and fifty full days) the Bishops not only went through the amendments of the other two Houses, but also made such a substantial remodelling that the result not unfairly produced the impression that they were addressing themselves to the improvement of the Prayer Book for the first time. From the start the Bishops of Norwich, Birmingham, and Worcester were seen to be in opposition.

It was proposed at the outset (October 1925) that the Revision should be effected in two stages, leaving all that concerned the Holy Communion until the rest of the Prayer Book had been revised. But this proposal was defeated by 24 votes to 9. The main differences throughout were with regard to the Order of Holy Communion and Reservation. In the former service the

[1] Norwich (Dr. Pollock), Sodor and Man (Dr. Thornton-Duesbery), Exeter (Lord W. Cecil), Worcester (Dr. Pearce), Birmingham (Dr. Barnes), Gloucester (Dr. Headlam), St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich (Dr. Whittingham), Bradford (Dr. Perowne), and Bristol (Dr. Nickson). None of these had signed the previous Nine Bishops' Memorial of 1919—all of whom had vacated their sees.

movement for an alternative order had steadily grown. The House of Clergy desired it—and the House of Laity were prepared to acquiesce if the Bishops said it would 'promote peace and order in the Church'. The real reason behind the desire for an alternative order was dissatisfaction with the abrupt close of the Prayer of Consecration in the Book of Common Prayer, which ends with the words of institution, and a desire to revert to the older form, as seen in the Prayer Book of 1549, where the Prayer of Consecration included (1) the prayer for the Church, (2) the present prayer of consecration, with some variation, including an invocation of the Holy Spirit, (3) the memorial and oblation. It was argued by some of those who advocated in particular the introduction of an invocation of the Holy Spirit (*epiklesis*) that this would help in guarding against a tendency to lay all the weight of consecration on the actual words of institution. Some, again, maintained that once an Anglican Canon thus enlarged was permitted, the use of the Roman Canon, secretly or otherwise, could be brought to an end. One Bishop, at least, Dr. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, who had signed the Memorial against an Alternative Canon, changed his mind during the meetings of the House of Bishops. In view of the fact that in other parts of the Christian Church alternative forms were permitted, like the Liturgy of St. Basil and the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in the Orthodox Church, he expressed his willingness to recognize the use of two Communion Offices side by side in the Church of England. The proposal for an alternative Canon was approved in June 1926 by 29 votes to 5.

What was the Archbishop's own attitude? Throughout the sessions of the House of Bishops his role was the role of chairman. Looking through the verbatim report, we hardly find a single occasion on which he gave a decided lead on a critical issue. The truth is that he was not really sufficiently interested; he took a lay point of view. His sympathies were on the whole with the moderate layman, and he did not understand the imaginative or romantic or perhaps even the sacramental side of the Anglo-Catholic party. To him it was a question, in the good sense of the word, of expediency:

January, 1926.

I have found it very difficult to know what, speaking generally, ought to be my own line in regard to proposals for changing the

Communion Office. On the one hand my own instinct would have been for leaving that Office alone and adhering to what has satisfied English people for more than three centuries. And I am certain that such is the view of the overwhelming majority of English Churchmen throughout the country. The average M.P. or County Councillor, or local squire, or man of business, says emphatically, 'let it alone'. Ought it to be one's policy to fall in with that wish or give leadership in that direction, and practically refuse what the ecclesiastically minded folk want in the way of change or reform or reversion to older usage? The answer is not easy. These people who have given their thoughts to the structure of a service which to many of them means more than anything else on earth, have been working for years at trying to bring about the sort of changes which they think would make our Office more Catholic without impairing its really English character. The majority of Churchmen want no change. But the people who do want the change are the people who have studied the subject and care about it most. Their views are for the most part not my views, but they are entitled to respect, and some people believe that by yielding in a reasonable degree to the wishes those folk express, we should allay present disorder and unruliness and that they would accept half the loaf they are eager for, rather than go on as things are, and that accepting it they would be peaceable. I am by no means sure that this is the case, but on the whole it seems certain that some experiment in that direction must be made, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I feel that it could honestly be made without impairing our Anglican orthodoxy at all. But such is not the view of the majority of the Protestants, who, under the leadership of Bishop Knox, or again of milder folk like Canon Storr, may so frighten the public mind as to make the peaceable carrying of a reforming measure impossible.

In the end, in June 1926, he agreed to an alternative canon, though unable to disguise from his brother Bishops, when the final form[1] was presented, that he found it 'very difficult to attach

[1] The final form of the Prayer of Consecration, as approved by the House of Bishops, differed from that of 1662 in the following way. The opening words were 'All glory be to thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy. . . .' Then came the rest of the Prayer of 1662 unchanged. Immediately afterwards there followed (1) a Memorial, and (2) an Invocation of the Holy Spirit, thus:

'Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death and passion of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, according to his holy institution, do celebrate, and set forth before thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts, the memorial

the importance that some attach to questions like the order of the paragraphs in a long prayer'—more particularly at the very time when, as he noted in his Papers, 'the outstanding thing dominating all else' was 'the strike—first general, then coalfields'.

With regard to Reservation, this was a practice, as we have already seen,[1] which had grown in a very remarkable way as a result of the War. It was 'An Alternative Order for the Communion of the Sick'. According to this Order, the consecrated bread and wine were set apart at the open communion in church and reserved only for the communion of the sick. This method of communicating the sick person in his own home was recognized in the Prayer Book of 1549, but did not appear in the Prayer Book of 1662. Its reintroduction after a long interval, in which it had been unknown, had been condemned in the Court of Arches as unlawful:[2] and Archbishops Temple and Maclagan had both given opinions from Lambeth in 1900 condemning its use in the Church of England. It was, however, lawful in the Scottish Episcopal Church, in the Province of South Africa, and in other branches of the Anglican Communion. Its danger was supposed to be a danger of superstitious use. The problem before the Bishops was how to regulate the Reservation of the consecrated elements in such a way as to rule out anything in the nature of corporate devotions in connexion with the Reserved Sacrament: in other words how to distinguish sharply in practice between Reservation for Communion and Reservation for adoration. They decided that the distinction could be made by means of Rubrics prescribing the purpose, and of Rules settling the method, of Reservation; and that this distinction, which was easy to make when Reservation was intended for certain known persons (for it ceased when they

which he hath willed us to make, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us.

'Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul.'

The Prayer ended with the words of the Prayer of Oblation of 1662, but commencing, 'And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness', and ending, 'world without end', then '*Amen*', followed by the Lord's Prayer said by the Priest and people together. After the Communion of the Priest and people, the Prayer of Thanksgiving of 1662 came with these prefatory words: 'Having now by faith received the precious Body and Blood of Christ, let us give thanks unto our Lord God.'

[1] See p. 806. [2] *Bishop of Oxford* v. *Henly*, [1907] P. 88, [1909] P. 319.

had received the Sacrament), could also be made when Reservation was continuous (in order to secure that 'any sick person' may not lack the benefit of the Sacrament), but in that case it must be definitely with the permission and under the control of the Bishop. Further 'there shall be no service or ceremony in connexion with the Sacrament so reserved, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be consumed in Communion, or otherwise reverently consumed'. It was this continuous Reservation which became the heart of the difficulty: for the opponents of the Bishops maintained that with continuous Reservation 'superstitious uses' were inevitable.

The proposal for Continuous Reservation was approved by the House of Bishops in June 1926. The first Rubric (approved with one dissentient) dealt with Reservation at a particular celebration for a particular sick person on the same day. The second and third Rubrics are as follows:

> If further provision be needed in order to secure that any sick person may not lack the benefit of the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, the Priest, if licensed by the Bishop so to do, may, to that end, when the Holy Communion is celebrated in the church, reserve so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as is needed for the purpose. And the Bishop shall grant such licence if satisfied of the need, unless in any particular case he see good reason to the contrary.
>
> The consecrated Bread and Wine set apart under either of the two preceding rubricks shall be reserved only for the Communion of the Sick, shall be administered in both kinds, and shall be used for no other purpose whatever. There shall be no service or ceremony in connexion with the Sacrament so reserved, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion, or otherwise reverently consumed. All other questions that may arise concerning such Reservation shall be determined by rules, framed by the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province, or by Canons lawfully made by the Convocation of the Province, and subject to any such rules and Canons, by the directions of the Bishop.

The second Rubric was approved by 19 votes to 11; the third Rubric by 25 votes to 6.

The Rules referred to in the second of the above Rubrics required that the consecrated Bread and Wine should be reserved 'in an Aumbry set in the North Wall of the Sanctuary or of the

Chapel; or, if need be, shall be reserved in some other place approved by the Bishop'.

On February 7, 1927, a Draft Book was presented to the Convocations, with speeches from both Archbishops. The main work was done, but, in view of the large number of amendments introduced, it was felt desirable to give the Lower Houses the opportunity of making their own comments and suggestions before the Revised Prayer Book was submitted to the Church Assembly in its final form. The Archbishop records his impression of the situation and of the propaganda in the press a few days later (February 13) in revealing sentences:

> I intensely dislike the wretchedness of getting these things (some of them too sacred, and some of them too petty, for public discussion) bandied about as though they were the things which absorbed the Church's interest, as, indeed, for the moment they do absorb clerical interest to the detriment of wider things. In my heart I cannot honestly say that I very greatly long for any of the changes, or that they are of supreme deep-down importance. I cannot get myself to feel warmly about such things as order of the Canon, or the Saints' days' Collects, or other matters and I have to admit that with regard to Reservation my line of action is based upon the conviction that in the present unsettled conditions in London and some other places, the only chance of peace is by allowing some degree of Reservation-liberty, guarding it scrupulously against abuses.

The Lower House met on February 22, 1927, and made a number of proposals. After further revision in the House of Bishops the final form was presented to the Convocations, March 29 and 30, and by them commended to the Church Assembly by large majorities.[1]

Meantime, the champions of the revised Prayer Book and its adversaries marshalled their forces. The extremists of both parties in the Church were against it. The extreme Protestants were opposed to Reservation and to any Alternative Order of Holy Communion. The extreme Anglo-Catholics were opposed to the

[1]

	For	*Against*
Canterbury Upper House	21	4
,, Lower House	168	22
York Upper House	unanimous	
,, Lower House	68	10

(March 29–30, 1927.)

limitations attached to Reservation, involving permission from the Bishop for continuous Reservation as well as the prohibition of corporate devotions; and to the form of the Alternative Canon—in particular the inclusion of an Invocation of the Holy Spirit in the Prayer of Consecration which (they averred) belonged to the Eastern liturgies and was a sudden reversal of 'the tradition of the English Church since its beginning 1400 years ago'.

In addition, the Protestants, led by Sir William Joynson Hicks, then Home Secretary, wished to have a positive assurance from the Archbishop as to how the Bishops would treat clergy who still disobeyed, supposing the new Prayer Book became lawful. On February 24, 1927, Joynson Hicks asked the Archbishop a number of questions and reminded him of a Memorial signed by 1,000 Anglo-Catholic clergy in 1917 refusing to obey any Regulation which forbade adoration. The Archbishop saw Joynson Hicks on March 7, but obviously took too sanguine a view of the conversation. He replied as follows:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. SIR W. JOYNSON HICKS

12th March 1927.

I must ask your pardon for a little delay on my part in fulfilling the promise I made in our recent interview that I would write to you a reply to your letter of February 24th. In that letter you ask, as you say, for further light upon certain points.

(1) You are anxious to know 'what steps the Bishops propose to take in order to secure obedience to the provisions expressed or implied in the issue of the new Book'. I am not surprised that this question should be asked, as it constantly is asked at present, in connexion with the new proposals. But I think you agree with me that the subject of how best to promote clerical discipline is a different one from the providing of Rubrics as to the conduct of Divine Service, and you have told me emphatically that you are not in favour of the institution of prosecutions where it can possibly be avoided. I can assure you that it is the earnest hope of myself and other Bishops that when the new provisions are in operation we may be able to secure much more effectively a reasonable adherence within the enlarged limits to the directions of the Church in regard to the conduct of Divine Service. I had the advantage of discussing this with you and I will not expand upon it now, for I think we are fairly in agreement about it. Our hope and belief are that if we can carry successfully some new

scheme like that which is under consideration for the improvement of our Ecclesiastical Courts with general consent, all disciplinary questions will be more happily and harmoniously handled.

(2) You next ask 'To what extent is the Composite Book to be regarded as a final settlement of the matter?' 'Finality' is of course an impossible and even a wrong thing to promise in the life of a living Church. You are thinking I suppose of a relative 'finality' and so far as I personally am concerned I am quite ready to say that if the provisions of the present Measure and the Book appended to it become law I should not anticipate any re-opening of the matter at any early period in our future history.

(3) You next ask 'To what extent is the new book to be understood as excluding unauthorised teaching and practice now prevalent and not authorised by the new book, though not explicitly condemned by it?' I hope that what I have said in answer to your first two questions affords a reply to this also.

Fourthly, you enquire whether it is contemplated that the Bishops, either individually or acting together, would continue giving permission for the use of practices plainly illegal. This again goes over the same ground as what I have tried to deal with, and we traversed it pretty fully in conversation. Once the new Book has been legalised I do not think that we shall experience the same difficulty as hitherto with regard to sanctions given or implied for practices which are not actually legal.

You have shown me that you appreciate fully what has been our difficulty in that matter and the prospect of its removal by degrees if the new Book becomes law. At the same time your experience enables you to realise the inability of Bishops to make a positive declaration that the observance of ritual rules in all their details will be everywhere and uniformly enforced. We shall do our best. We shall act I hope unitedly, or at least shall endeavour to do so, but these can never be matters upon which specific and binding undertakings can be given in black and white and be penally enforced. Nor, I am sure, would you desire it.

I hope I have succeeded in showing you that the conditions which you look for if the new Book is accepted are, so far as I can judge, likely to be reasonably attained.

The reply was unsatisfactory. Indeed the letter might be described as a kind of climax to the danger that lay in the Archbishop's habit of mind, especially when engaged upon an uncongenial subject. His method worked extraordinarily well when his interest was aroused, that is when the strong force

of his character and his personal convictions were behind it. It was much less likely to succeed when these were lacking.

Sir William's rejoinder has an ominous tone:

The Rt. Hon. Sir W. Joynson Hicks *to the* Archbishop of Canterbury

70, Queen's Gate, London, S.W. 7.
18th March, 1927.

I have received your letter of the 11th instant in reply to mine of the 24th February. Will you forgive me if I say it does not seem to deal with the matter quite as fully as you did in your conversation with me last week.

I had hoped that I had convinced Your Grace of the very grave and unhappy position in which many of the Evangelicals like myself are placed. We have been all our lives opponents of vestments and reservation; we honestly do not believe in them, but some of us might have been willing for the sake of peace in the Church to waive our objections—not altering our beliefs—if we could have been satisfied on the points raised in my letter.

We should have still felt sore and, of course, we should never attend any Church in which these practices were adopted, but, at the same time, speaking at all events for myself, I should have gone a long way in the cause of peace if you had met me with a full and frank acceptance of the points raised in my letter—if you had been able to say to me—'Of course, this is a concordat which will be carried out in the letter and spirit on both sides; those Anglo-Catholics who desire to use the Reserved Sacrament for the purposes of Adoration can have no part or lot in the future of the Church of England; and we, as Bishops, give you a frank assurance that not only will we not consent to going any further but we will use our utmost endeavours to deal with men who in the future may really be considered as defying every law, canonical, Ecclesiastical or political'.

Alas, you have not given me this assurance. You refer to the fact that I do not want wholesale prosecution. I agree; I always have agreed but as long ago as the Royal Commission I suggested a way out of that difficulty, namely, not to promote the offenders and the Diocese of London has been flooded with them by the Bishop of London since the Commission made its report.

I am deeply sorry; I thought there might have been as the outcome of our interview and our correspondence a hope for peace in the Church, but as I write it seems to me to recede into the distance.

The Archbishop replied again—but he was still insufficiently definite:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* RT. HON. SIR W. JOYNSON HICKS

21 March, 1927.

Every case would have to be considered on its merits. So far as I am myself concerned I can say unhesitatingly that I should regard any man who deliberately flouts the directions explicitly laid down not two hundred years ago but to-day as a very grave offender. How an 'offender' should be treated is a question quite separate from the Rubrics, and you have expressed to me in no doubtful terms your own opinion of its difficulty, but the fundamental thing to remember is that the number of offenders will be, as we firmly believe, comparatively few and the difficulty of the situation proportionately reduced.

The interest in the country was extraordinary. All through the year the papers were full of news, speeches, and letters: and an immense flood of pamphlets was produced besides. There were four Bishops against the Book—Norwich, Birmingham, Worcester, and also Exeter. The Bishop of Norwich advocated a division of the measure into two portions, the controversial and the uncontroversial—which had the fatal defect of leaving the substantial problem with which the Assembly was asked to deal unsolved. There were objections to the Book from very different camps—that it was too modernist, too old-fashioned, too rigid, too loose, that there were too many prayers for the dead, and too few prayers for the King. But the crucial charges were briefly that the new Prayer Book changed the doctrine of the Church of England so as to be untrue to the Reformation, and that, even if it became lawful, it would not be obeyed. The debate in the Church Assembly took place on July 5 and 6, 1927. The measure authorized the use of the Revised Prayer Book, known as the Deposited Book (because deposited with the Clerk of the Parliaments for purposes of identification). The use was to be optional. The old Prayer Book remained as before: it was not superseded. The Deposited Book was not a compilation of additions and deviations by themselves but, as desired by the House of Laity, a *Composite* Book, containing within its covers both the proposed additions and deviations, and also the whole of the existing Book of Common Prayer with a few slight

exceptions. The Archbishop himself moved the final approval of the Prayer Book Measure. His crucial words were:

> You may take it from me as absolutely certain that the bishops will require obedience to the new rules and will do their utmost to secure it.

But he again refused to specify the methods. With regard to doctrine he repeated what he said in Convocation:

> If I thought that what we are suggesting to-day would mean or involve any marked re-setting of the distinctive position of the Church of England, I should not be standing here to advocate your acceptance of what we lay before you. My Churchmanship is the Churchmanship which has found it possible, yes, and desirable, to include Hooker and Jewel and Andrewes, and Cosin and Waterland and Simeon and Keble, and I am persuaded that we are not departing therefrom to the right hand or to the left.

The attack was led by Dr. Darwell Stone for the extreme Anglo-Catholics, and by Sir William Joynson Hicks, the Bishop of Norwich, and Sir Thomas Inskip for the Evangelicals. It was strong and determined—and Dr. Stone's quotation of a statement by 700 Anglo-Catholic priests of their most complete and uncompromising opposition, afforded a further argument for the Evangelicals. In the end the measure was passed by a very large majority in all three Houses as follows:

	For	*Against*
Bishops . .	34	4
Clergy .	253	37
Laity	230	92
	517	133

III

The next step lay with Parliament. But in the meantime the agitation to influence the votes of members of both Houses grew apace. The Archbishop of Canterbury addressed a private meeting of Peers: and the Archbishop of York a private meeting of M.P.s. Dr. Darwell Stone and his Anglo-Catholic colleagues, as well as the extreme Evangelicals, alike did their best to persuade Parliament to reject the measure. An attempt was made to prohibit the measure in the High Court, which Sir John Simon successfully resisted on behalf of the Church Assembly. Non-

conformist opposition also grew in spite of the friendly attitude of Dr. Carnegie Simpson and Dr. Scott Lidgett. And fuel was added by a declaration on behalf of 1,400 Anglo-Catholic members of the Federation of Catholic Priests, that, if the Prayer Book Measure passed in its present form, they would feel justified in the following practices: Communion from the Reserved Sacrament of the whole, as well as the sick; corporate Devotions; Reservation in one kind; and perpetual Reservation in spite of the prohibition of the diocesan.

The Archbishop was again pressed on the question of the Bishops' attitude to clergy who might still refuse obedience supposing the Prayer Book Measure were approved by Parliament and received the Royal Assent. After consulting the whole body of Bishops he obtained their consent to the publication of a letter, containing a new assurance, to Canon V. F. Storr, who had written on behalf of a number of Liberal Evangelicals. This letter repeated the pledge given in the Church Assembly. It was the strongest statement made by the Archbishop during the whole discussion, and though he still declined to state the methods by which obedience was in fact to be secured, he made the important announcement that the Bishops would act together in the matter. The letter appeared in *The Times* on October 31:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* REV. CANON V. F. STORR

29 October 1927.

I did not speak lightly when, on July 6, I publicly used the words:

> You may take it from me as absolutely certain that the Bishops will require obedience to the new rules and will do their utmost to secure it.

I was sure at the time that I was speaking correctly, but I have now, in conjunction with the Archbishop of York, had an opportunity of meeting or communicating with all the diocesan Bishops of both Provinces, 43 in number, and I am able to tell you that I have obtained the concurrence of every one of them (except the Bishop of Norwich) in reiterating the announcement I have referred to. It is obvious that the methods by which this clear and definite intention will be fulfilled cannot be specified in detail beforehand; but those whom you represent and indeed all others who are interested in the matter, may rest assured that what is

laid down in the new Book will, if the Measure receive the Royal Assent, be faithfully administered, and that the Bishops will act together in the matter.

On November 24, 1927, the Ecclesiastical Committee in a lengthy report advised the Houses of Parliament that in their opinion the measure should proceed. The most important passage in the Report was as follows:

> The Committee would not recommend any interference with the decisions of the Church Assembly on matters so clearly lying within the province of that Assembly as the doctrines and ceremonial of the Church, unless persuaded that any proposed change of doctrine were of so vital a description as materially to alter the general character of the National Church as recognised in the Act of Settlement and by the oath sworn by His Majesty at his Coronation, whereby His Majesty has promised to maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion established by law.
>
> The Committee have carefully examined the Measure and the Deposited Book from this point of view, as well as the arguments of the objectors in relation thereto, and the replies of the Bishop of Chelmsford and other authorities of the Church. Without entering into argument on doctrinal questions, but having considered all that has been laid before them and the expressed opinion of the Archbishops and Bishops as to the doctrinal position of the Church of England, the Committee take the view that no change of doctrine of constitutional importance is involved, that accordingly the 'constitutional rights of all His Majesty's subjects' are not in this respect prejudicially affected, and there is nothing to modify the purport of the Coronation Oath.

On December 12, the Archbishop moved in the House of Lords 'that the Prayer Book Measure be presented to His Majesty for Royal Assent'. The House was crowded and interest intense. The Archbishop spoke for over an hour, and in most persuasive manner. He began by referring to the position of Parliament:

> We hear words which I think windy and even foolish, to the effect that this is not really a matter for Parliament, that the Church has spoken its own voice decidedly and that the duty of Parliament is to endorse what the Church has said. I dissent altogether from that view and dissociate myself from those statements. We are acting under what is known as the Enabling Act. . . . Every member of this House has, in my view, his absolute right to vote

freely upon a matter of this kind and it would be impertinence on my part to suggest anything else.

It seemed a strong—perhaps too strong a statement: but he qualified it in a moment by insisting on the moral aspect of the matter, the need of a man before voting exercising 'very extreme care' and reflecting 'what would be the consequence in the country of the rejection of a united wish officially given by a united Church'. (It must of course be remembered that the successful opposition afterwards claimed that the Church was not united.) He struck a personal note:

> The attack has been largely against myself. I am an old man. I have been a Bishop nearly 35 years and an Archbishop for nearly 25 years and my life has not been lived in private or silently or unrecorded. Standing here I assure your Lordships to-day that I am absolutely unconscious of any departure from the principles of the reformed Church of England to which I declared allegiance at my ordination 52 years ago and I have striven to maintain them ever since.

He then recounted the history of the revision, calling attention once more to the words of the Royal Commission that 'the law of public worship in the Church of England is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation': and emphasized the representative character of the Church Assembly and its laity:

> They do not profess to represent the people of England, but they do profess to represent the Church of England, the people who care about these matters and go to church, who want to use their Prayer Book, who care about the form that Book should take, who understand the question and who are the people really qualified to speak.

He gave an account of the main parts of the revision, including the Order of Holy Communion and Reservation, where the most important difference lay—but refusing to 'go into such profound doctrine as the presence of our Lord, in argument on the floor of this House'. And as to doctrine he said again:

> In my deliberate judgment nothing that we have suggested makes any change in the doctrinal position of the Church of England. The balance of emphasis may here and there be somewhat altered, but that mere fact will disquiet no one who remembers

what different aspects of the truth have been emphasized by recognised Church leaders during the last four hundred years.

He pleaded that the adoption of the Book would 'enormously facilitate the work of the Bishops'; and repeated his public promise 'that the Bishops mean to act together in this matter, and that they intend this Book to be obeyed and intend to use all their efforts to secure that it shall be obeyed'. And finally—and most characteristically of his whole attitude to Prayer Book Revision and the work of the Church—he took still larger ground and urged 'that the giving to us of this Book would mean the liberation of the Church from the great mass of those petty strifes which have troubled us up and down the country in the past'.

> We have talked about rubrics and special prayers and differences of view on important questions, but in my personal opinion there is a larger issue at stake than any of these. The Church of England, for which to-night I am spokesman, has a trust immeasurably great and sacred. From the depths of our hearts we want to use it aright. We want to use for the bettering of English life every ounce of the strength which by God's benediction is ours. We want that strength so consecrated and so united that it shall be irresistible for what we desire to effect in our country's life.

The debate lasted three days. All through it, Privy Councillors and M.P.s were coming to and fro, and the public galleries were thronged. There had been nothing like it for years. It had been feared that the Lords would be more difficult to win than the Commons. Nearly all the speeches reached a high standard, but the honours easily lay with the Archbishop and his supporters.

In the end, the Resolution was carried by 241 votes to 88.

The last act of the drama was played next day, December 15, in the House of Commons. The large majority in the House of Lords seemed of good omen. The Archbishop himself had left the choice of speakers and the whole conduct of the debate to the House of Commons supporters; and by their wish he invited Mr. Bridgeman to move the required Resolution, as a popular country gentleman who had done well for the Government in difficult waters as First Lord of the Admiralty.

That afternoon the House and the galleries were crowded; and there was an extraordinary buzz of excitement everywhere. The Archbishop sat over the clock, and surveyed the scene. Near

him was the Archbishop of York, and not far away sat Free Church leaders. Soon after three-thirty, the debate began. But it was an unhappy start. Mr. Bridgeman had been told to present the measure in its broad issues, leaving others to go into detail should it prove necessary. No one could have predicted the course the debate would take. He was irritated by interruptions into saying: 'I can imagine that those who dislike the Church of England may wish to reject this measure.' These unfortunate words provoked the first sign of the coming turmoil; and Mr. Bridgeman sat down almost without having attempted any real explanation of the case.

Sir W. Joynson Hicks followed—and at once directed the debate to far more controversial ground. He did the very thing which the Archbishop had refused to do—on the floor of the house. He turned the occasion into one of high doctrinal dispute. Before ten minutes had passed, he had kindled the first sparks of the fire which was to consume the new Book, the fire of the fear of Rome:

> It may be quite true that the new scheme is right. It may be equally true that the doctrines of the Church of Rome are right; but it is quite clear that the doctrines of the Church of Rome, or any doctrines approximating to those of the Church of Rome, are not the doctrines which were established by us at the time of the Reformation. I do not propose to say one word against the doctrines of the Church of Rome; they are not in dispute here. All I have to say is that they are not the doctrines of our Church, and that there are many things done in our Church to-day which, as the Royal Commission itself said, are 'on the Romeward side of the dividing line'.

The whole attack was really an attack not only against the new Book but against the teaching of the Church of England itself: for it was the old Prayer Book quite as much as the new which taught the doctrines which Joynson Hicks deplored. And, so far as Romanist tendencies were concerned, no notice was taken of the fact that the Romanizers were in league with the supporters of Joynson Hicks. But it was an attack, flashy as it was itself, which proved abundantly successful. And it was aided by the reproaches he cast at the Archbishop, as he looked up at him over the clock, weighting them with quotations from former charges or speeches or reports, because episcopal authority had not been

exercised either sternly or decisively (as the Archbishop had promised, when Bishop of Winchester, thirty years ago)—'The sands are still running out to-day, and nothing has been done. We are asked to trust the Bishops. Therein lies the difficulty.'

The speech of the evening, so far as votes were concerned, was made by Mr. Rosslyn Mitchell, member for Paisley. It was extraordinarily eloquent. The Archbishop noted:

> The most effective speech of all as regards votes was, I think, Rosslyn Mitchell's. It was a simply ultra-Protestant harangue, with no real knowledge of the subject, but owing its power to a rhetorical presentment of no-Popery phrases and arguments of the sort which are to be found in *Barnaby Rudge*, when the Lord George Gordon Riots set London aflame.

There were other speeches, effective in their way, against the measure, like Sir John Simon's: and some speeches of a thoughtful character for the measure. But the Archbishop, in the gallery, listened to the debate with increasing dismay. There was no one to argue—nor even to explain. All hopes lay on Lord Hugh Cecil. But in vain:

> For some reason or other he completely failed. He was nervous and obviously was bitterly chagrined when the House began to thin.

The Prime Minister spoke in support, but the tide against the measure was too strong, and when Sir Thomas Inskip closed for the opposition, its fate was sealed. The measure was rejected by 238 votes to 205.[1]

The defeat was sensational. Sympathy for the Archbishop was universal, and many letters, private and public, came assuring him of admiration and affection. And he himself never once spoke a wounded, much less a bitter word; and though his disappointment was keen, he immediately issued an appeal 'that

[1] Considerable confusion exists as to the division figures in this case. The *Journals of the House of Commons* (vol. clxxxii, p. 378) give the figures as Yeas 205, Noes 247. With this the Day to Day series of the *Parliamentary Debates* (vol. 211, No. 139, col. 2662) agrees, as does *The Times* of Friday, 16 December 1927. But the *Parliamentary Debates, Official Report* (vol. 211, 5th series, col. 25652) gives Ayes 205, Noes 230; and prints a detailed division list, in which the number of names voting with the Noes totals 238. With this figure of 238 *The Times* of 17 December 1927 agrees, giving also a list of persons voting. It seems safe, therefore, to regard 238 as the accurate figure of the Noes.

patience and charity may be exercised, and precipitate words and acts avoided'.

What should be the next step?

In a single hectic night the House of Commons had apparently destroyed the work of more than twenty years. But it could not quite be left there: for thirty-nine out of forty-three Bishops, most of the clergy, the representative laity from the dioceses, almost all the Diocesan Conferences, a majority of English M.P.s[1] and a majority of the House of Lords had recommended the changes; and whatever else might be the result of the Prayer Book Measure, its existence, thus recommended, made it quite impossible for any Bishop to discipline a clergyman who adopted those parts of the Revised Book which were considered objectionable. There was therefore much to be said, as Lord Birkenhead and others argued, for allowing the Book, and letting the next step rest with the Legislature.

The Bishops, however, decided otherwise. On December 23, the two Archbishops issued a statement on behalf of the Bishops, containing the following words:

> It was within the right of the House of Commons to reject the Measure. On the other hand, mere acquiescence in its decision would be in our judgment inconsistent with the responsibilities of the Church as a spiritual society.
>
> The Bishops fully recognize that there are circumstances in which it would be their duty to take action in accordance with the Church's inherent spiritual authority. We realize this duty, and are ready, if need be, to fulfil it. But we believe that the recent decision of the House of Commons was influenced by certain avoidable misunderstandings as to the character of the proposals before it, and we cannot, therefore, take the responsibility of accepting as final the vote of December 15.
>
> The House of Bishops has accordingly resolved to re-introduce the Measure into the Church Assembly as soon as possible, with such changes, and such changes only, as may tend to remove misapprehensions and to make clearer and more explicit its intentions and limitations.

Such a reintroduction was a hazardous measure, and the removal of avoidable misunderstandings involved many heart-

[1] The Division list showed that amongst members representing English constituencies there was a clear majority in favour of the measure. (Roman Catholics abstained from voting.)

burnings, and lost the support of certain Anglo-Catholics without much pacifying of Evangelicals. The debate in the House of Commons had certainly revealed curious misunderstandings of what were by comparison details, which the Bishops believed they could meet. The Bishops had, however, miscalculated the amount of Protestant prejudice behind the adverse vote, which they could not hope to satisfy. The crux of the matter was perpetual Reservation. The Archbishop was himself very nervous about retaining it—and many of his friends begged him to let it disappear. Sir Thomas Inskip also saw the Archbishop, at the latter's request (January 18, 1928). The Archbishop noted:

> I found him greatly troubled about the Prayer Book situation and I think quite genuinely anxious to get things settled, if it can possibly be done, without compromising what he regards as fundamental principles. He told me that he had come to the conclusion that, on the whole, he would be prepared to assent to a great deal that he dislikes in the new Book provided we could get rid of the continuous Reservation which the Book, under certain conditions, sanctions. I pressed him as to Vestments, the Alternative Communion Office, and even the Reservation for the Sick under the first rubric. All of these he said that he would, though somewhat reluctantly, be prepared to agree to, and I think he went so far as to say that he would press those who act with him in the Assembly or in Parliament to take the same view. But on the question of continuous Reservation he could not possibly give way.

The suggestion, however, was really impossible. If Reservation were to be included in any form, some provision for continuous Reservation was inevitable. Otherwise, not only would the general body of Anglo-Catholics, extreme and moderate alike, have been irretrievably alienated, but in the opinion of large numbers of thoughtful church-people, as well as critics and observers, too great a surrender would have been made to Parliament in a spiritual matter. 'We give not to our Princes', says the 37th Article, 'the ministry either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments.' The Archbishop did, however, persuade the Bishops to make the conditions of Continuous Reservation more definite, with the result that they appeared more rigorous. He also persuaded the Bishops to insist on the arrangements with regard to Reservation being incorporated in Rubrics instead of Rules. The relevant Rubrics, thus amended and extended, are as follows—attention

should be specially drawn to the opening words of the first of these three Rubrics:

> If the Bishop is satisfied that in connexion with hospitals, or in time of common sickness, or in the special circumstances of any particular Parish, the provisions of the preceding rubrick are not sufficient, and that there is need of further provision in order that sick and dying persons may not lack the benefit of the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, he may to that end give his licence to the Priest, to reserve at the open Communion so much of the consecrated Bread and Wine as is needed for the purpose. Whenever such licence is granted or refused, the Minister, or the people as represented in the Parochial Church Council, may refer the question to the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province.
>
> The consecrated Bread and Wine set apart under either of the two preceding rubricks shall be reserved only for the Communion of the Sick, shall be administered in both kinds, and shall be used for no other purpose whatever. There shall be no service or ceremony in connexion with the Sacrament so reserved, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion, or otherwise reverently consumed.
>
> The consecrated Bread and Wine thus set apart shall be reserved in an aumbry or safe. The aumbry shall (according as the Bishop shall direct) be set in the North or South wall of the sanctuary of the church or of any chapel thereof, or, if need be, in the wall of some other part of the church approved by the Bishop, provided that it shall not be immediately behind or above a Holy Table. The door of the aumbry shall be kept locked, and opened only when it is necessary to move or replace the consecrated Elements for the purposes of Communion or renewal. The consecrated Bread and Wine shall be renewed at least once a week.

With these and a few other modifications (including the insertion of the Black Rubric at the end of the Alternative Order of Holy Communion), the new Measure was submitted first to the Convocations and then to the Church Assembly.

At the time, there were many heartburnings on account of the haste with which the policy of going to Parliament again was adopted; and there was a curious want of consultation between the House of Bishops and leaders of either of the other Houses or of leading Churchmen of different schools outside the Church Assembly. The imposition of fresh limitations was resented by Anglo-Catholics—while some Evangelicals who had supported

the old Book now changed their minds. And in the end the majorities in both Convocations and the Church Assembly were appreciably smaller.[1] The fusillade of pamphlets continued—and the Archbishop himself contributed to their number,[2] though, perhaps because too late in the day, his own brochure, while straightforward and disarming, did not influence votes.

On June 13, 1928, the Solicitor-General, Sir Boyd Merriman, opened the debate in the House of Commons—in a clear and excellent speech. This time the debate lasted two days. The Archbishop again listened in the gallery, though unwell:

> I sat through the debate in the Commons notwithstanding my rather invalid condition, and in the face of grumbled remonstrance from Barlow and Cassidy, but I felt it rather vital to see the discussion through to a finish. I consider that the debate of this last week was in every respect superior to the debate on Dec. 15th. The tone was on the whole higher, the mere rodomontade was less, and there were speeches of general excellence, notably Hugh Cecil's, the Duchess of Atholl's, and Lady Iveagh's. Joynson Hicks was necessarily, I suppose, rather unfair, for he had to make the best of what I honestly think was not a very good case. And the same applies to Inskip, but I have no real ground of complaint against either of them, except in one matter of Inskip's speech about which I have written to him.

The particular point which Sir Thomas Inskip, winding up for the opponents, made with icy effect at the close of his speech was this:

> We have been challenged to produce a policy. The hon. Member who spoke immediately before me challenged me to refer to what I said in the previous Debate as to accepting nine-tenths of this Book. He asked me what I would do. I will tell him a little piece of history—it is hardly right to call it history, but a statement of what I have done in that connection. I was prepared to take a great responsibility upon myself, which perhaps I had no right to

[1]

	For	*Against*
Canterbury Upper House	20	6
,, Lower House	126	48
York Upper House	unanimous	
,, Lower House	50	19

	For	*Against*
Church Assembly		
Bishops . .	32	2
Clergy . .	183	59
Laity . . .	181	92
	396	153

[2] *The Prayer Book: Our Hope and Meaning*, Hodder and Stoughton.

> do. I ran the risk of being told I was sacrificing my principles to expediency. With the concurrence of the Home Secretary and the present Lord Chancellor, I went to the Archbishop of Canterbury and told him that, with whatever influence we had, we were prepared to assent to a Measure passing through this House provided it did not include this perpetual Reservation, which is the keystone of the system. In his wisdom the Archbishop of Canterbury perhaps thought that offer unworthy of further consideration. It was honestly made. I believe if the Home Secretary and the Lord Chancellor and myself—I hope the House will not think this is taking too much upon us—had expressed that opinion, I believe that we should have had enough of our hon. friends to go with us to ensure the passage of such a Measure through this House of Commons.

As a matter of fact the Archbishop had not so understood Sir Thomas, even when he had again visited Lambeth, after the first interview described above, though Sir Thomas clearly felt that he had made the offer plain. But for reasons already given, acceptance of such offer was not practicable. It was in fact—though in a different sense from the speaker's—'the keystone of the system'. Still the making of the point at the very last minute, and the suggestion which it contained that something had been concealed by the Archbishop, was decisive—and, what made it especially unfortunate, there was no means of replying. The Prime Minister followed, and had the last word, but he did not succeed in averting defeat.

In the end, the House of Commons rejected the second Prayer Book Measure by 266 votes to 220—a slightly larger majority.

Once again the House of Bishops met to consider the results of the defeat. There were some who urged that the Convocations and Church Assembly and Bishops should ignore the Commons' verdict and should arm the new Prayer Book with the fullest Church authority in their power, and see what happened. In the end the Bishops agreed unanimously to the following statement:

> It is a fundamental principle that the Church—that is, the Bishops together with the Clergy and the Laity—must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its Faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its forms of worship.

The Archbishop, commending the statement to the Assembly, said:

> I venture to believe that no one can challenge that principle as a principle however loyal he be to the true relation which that principle bears in a Christian land, and ours is a Christian land, to the recognised constitutional rights of the State or nation as such. I do not regard that principle of our fundamental loyalty to Christ and its full expression as in the least inconsistent with, or traversed by, the national position which the life-history of England has, thank God, accorded to our Church and has steadily maintained under all the changes of Parliamentary conditions. But whatever may have been the intentions of those who voted, the recent decision has troubled many consciences and has raised anxious questions.
>
> It is our firm hope that, when the facts have been quietly considered, some strong and capable committee of statesmen and Churchmen may be appointed to weigh afresh the provisions of the existing law in order to see whether any readjustment is required for the maintenance, in the conditions of our own age, of the principle which we have here and now reasserted.

In reality such a statement, thus delivered by the Archbishop, was a courageous statement for one with Dr. Davidson's past traditions to make at the end of a long life; but it did not go so far as some would have liked, and in particular the Bishop of Durham considered that the fact that it could be accepted by the Bishop of Norwich, the principal opponent of the Prayer Book Measure, deprived it of all vital meaning. The Archbishop read it to the Church Assembly on July 9. His speech introducing it was ordered to be entered in the Minutes. That speech again was too calm and moderate to satisfy those who felt that the authority of the Church had been desperately challenged. The Archbishop realized the deep interest in the faith and worship of the Church which the discussions in Parliament had shown —he recognized the seriousness of the consequences, and the impossibility of drifting. But he refused to believe that the House of Commons was 'arrogantly claiming to take in hand the absolute control of the belief and worship of the Church of England':

> I venture, while carefully regarding the matter with all the gravity that it demands, to express my own judgment that no such far-reaching challenge was intended. If the House of Commons, by

its vote on June 14th—a vote which I deplore—is supposed to have flouted or violated the well-proven working arrangement of Church and State, the House did it with no intent of a constitutional kind. Many of those who rejected the resolution believed, however mistakenly, that they were voicing the real underlying wish of a majority of Church folk in England.

The root of the trouble was that, in exercising its unquestionably legal power, the House of Commons had 'departed, lamentably as it seems to me, from the reasonable spirit in which alone the balanced relationship of Church and State in England can be satisfactorily and harmoniously carried on':

> While claiming to appraise what can be called Church opinion, it deliberately traversed the declared desire of the Church's official and representative bodies—Bishops, Clergy, and Laity. It declined to respect the wishes of the solid central body of Church opinion duly expressed and recorded both centrally and locally throughout the land, and allowed itself, on the contrary, to be influenced by the representations of the strange combination of vehement opposite groups or factions of Churchmen united only in their resolve to get the Measure and the Book defeated.

But the Archbishop refused to admit that all the wearisome work was wasted. He appealed to the younger members of the Assembly to see that its very perplexities made it fruitful, and reminding them how, years hence 'across years which I shall not see', they would look back on 1928 as a year almost unique in English Church History, he added:

> I pray God that in that backward look you may find nothing in your record of here and now to be sorry for, nothing of narrowness or of obstinate self-will either as invididuals or as groups, nothing of the spirit 'it must be my way or no way at all', nothing but the memory of a whole-hearted resolve to go forward unitedly in God's service as Christ's men, strong in the power of prayer and conscious of His Captaincy alone. If that spirit can permeate our whole ranks now, and if we can welcome close to our side, shoulder to shoulder, in the onward march, those who like ourselves have made their sectional preferences—even cherished preferences—give place to the larger unity, then, if that come true, our efforts, our sore disappointments, even our unhappy rivalries, may prove to have been not in vain.

It was the last session of the Church Assembly over which the

Archbishop presided, and the closing words of this speech fitly express the spirit which he had sought to make prevail during the whole of his twenty-five years as Primate of all England.

IV

Why did the Prayer Book Measures fail? We are perhaps still a little too near to give a satisfactory reply. But two or three reflections may be of service.

First and most strong was the ancient fear of Rome—a fear which flares up in an astonishing way at intervals in our history. It was the fear men felt at the time of the Gunpowder Plot; the fear which inspired the Lord George Gordon riots; the fear which lay behind Lord John Russell's Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, 1851, and the agitation against the restoration of the Roman hierarchy. It was behind the heated controversies about ritualism with which the present century opened—when Sir William Harcourt clashed his armour and Parliament was stirred. And the Archbishop was under no illusion about its influence in the House of Commons debates of 1927 and 1928. After the second rejection he wrote:

> One kept asking as the talk went on, 'what are really the facts or motives which will affect the issue?' I think they are not to be sought within the House of Commons, but in the country at large. I suppose there is no force on earth so determined and uncompromising as the force of the No-Popery cry in England, and it does not need any knowledge of history for backing it except the general sense with which England is impregnated. We suffered so much from Rome that everything which can be depicted, however unfairly, as having a Romeward trend is condemned *ipso facto* without need of argument. I honestly think that that spirit is much more answerable for our defeat than any detailed attacks upon the Prayer Book in its various parts. The purveyors of literature on the subject, and especially the Protestant Alliance, played down to this prejudice in the literature they produced, and they were wise in their generation.

The fear was strong enough: it showed the deep Protestantism of English people; but it was very irrational.

The second reason was the disunity of Churchmen. Time after time it was said that, if only the Church could present a united demand, there would be no question but that Parliament would

grant it. This reasoning appears more plausible. But its substance is not as great as it seems at first sight. In a matter of such profound religious interest, division was inevitable. The majorities in favour of the revision were composed of the instructed Church leaders and communicants—those, that is to say, who knew something of the problem and what was at stake, and had the responsibilities; although it must in fairness be added that not a few distinguished liturgical scholars, such as Dr. F. E. Brightman, were not altogether happy about the liturgical quality of important parts of the new Book.

The real question was whether a vital religious movement was to be given an honourable place in the Church of England. Did Sir Thomas Inskip and his friends really wish the members of this movement to be driven from the Church, as the Methodists had been driven? It was a question which was never fairly and openly faced—as the Archbishop's own Memorandum shows, though he realized its importance:

> My own thoughts turn to a time nearly 200 years ago, when the vagaries and excitements of Methodists irritated the Bishops and clergy so much that they made no real effort to prevent those enthusiasts from going off at a tangent and fashioning a new Church or Churches of their own, Methodists and Independents and Wesleyan Methodists and Primitive Methodists and so on. Nearly every one now says—'Surely if the Bishops of that time had taken a larger view the splendid work which evangelists have done outside the Church for 150 years might have been done inside the Church to the steadying of vagaries and the infusion of spiritual life into the Church.' I want to ask Inskip whether he thinks a similar criticism might be current in the year 2000, if he and his friends can get the Church authorities of to-day so to act as to force Anglo-Catholics of an advanced kind to form some kind of organisation of their own, and weld together men of intensest devotion, great pastoral effectiveness, and deep piety, whom the Church ought never to have lost. I think of saying something to that effect when I have to debate the matter, if we reach a really critical stage. The problem may reduce itself to this—'Will you support the inclusion within the Church of a body of deeply devout men who by temperament or training or belief are irrevocably tied to a view of the Holy Communion which seems to you quite erroneous? You say nothing will induce you to do so. Are you sure that you are thus acting in accordance with the Holy Spirit, or that your action would be justified when the history of this

century is completed?' I have not said this publicly, and hardly to any one privately, for it is the kind of argument which, if vulgarised, might become I think untenable, but after abundant thought it is the direction in which my own thoughts tend when I am trying to frame in the sacred sense a policy pleasing to God, and consonant with loyalty to the principles of the Church of Christ. It may all look differently a few months hence. That is how it suggests itself to me at this Epiphany. [January, 1928.]

The fact that the Archbishop did not himself bring this argument forward, which was really the most powerful argument, in a vigorous way, forces us to ask how far his own leadership was responsible for the failure. It must be admitted at once that the Archbishop's lack of personal interest in the main question at issue—which has been already brought out in the extracts from his papers—was itself a great handicap. Considering the complexities of the subject, the keen passions on either side, profound conviction or deep enthusiasm were necessary to successful generalship. He lacked them. He had great experience, ample memory—and was a first-rate chairman. But he had not the interest in the subject itself which was necessary for effective command and direction. It was too much a matter of expediency (in the right sense of the word): and when passions are aroused on either side, expediency is not enough. The Archbishop could not bring himself to believe that the revision of the Prayer Book was in fact a vital matter to the Church. Not believing it himself, he lacked the fire to convince others, and especially the House of Commons. To acknowledge this is not to say that the Archbishop was wrong, because of this lack of interest or conviction. His religious interests were of a more general, even a broader character. But his inability to devote his best mind to what was first the Rubrics, and then the Prayer Book question, prevented him from giving a decided lead to the Church itself, and from pressing for a swifter and much less ambitious revision—when this was possible, in the earlier stages before the War. That want of deep interest and fire also made it impossible for him to go to Parliament and say that the Church, in its deliberative assemblies, had made up its mind after twenty-two years of labour, and claimed from Parliament the statutory ratification of the Church's measure if it wished that kind of Church to remain the Established Church.

There was another reason which played an important part in the rejection of the measure in Parliament. This was the Archbishop's unwillingness to give definite pledges with regard to the enforcement of obedience. He knew the importance of the reform of Ecclesiastical Courts: he had pressed it indeed ever since he had been chaplain to Archbishop Tait. He would in some ways himself have preferred the reform to have been carried through before the revision of the Prayer Book. And a very valuable Report of a Special Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts of which the Archbishop of York was chairman was published in 1926. He acquiesced, however, in its consideration being postponed till after the Revision, accepting the argument that the law which the Courts must administer ought to be settled before the Courts were reformed. But apart from the Courts he was asked by Joynson Hicks to give the pledges with regard to discipline which we have noted. Under pressure he went a certain distance, but not far enough to be of service. He would not say that the Bishops either (as Joynson Hicks desired) would refuse to promote men who were disobedient, or (as Dr. Carnegie Simpson desired) 'would unitedly withdraw all spiritual episcopal recognition from any plain transgressors of the limits laid down in this book'. One reason for the Archbishop's unwillingness to give such pledges was, no doubt, the belief, whether right or wrong, that they would be regarded by the Anglo-Catholics as a threat, and involve the withdrawal of the support which all but the extremists gave.

But, when all this is said, something more fundamental remains. The deepest reason for the failure was that the whole method was from the very beginning wrong. The revision of Church services and the enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline are different things. A revision of worship, of common prayer, which is intended from the start to be used as an instrument for stopping disobedience is at any rate not likely to produce the happiest results in the realm of worship! And side by side with this, the recommendation of the Royal Commission to consider the preparation of a new Ornaments Rubric 'with a view to its enactment by Parliament'—and to frame modifications in Church services 'with a view to their enactment by Parliament'—started all on a false track. Before ever he became Archbishop, Dr. Davidson had declared his abhorrence of detailed discussion

by Parliament of proposed changes in Church Services.[1] A year after he succeeded to the Primacy he made a strong appeal to Mr. Balfour as Prime Minister against a proposed reference of ritual questions to a Parliamentary Select Committee. He did this on the ground that it was on sacramental questions that ritual difficulties ultimately turned. He quoted the argument of leading clergy that the strain between the Parliament and the Church 'might become intolerable and preponderate over the national gain of Establishment if Parliament were to exercise its undisputed rights to the full extent that it logically can'. By such arguments he persuaded Mr. Balfour to appoint a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline instead of a Parliamentary Select Committee.[2] Again, when the Royal Commission reported in favour of issuing Letters of Business to the Convocations with instructions to consider the preparation of an Ornaments Rubric and to frame modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service, 'with a view to their enactment by Parliament', the Archbishop, who was mainly responsible for those recommendations, reminded Convocation that it was the requirement of Parliamentary sanction that was 'the very crux of our difficulties'. At the time, the Archbishop hoped that some method might be found for securing Parliamentary sanction 'without involving discussions which would be quite obviously and manifestly unsuited to Parliament if they necessitated discussions there upon the details either of worship or of doctrine'.[3] The Archbishop's fears were more than confirmed. The very discussions on worship and doctrine which he so earnestly deprecated, took place in a most vehement form. And if one thing is clearer than another, it is that the present parliamentary method of legislation in questions of public worship is not and cannot be a satisfactory method.

NOTE

To carry the record of the Prayer Book controversy beyond Archbishop Davidson, it should be said that at the end of 1928 the Prayer Book of 1928 was published by the privileged presses as an ordinary book, with a note stating what had happened in the Church Assembly and Parliament, adding, 'The publication of this Book does not

[1] See p. 328. [2] See p. 460. [3] See p. 652.

directly or indirectly imply that it can be regarded as authorised for use in churches'. Between the autumn of 1928 and July 1929, most of the Bishops consulted the clergy and laity in their Diocesan Conferences. As a result, in July 1929 (with the support of the Lower House), the Upper House of Convocation of Canterbury recognised the impossibility of bringing back the conduct of public worship strictly within the limits of the Prayer Book of 1662, and resolved 'that in the exercise of their administrative discretion they will in their respective dioceses consider the circumstances and needs of parishes severally, and give counsel and directions' in conformity with the following principles:—

'(1) That during the present emergency and until further order be taken the Bishops, having in view the fact that the Convocations of Canterbury and York gave their consent to the proposals for deviations from and additions to the Book of 1662, as set forth in the Book of 1928, being laid before the National Assembly of the Church of England for Final Approval, and that the National Assembly voted Final Approval to these proposals, cannot regard as inconsistent with loyalty to the principles of the Church of England the use of such additions or deviations as fall within the limits of these proposals. For the same reason they must regard as inconsistent with Church Order the use of any other deviations from or additions to the Forms and Orders contained in the Book of 1662.

'(2) That accordingly the Bishops, in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion, which belongs to each Bishop in his own Diocese, will be guided by the proposals set forth in the Book of 1928, and will endeavour to secure that the practices which are consistent neither with the Book of 1662 nor with the Book of 1928 shall cease.

Further—

'(3) That the Bishops, in the exercise of their authority, will only permit the ordinary use of any of the Forms and Orders contained in the Book of 1928 if they are satisfied that such use would have the good will of the people as represented in the Parochial Church Council, and that in the case of the Occasional Offices the consent of the parties concerned will always be obtained.'

It is on these lines that Bishops have been administering their dioceses since 1928, 'during the present emergency, and until further order be taken'. In the meantime with a view to such further order being taken, the Archbishops have appointed a Commission on the relations between Church and State in pursuance of a Resolution passed by the Church Assembly of February 5, 1930. The Resolution,

which contained the Terms of Reference of the Commission, was as follows:

'That whereas, in the words addressed to the Church Assembly on July 2nd, 1928, by Archbishop Davidson, with the concurrence of the whole body of the Diocesan Bishops, "it is a fundamental principle that the Church, that is, the Bishops, together with the Clergy and Laity, must in the last resort, when its mind has been fully ascertained, retain its inalienable right, in loyalty to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to formulate its faith in Him and to arrange the expression of that Holy Faith in its form of worship";

'It is desirable that a Commission should be appointed to enquire into the present relations of Church and State, and particularly how far the principle, stated above, is able to receive effective application in present circumstances in the Church of England, and what legal and constitutional changes, if any, are needed in order to maintain or to secure its effective application; and that the Archbishops be requested to appoint a Commission for this purpose.'

Viscount Cecil was appointed Chairman of the Commission.

CHAPTER LXXXIII

RESIGNATION

Let me not live . . .
After my flame lacks oil, to be the snuff
Of younger spirits.
SHAKESPEARE, *All's Well that Ends Well*, I. ii.

IF any one were to look through the newspaper-cutting books at Lambeth for the ten years after the War, he would find an almost regular reference in the autumn and winter months to the impending resignation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and queries as to his successor. The Archbishop made it a practice to remain quite indifferent to these recurrent speculations. He had one large guiding principle with regard to the whole matter: and it is deeply significant. The Lambeth Conference was due again in 1930. Its deliberations would affect the life of the whole Anglican Communion for another ten years. The chairman, therefore, of that Conference must be an Archbishop of Canterbury who, on all ordinary reckoning, would be able to play his part in following up the policy of that Conference for some while at least after it had taken place. So the Archbishop wrote in his private papers—after resignation:

> I had repeatedly said, and most of the Bishops had heard me say it, that I should not preside over another Lambeth Conference, and that I must in fairness to my successor have left Lambeth in good time to allow him to make the Conference arrangements. (*Jan. 5, 1930.*)

It is true that the formal announcement of his decision to resign came only a few weeks after the second rejection of the revised Prayer Book. And in some quarters his resignation was attributed to that rejection. But the facts are quite otherwise. To quote his private papers again:

> I tried to forestall this misinterpretation of my action by announcing to the Canterbury Diocesan Conference in June, some days before the second Prayer Book debate in the House of Commons, that another man would be in my place in 1930. Had I been ten or fifteen years younger, I should have treated the defeat of the Prayer Book as an episode in the life of the Church—and in my own life

—an important episode no doubt, but not one that called for heroic measures or a drastic resignation. I wish to leave on emphatic record that this episode had no influence on my action. My mind was really made up, I might almost say, in 1920, that the Lambeth Conference of 1930 would not find me as its President. (*Jan. 5, 1930.*)

The Archbishop was now eighty years old, and though astonishingly hale and alert in comparison with most octogenarians, he could not disguise the fact that he was no longer able to do all that he had been accustomed to do as a matter of course. He got more easily tired in the evenings; and he suffered especially in the last year or two from intermittent attacks of a serious form of headache. Moreover, while he could tackle the big occasions which came his way—important speeches and sermons—the constant strain of everyday work, with its unceasing demands of all kinds, was proving too severe for his strength. To put it in another way, and in his own words while talking at Canterbury to the wife of Canon Bickersteth, on January 5, 1928, just after the first rejection of the Prayer Book, he said quite plainly that it was his intention to resign that year whether the Prayer Book passed or not, and gave as his reason, 'While my mind can grasp one thing, it cannot grasp six or seven almost simultaneously, as it ought to be able to do, and as it had been able to do in the past.' Naturally enough, before 1928, the question of the Archbishop's duty as well as the date of any resignation was often in his mind, and formed the subject of discussion with some of the most intimate of his friends. It is possible that if the Archbishop or those nearest to him had realized the greatness of the danger that the Prayer Book Measure should suffer defeat, he might have entrusted its final piloting in 1926–7 to the hands of his successor. But though the Archbishop was anxious at times as to the issue, he believed, rightly enough, that his own influence would count for a great deal. And therefore it was not unnatural that he should wish to see the long labour of Revision brought to an end while he was still at Lambeth. In any case, rightly or wrongly, it was not the Revision of the Prayer Book and the tasks which it would inevitably bring for the two Provinces of Canterbury and York, but the unknown responsibilities which the next Lambeth Conference must involve for the whole Anglican Communion, which formed the determining factor.

At first, as the Archbishop's age advanced, the arguments

against resignation, brought by people of very different schools, were very strong. Men relied on him so much, and, while he held the helm, the ship, it was said, would steer a steady course. Was not the archbishopric itself a trust which could not be forsaken? And to the very end there were those who regarded his resignation as almost a sin against God—on the grounds that an Archbishop of Canterbury ought not to resign in any event. Indeed, the plain fact that no Archbishop of Canterbury had resigned and the strong sense of a trust were both facts which would weigh with Archbishop Davidson himself to a peculiar degree. And there were many others, both laymen and Bishops from overseas, who disapproved of the idea and when the decision was finally made expressed keen disappointment. There were all sorts of reasons why the Archbishop should never resign. And, as every one who has had to do with the question of resignation in even the smallest sphere knows, resignation is extraordinarily difficult to face—and though it may be discussed for months or years, its achievement is a very different matter. But the Archbishop's own sense of duty, and his and Mrs. Davidson's most careful guardianship of the good of the Church, proved stronger than all the reasons on the other side. The most trusted of his friends whom they both consulted agreed that resignation would be right. He had his hesitation, it is true. He was not quite sure that his nearest friends based their thought on adequate knowledge. But his recognition that he could not efficiently discharge so continuous a strain of work, as well as the counsel of his friends, prevailed on the other side. Thus the decision was taken—though none but the Archbishop himself could ever have realized the wrench which it meant—and he fixed the actual date for November 12, the day of his golden wedding. It was the most difficult thing that he had ever had to do: it was the end, the voluntary laying down, of his life.

The resignation itself had to be accomplished in proper form. A commission was accordingly appointed by the King consisting of the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of the three principal sees. The formal announcement was made in the Press as follows:

10, Downing Street,
Whitehall, S.W. 1. 25th July, 1928.

The King has received with great regret an intimation from the Archbishop of Canterbury that he is desirous of resigning his high

office. His Majesty, on the recommendation of the Prime Minister, has, by Royal Warrant, appointed a Commission consisting of the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Durham, and the Bishop of Winchester, for the purpose of receiving the resignation.

The Commission have reported their acceptance of the Archbishop's resignation to take effect on November 12 of this year and this has been approved by His Majesty.

The Archbishop also, later, wrote to the Dean of Canterbury to intimate formally to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury the fact of his impending resignation on November 12, adding:

The ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY *to the* DEAN OF CANTERBURY

25 October 1928

It is right that you and the Chapter of Canterbury should be thus made formally cognisant of the fact and of the consequent obligations which will devolve upon you and the Chapter.[1]

II

The announcement of the Archbishop's resignation was the signal for a quite extraordinary outburst of gratitude and affection on all sides. It is literally true to say that no one was more surprised than the Archbishop himself. He said at the time to an intimate friend, with complete sincerity:

I honestly don't understand it; I am speaking, as I should to you, absolutely freely—and if I was describing myself I should say I was a funny old fellow of quite mediocre, second-rate gifts and a certain amount of common sense—but that I had tried to do my best; I have tried—and I have tried to stick to my duty; but that is really all there is about it.

The fact remained that the appreciation and reverence were felt and expressed very widely indeed. Already in the earlier part of the year, on the actual completion of the twenty-fifth year of the primacy, and again on his eightieth birthday, the opportunity had been taken by old friends, by the public at large, and by the clergy of the diocese, to express their admiration; and the Mayor

[1] The receipt of this letter was duly referred to by the Dean and Chapter in their petition to the Crown for a *congé d'élire*. An attempt was made in connexion with the election of Archbishop Davidson's successor to maintain that the Archbishop had not canonically resigned: but the Dean and Chapter (after taking the Opinion of Mr. F. H. L. Errington, the Commissary-General of Canterbury and Chancellor of London), rejected the plea, and gave their reasons.

and Corporation of Canterbury presented him on the birthday itself with the Freedom of the City. There can be no doubt that a special warmth was added to these and later expressions by a feeling of deep sympathy for the Archbishop personally in the fate of the revised Prayer Book. The whole volume of thankfulness, however, found a special focus in what came to be known as the Tribute to Archbishop Davidson, organized by a special committee including the Archbishop of York (as Chairman), the Prime Minister, Lord Stamfordham, Lord Harris, Dr. Scott Lidgett, the Headmaster of Harrow and other representatives of public life, the Church, the county and diocese, and having Mr. Arthur Sheppard[1] as secretary. The response to the appeal (issued June 29, closed October 31) was astonishing. It came from the widest circles—and from all ranks: at least 15,000 subscribers: and it included not only substantial sums from the well-to-do but very many a widow's mite. The total reached was £17,117. Of this a portion was spent on a stone cross, the work of W. Reynolds Stephens, the sculptor, with the architectural assistance of W. Tapper, set up in the middle of the courtyard of Lambeth Palace—while the main portion was to be used in such ways as would enable the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson to end their days in peace and comfort. The gift made possible the purchase of a house in Cheyne Walk.

The announcement of the Archbishop's successor followed swiftly after the announcement of his resignation. He was taken fully into the Prime Minister's confidence over this—and the consequential appointments. There was, indeed, not a moment's doubt in the Archbishop's mind as to who that successor should be—Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of York since 1908. The Archbishop's record is as follows:

> Baldwin has been kindness itself, and has come repeatedly to Lambeth to talk things over, besides seeing me in the House of Commons and in Downing Street. . . . There is no parallel, I am sure, to the speed with which these things have been settled. But the speed did not in the least mean carelessness or lack of trouble, for we have given hours to the matter and Baldwin has honestly grappled with the difficulties. . . . His (Ebor's) appointment was really dramatic. I saw Baldwin at the King's Garden Party on Thursday, July 26, and he told me that he wanted some quiet talk

[1] Formerly private secretary to the Archbishop.

at Lambeth. I was able to tell him that Ebor had come to London that day and he would sleep at Lambeth. We accordingly arranged that Baldwin should come to Lambeth at 9.30 p.m. and that I would have Ebor there ready for a talk. This was a great relief to me for I had been rather set in a tremble by rumours during the previous 48 hours to the effect that Baldwin had in some way changed his mind; apparently there was no foundation for this. He came at night and I left him alone with Ebor for half an hour and then we all three discussed the other appointments—to York, to Manchester, to Chelmsford, supposing these to be the men promoted. Wonderful to relate, the whole thing was carried out within the week. Baldwin came again to Lambeth and saw Temple, on the Monday night, July 30th, Temple being on his way for a holiday in France. It was all arranged then and there, though of course Temple had thought it all over carefully owing to the popular expectation. Temple . . . approved of Chelmsford being his successor, and Chelmsford accordingly met Baldwin on Wednesday, came straight from Baldwin to me, and the matter was clinched.

In August, the Archbishop went for his regular holiday to Scotland, going the familiar round with the omission of Cloan, since Lord Haldane had died. He returned at the end of September, and then came a winding up both at Canterbury and Lambeth. Interspersed with it all were 'the large and deep things attaching to the great laying down of an office after a quarter of a century of leadership':

One had little time, I fear, for adequate quiet thought about it all, and yet I do not think that on any single day I began it lightly or prosaically—so far as my own thoughts went.

The last Bishops' Meeting which he attended was held on September 25–7. It was an important meeting and concerned the future policy of the episcopate in the matter of Prayer Book Revision; but, while present, he left the guidance of the discussion to the Archbishop of York. On October 22, he received the freedom of the City of London at the Guildhall—and this honour, given in the presence of a great and representative assembly, pleased him much. Never before (he said) had any ecclesiastic thus been honoured *qua* ecclesiastic, and he took the 'unexpected honour' characteristically enough as a tribute to the interweaving of the Church and national life, and the Church's task to witness to righteousness as above denominational interests.

Another honour which gave him still greater satisfaction when it was announced on November 3 was his nomination to a peerage. For thirty-three years he had been one of the spiritual peers, and throughout that time he had taken an active part in Parliamentary work. There was a widespread feeling that means ought to be found by which his experience and advice would still be at the service of the country in the House of Lords. Accordingly the King, on the advice of the Prime Minister, created him a Baron, and he took the title of Lord Davidson of Lambeth. There were some, like Lord Rosebery, who felt that, if he were to take his place in the House of Lords after resignation of the office which made him First Subject of the Crown, he should be given a Dukedom. There were others who felt that, having been in the House of Lords as Archbishop of Canterbury, he could not fitly return there in any lesser capacity. But the Archbishop himself did not see any anomaly in re-entering the House of Lords as a temporal peer. He quite clearly wished still to have his place in that Chamber; but he also quite clearly only desired the qualification for entry and he did not trouble his head about the question of rank in the peerage. The possession of a barony supplied the qualification, and that was all that was requisite.

On November 3, he went to Canterbury for the last time as Primate. Here he dedicated a Memorial to Viscount Milner, in the Cathedral, where the Chapel of S. Martin of Tours had been restored by Lord Milner's personal friends.

On Sunday, November 4, he preached his farewell sermon from the Cathedral pulpit. The crowds all day were very large, craning for a sight of the old Archbishop, as he went to and from the Cathedral and his home. His sermon (which was broadcast) was simple and full of hope. Its keynote was struck in the following sentences:

> An old man has the gain of being able to look back. He can think not only, as we all think within these walls, about the varied blessings and the fruitful captaincies of former centuries. He thinks, too, about what in the long years his own eyes have seen. At fourscore I look back along 50 years of serious service—25 of special trust and answerableness. So looking, I say to you to-night, as my firm conviction, that the Church of England to-day, whatever her difficulties, is far stronger, far more zealous, has a truer vision of God's purpose, and is more united—yes, more united in effort

and in prayer—than it was when my working years began.' It may seem to be a paradox, but it is true that these Prayer Book discussions in themselves—until some jarring notes, relating to a few points only, raised trouble at the close—have evolved a deeper and more thoughtful spirit of unity in purpose and in prayer than any we have known before.

But that unity in extended prayer is only one of the firm foundations we have for thankful confidence and high hope. Who shall measure the growth and deepening of our sense that God has been increasingly giving us a great trust as a Missionary Church in contemporary life? A Missionary Church, too, which is extending with free development throughout the world. Who again shall measure our growth in understanding other parts of the Church of Christ in East and West? Are we not beginning to see on a new scale how to embrace different types of Christian saintliness and thus perchance to have a pivot-place in a United Christendom? Think of the wider sense we have of the Church's obligation in the leavening of social and industrial life. You find little or no word of that in former days. And that we may do our enlarged work better our whole organic life has been made stronger and its touch closer with our brothers overseas. But underlying all that, I note with yet greater thankfulness in how many ways our spiritual life grows deeper, not least in a sounder and better reasoned appreciation of sacramental grace. On every one of these lines I am persuaded that our Church has been growing from strength to strength. God, not man, has been at work, both to will and to do of His good pleasure. And the old man whose duty it has been to mark and further the advance along all these lines and to compare the present with the past must surely bid you remember those much greater things when with penitence and resolve you are noting what is amiss.

On the Monday afternoon came the final departure for Lambeth. The Archbishop left the Old Palace quietly walking, as was so often his wont, to Canterbury East Station. Earlier in the day, when arrangements were being discussed, he remarked, 'I wish to avoid any dramatic departure.' Mrs. Davidson left two hours later, also by train. The friend of many years, Canon Thory Gage Gardiner, was at the station for the departure of each train to bid them farewell.

November 12 was the day of the golden wedding. It began with a celebration of the Holy Communion in Lambeth Palace Chapel, at the very altar before which Randall Davidson and

Edith Tait had been joined in matrimony fifty years before. Joining with them in deep thanksgiving for the blessings of that long married life were members of their family and many intimate friends. All day long deputations, gifts, and good wishes poured into the house, the gifts including a golden bowl from the King.

During the afternoon the Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson received a large number of the inner circle of their friends, and at 5 o'clock these assembled in the Chapel for a final act of praise and thanksgiving. Achievements and disappointments, joys and sorrows, the love of friends, and all the varied associations of fifty years were gathered together on that afternoon of golden memories. The Archbishop by the light of a silver candlestick held in his own hand read the words from Philippians i. 3, 'I thank my God upon every remembrance'.

At 6 p.m. the Prime Minister, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, came as the representative of the Nation to present the Nation's gift. He was accompanied by other members of the Tribute Committee, including the Archbishop of York, Lord Stamfordham, Sir Thomas Inskip, Lord Cornwallis, Dr. Scott Lidgett, and Dr. Carnegie Simpson. The Archbishop and Mrs. Davidson received them in the study, some intimate friends being also present. The Archbishop of York read the address, which closed with these words:

> It is our earnest prayer, and we are confident it is the earnest prayer of all who offer you this tribute, that God may crown the many gifts which He has bestowed upon you and upon Mrs. Davidson in your fifty years of united service, with the gift of His abiding peace.

The Prime Minister followed with words which while touching in their simplicity were significant by their insight—for in dwelling on the admiration he felt for the Archbishop's character he declared that what he had chiefly learnt from him was the power of love unfeigned.

Then came a gift from the Diocese of Canterbury, consisting of a cheque, together with bookshelves for the study in his new home bearing the inscription "ΞΥΛΙΝΑ ΑΝΤΙ ΧΡΥΣΕΙΩΝ".

In the evening, Bishop Brent and the Rev. Dr. Ogilby brought the gift from the Episcopal Church in the United States of America—a golden inkstand together with a cheque.

At midnight the resignation took effect, and Randall Davidson ceased to be Archbishop of Canterbury.

CHAPTER LXXXIV

THE END

For life, with all it yields of joy and woe,
And hope and fear,—believe the aged friend,—
Is just our chance o' the prize of learning love,
How love might be, hath been indeed, and is.[1]

ROBERT BROWNING, *A Death in the Desert.*

ON November 14, the Archbishop and Lady Davidson left Lambeth Palace, and stayed as the guests of General Sir Neville Lyttelton at the Governor's House, Chelsea, while their new house in Cheyne Walk was being made ready. The same day he took his seat in the House of Lords as Baron Davidson of Lambeth. He sat on the Cross benches, and from time to time took part in debate, while further assisting on certain committees. He also had the happiness of still being able to attend the meetings of the Trustees of the British Museum, which had been one of his most prized public duties ever since 1884. His note is as follows:

> One very pleasing incident is perhaps worth recording.
>
> I have been a Trustee of the British Museum since Queen Victoria appointed me in 1884. That position came to an end when as Archbishop I became ex-officio a 'Principal Trustee'. That again came to an end by my resignation, but I could not revert to the former post, as it is now held by Lord Esher. Thereupon the Trustees decided to get a vacancy made somehow to elect me. Lord Kilbracken most generously resigned and I was elected, and then they revived the use of an ancient statute allowing for the increase of the number of the Standing Committee—they increased it by one so as to give me a place thereon. It was a remarkable testimony, and to me a very pleasant one, for though I am not in the Chair at meetings I am practically carrying on as before, and must do it with thoroughness if I am to justify all their kindness.[2]

Another event which gave him pleasure was his entertainment

[1] These lines from *A Death in the Desert* were printed on the letter of thanks sent by Archbishop and Lady Davidson to the many friends who sent them messages in their 'going out from Lambeth', November 1928.

[2] See p. 1199.

as the guest of honour by the Athenaeum Club on December 11, 1928. Twenty-five years before, at the opening of his Primacy, some twenty-four members, nearly all laymen, and a brilliant representation of the Club, had given him a dinner, in circumstances already described,[1] the Prime Minister, Mr. Balfour, being in the chair. On the present occasion the Club desired to do honour to Lord Davidson and Lord Balfour together, as senior trustees, on the attainment of their eightieth birthdays. Lord Balfour was unable to attend, owing to ill health. Over a hundred and fifty members were present, with the junior trustee, Lord Warrington of Clyffe, as chairman. The only speeches were those of the chairman, proposing the Archbishop's health, and his Grace's reply.

But the transformation of daily life and interest which resignation brought, was indeed profound. Unlike statesmen accustomed to the spells of comparative idleness and detachment which a change of government brings, the Archbishop never had been out of office, and he found it difficult to realize the full gravity of the difference which twenty-four hours could bring to the whole habit of his life. Looking back four months later—the first time he dictated a Memorandum about himself after his resignation—he described the position as follows:

> Anyhow, after several months have passed, I am able better to judge and to consider quietly what the change means. So far as I am personally concerned, the position is different from what I had visualized beforehand. I had thought of getting quietly out of things, yet being for some time in a position of a good deal of responsibility, and instead of that it looks to me as if a shutter has come down with a run, like a draper's shop on a Saturday afternoon—and that lo and behold I was somewhere outside it—out of all touch and out of all responsibility—and all in the space of a few hours. Perhaps this sounds, even to oneself, like a want of appreciating the kindness of everybody. It is not so. I do not know what more either the new Archbishop or his friends could have done. It was my own misunderstanding of how things shaped themselves at such a juncture.

In the other memoranda written intermittently during the next twelve months, similar thoughts find expression. And though the change for Lady Davidson was different in character it was

[1] See p. 406.

perhaps no less great—as the Archbishop fully understood. He wrote:

> What it has meant to Edith I can hardly put into words. I have been intensely impressed by her quietness and courage throughout it all. . . . It is all of a piece with what she has been for 50 years.

The new house at 10 Cheyne Walk was thoroughly comfortable. It had a little chapel where family prayers were regularly said. And the study, furnished with book-cases, specially designed by Mr. T. F. W. Grant, a gift from the Diocese, was admirably equipped, and, thanks to Lady Davidson, everything was done to make the new house home. But there is no denying that the Archbishop felt the difference between it and Lambeth, and the whole change which it symbolized to him, patient as he never ceased to be. He found it hard to have so little to do—and not to be wanted:

> I will not deny that I have found the adjustment to the new life intensely difficult. I have felt the comparative smallness of the house: I have missed what was I suppose the unconscious stimulus of intercourse with men of all shades of opinion. I have felt the lack of the spur of a daily round of work which had then and there to be done. This is a little different from the help given by the greater stimulus and invigoration of being in the centre of 'affairs'. And it has been strange not to have the sense of being 'wanted' at every hour of the day, and sometimes night. (*Jan. 5, 1930.*)

The pang was all the keener, as, within three weeks of his enthronement on December 4, the new Archbishop fell dangerously ill at Canterbury, and was out of action till the summer, while he himself was or felt comparatively hale. The early weeks of resignation were also overshadowed by the King's grave illness, which he felt intensely.

His relations with his successor were as frank and intimate as ever. There was no sort of nervousness on the part of the new Archbishop about the old Archbishop intervening in troublesome ways. His advice was welcomed though 'it is obvious that there are a great many details of administration on which he [Archbishop Lang] will act on lines differing widely from my own'; and 'certainly he will be free from what some of those dearest to me regard as my temptation, or weakness, of consulting too many people'.

His advice was still sought by many, both at home and overseas; and his old talent of giving the whole of his mind and will to the needs of those who consulted him was not suffered to rust. He entertained many friends; and nothing pleased him and Lady Davidson more than seeing and welcoming Bishops and others on their journeys to London. One of the visits he himself most enjoyed was a visit he paid to Archbishop Lang, at Bognor, in March 1929, when he had long talks with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the King, who were both convalescent from grave illness within a mile of one another at Aldwick.

He was much in request for speeches and sermons, and was not unwilling to accept such invitations. On June 9, 1929, he and Lady Davidson spent two nights at the Deanery, Canterbury, in order to take part in the consecration of his former chaplain (G. K. A. Bell) as Bishop of Chichester. In the summer of 1929, he took an active part in the difficulties which had arisen over the proposed new sacristy which had been designed by Walter Tapper as an additional building on the north-east side of Westminster Abbey, and became chairman of the committee formed by the Dean of Westminster to give advice. But though he took the greatest pains, going over the whole of the Abbey buildings more than once, his labour was in vain, as the money offered to build the sacristy was withdrawn in view of the controversy which the proposal caused.

One task loomed ahead as likely to claim a good deal of his time. This was the sorting of his papers, and in particular the handling of the piles of Memoranda he had made at nearly all stages of his public life. On March 16, 1929, he wrote:

> I do want intensely to get forward with the papers of the past in my own life, and to leave rough-hewn behind me some kind of history of the last 50 years, wherein during that period I have been for the latter half principal, and for the former half cognisant of and sharing, in all that was taking place.

And many were the people, both friends and acquaintances, who pressed upon the Archbishop that his really urgent duty was the preparation of a biography, and that the other things he was doing were comparatively unimportant. It is true that a good deal of work was done towards compiling the book—especially for the earlier part of his life before 1900—but on February 23, 1930 (the date of his last dictated Memorandum),

he admitted that 'Mary and I have not been making very rapid progress with biographical work'. It was not very easy, especially at eighty-one, to apply the mind in a systematic way to autobiographical toil; and the whole task proved more exacting than a stranger might suppose.

The last big event in his life was his visit to Scotland to take part in the final act of the Union of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland, by speaking at the final evening session of the first reunited General Assembly, held in the large Hall in Annandale Street, Edinburgh, on October 3, 1929. The Duke of York sat in the Royal Throne as Lord High Commissioner, and the Right Reverend Dr. John White presided as Moderator. In introducing Lord Davidson, the Moderator referred to his previous visit to their separate Assemblies in 1921 when he addressed them on the Lambeth Conference's Appeal for the Reunion of Christendom; and, in the name of all, he welcomed him now alike for his work's sake and for his own sake. Lord Davidson spoke both as a Scotsman and as a great leader of the Church. He described the nature of the discussions about Church truth and Church order over many years 'as more or less peculiar to us Scotsmen'. He spoke of Walter Scott, 'that most Scottish of Scotsmen', and the strong brush which he used in *Old Mortality*, *The Heart of Midlothian*, and elsewhere in his tales of Scottish history. He spoke also of the understanding which every Scotsman for generations had, more or less, of questions which would be quite unmeaning to ordinary folk elsewhere. And then he went on:

> If you will pardon a personal note, I was myself, in years not far after the Disruption, brought up in Scotland, and though I flitted early across the Tweed for training and education and work of quite another kind and allegiance, I have vivid memories of the talk of my elders in those days, and had heard of Auchterarder and Strathbogie long before I can have had a glimmer of what they stood for, and I regarded it as a kind of adventure when I was taken once in a way to listen to such men as Candlish and Guthrie at their best. Such memories come flooding in upon me now.

But his speech took a wider range than Scotland. He spoke of the Lambeth Appeal, and the responses received, of the first World Conference on Faith and Order held in Lausanne in 1927, a babe conceived in Edinburgh at the World Missionary Conference of

1910. He referred to the new efforts in Christian Unity being made by the great Churches in the East and to the one great exception, Rome, 'no helpful word or act comes from the City of the Seven Hills'. He emphasized the significance of the Scottish union, and of the part which Scottish thought must play in the whole field of Christian Unity. And he ended, first reminding the Assembly of the greatness of the Christian calling, and the war in which all Christians were enlisted and armed and united—a war to the death against the impurities and the laziness and the greed which mar and corrupt the common life: and then, in a final word, he commended to his younger brothers the lesson of hope which his eighty-one years had brought to him, and appealed to them, with their vigour of manhood and buoyancy of youth, to bring to its accomplishment the vision of unity which those whose course was wellnigh run had seen. It was a noble close, and received the loud applause of its hearers.

The speech, however, proved a severe tax, and on his return to London he was exhausted and over-tired.

> Dr. Cassidy declared the curious form of headache, together with rheumatism and lumbago, which was prostrating me, was due to over-fatigue, and that I must give up for the time being sermons and speeches to big audiences. (*Jan. 9.*)

He was obliged to cancel a further visit to Edinburgh and Glasgow in November, where he had promised to preach and speak for the Scottish Episcopal Church. During the latter weeks of 1929, he was only fairly well—and suffered at times from the same peculiar form of headache which in the last two or three years of his life was so real a trial.

On Friday, January 3, 1930, he went with Lady Davidson to the Exhibition of Italian Pictures at Burlington House, and was there taken with sharp pain due to old surgical troubles. He stayed a few days in bed, and the discomfort passed off. But in the next few weeks there were many ups and downs—days in bed, varied with short visits to the Italian Exhibition (which he much enjoyed), and some special committee work for the British Museum, besides seeing friends, and the sorting of papers. On Sunday, January 26, he celebrated Holy Communion for the last time in the little chapel at Cheyne Walk. On February 15, he attended church for the last time in the Old Church, Chelsea—for the christening of a grandson of an old friend, Tom Gordon

Duff. The same day, and again on February 28, he and Lady Davidson went to Horsted Keynes to see Miss Tait who was in poor health. During this fortnight, he was suffering acutely from a whitlow on his finger, which had been giving trouble for some time. He was still, however, eagerly thinking about his next big task. On February 23 he wrote:

> I have a few big things ahead which may or may not admit of ultimate accomplishment. The biggest will be the Lambeth Conference Sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral at the opening of the Conference. I have full hopes of being able to do it, and should be disappointed were it not to come off. At present unhappily I have no vision of what ought to be said.

His own share in the Lambeth Conference—though as a spectator from outside—occupied a good deal of his thought; and he looked forward to afternoons in Lambeth Palace garden during July when he could see and talk to Bishops from overseas. On Friday, March 7, and Saturday, March 8, he was at the British Museum. Lady Davidson and Mary Mills fetched him in the car on the Saturday. Mary Mills writes:[1]

> Though in pain and with his arm in a sling, he had enjoyed the meeting of the Trustees, and some talk he had had with the Archbishop of Canterbury. Before leaving we all three (together with the Archbishop of Canterbury) looked at the Luttrell Psalter and Bedford Book of Hours, which were on view. This was his last visit to the British Museum. In the evening he dined with Lord Stamfordham. This was the last time he left the house.

During the next few days he was partly in bed, and partly in the study, but in much pain and general discomfort. On March 17, it became clear that a nurse was necessary, the Archbishop, owing to the whitlow on his finger, being crippled in all his movements. The next day an emergency meeting of Harrow School Governors was held in his bedroom:

> The Archbishop was too unwell to come down to the study, and the Harrow Governors who came that morning, the 18th, met round his bed. The Warden of All Souls was there, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, Mr. Amery, Mr. Grenfell and several more. The Archbishop was in pain and discomfort and got through the meeting with much difficulty.

[1] The passages which follow describing the stages of the Archbishop's illness are from a memorandum written at the time by Mary Mills.

The Archbishop's illness grew worse, and two regular nurses, from St. John's and St. Thomas's Home, Nurse Amsden and Nurse Higgins, took up their quarters in the house. Both were carefully chosen.

> No better choice could have been made, and to our great comfort and help they stayed with us to the end. We soon settled down into a routine. In the morning after his quiet time of prayer with E.M.D., letters and reading—as of old the newspapers first; then the morning letters, which of course grew less and less as the weeks ran on; the reading of old journals and diaries—sometimes a friend would come in for a talk before luncheon time. After lunch he would rest, while E.M.D. and I went out for an hour or hour and a half.

Each day Lady Davidson would try to arrange that some one, preferably a man, should come to tea and have a talk with him afterwards. The Archbishop of Canterbury was among these visitors, who included Bishops and many old friends and chaplains: and every Sunday the Holy Communion was celebrated in his room, or the little chapel. On April 3, he became a little better and was able to lie on the sofa in his study. April 7, was his eighty-second birthday, and he was much touched by the many messages which reached him, including a visit paid the following day on the King's behalf by Lord Stamfordham.

> We had much reading aloud, including portions of his favourite *Waverleys*. We also read Stephen Gwynne's *Life of Walter Scott*, a book which gave him much pleasure. Easter Day, April 20th, was a great disappointment to him; his head was very bad and he suffered much discomfort. Bishop Montgomery celebrated and the maids sang 'The strife is o'er' outside his room' Later in the day he saw the Bishop of London and Bishop Gore. He came down as usual to the study. He stayed for prayers in the evening and blessed us all from his chair by the fire.
>
> The next day he was again in the study and stayed up for prayers, giving the Blessing as on the previous evening. Earlier in the day we had read him the closing chapters of Scott's life, and he was much moved at the description of Sir Walter's last home-coming to the Border country.

After this the Archbishop seemed to get worse. As the days passed he seemed both depressed and often confused.

> Friday April 25th, St. Mark's Day, his Consecration day—was an anxious one. He slept most of the morning. In the afternoon

when we returned from our walk we found him unhappy and tired and confused. He was very weak and went to bed early. This was the last time he came downstairs.

Sir Thomas Barlow was away for a month, but Dr. Cassidy, who had been attending him with Sir Thomas for some time, kept a steady watch on his patient. All these days were days of long summer sunshine.

On Wednesday Sir John Rose Bradford came for a consultation with Dr. Cassidy. The Archbishop quite understood from the doctors that they wanted him to give himself up to rest. He saw Mr. Ellison for a few minutes. We read him *Old Mortality*.

On May 1st he was much interested in Edward Woods' Consecration as Bishop of Croydon in the Abbey. We had much reading of papers and some old journal-reading too. George and Hettie Bell saw him, and John Macmillan. E.M.D. had quiet talk with him about what to expect and plan for the future—a quieter life: preparation of papers: helping friends by counsel etc.

As the days slipped by, though there were occasional rallies, the Archbishop got weaker; though he still enjoyed seeing old friends, and appreciated the gifts they brought, sometimes conversations about passing events, sometimes spiritual help. He was always thankful for the prayers which were said beside him. And all the time he displayed a quite extraordinary patience and courage: and was consistently courteous and grateful to those about him.

There were times of real pain and much discomfort and weariness, but not one complaint ever crossed his lips. His nurses marvelled at it.

Nurses Amsden and Higgins nursed him devotedly; nor could anything exceed the care and solicitude of Sir Thomas Barlow and Dr. Cassidy. In the earlier stages when surgical help was required Mr. Pearce Gould gave every help in his power, and Miss Lloyd Still, of St. Thomas's Hospital, a friend of many years, was always ready with help of all kinds.

Then there was, again as ever, the strong determination to work just so long as strength endured, the morning's letters must be dealt with promptly, the papers read, and in the early days of the illness interviews arranged.

Every day up to the very last, he would ask each morning (using the phrase so often on his lips in full working days) 'What are

my duties to-day'—or 'what are my obligations' to-day—and in increasing weakness, each morning this question would be asked, sometimes almost in a whisper. And every morning the hand would be stretched out for the pocket book always by his side, the accusation being made sometimes that it was not being kept up to date.

One morning, not very long before the end, he handed it to me saying 'Tell me what we have to do to-day; there is so much written, but I cannot read it.'

Sunday May 18th, his last Sunday on earth—was very anxious. Mervyn Haigh celebrated in the little Chapel and took the Communion to him. He was very weak. After Mervyn Haigh and I had left the room and he was alone with E.M.D., in a clear voice he said part of the words of the Administration of the Bread: and then 'the Blessing of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost be upon you all'. E.M.D. asked if the blessing included Lucy; he replied 'Of course; it was *all*.' E.M.D. said that he spoke the words of blessing looking right *out*, and she was sure that he meant it to go far beyond his bedroom.

The same afternoon:

The Archbishop of Canterbury came and prayed with him. We read him little bits of *Beside the Bonnie Briar Bush*, and though he had been much confused and restless, the Scottish words and phrases seemed to soothe him. The third Nurse came.

On May 20 he saw the Archbishop of Canterbury for the last time.

The Archbishop of Canterbury asked for his blessing; he knelt by the bedside and asked him to put his hands on his head: then the words came

'God give you judgment [repeated twice],
God give you mercy,
God give you peace.'

After that he was quiet for a little. Later in the evening he blessed his household. At the close of his blessing he added very faintly 'We come to Thee in thankfulness and love; we come in trustfulness, simplicity and peace—but always simplicity.'

During the next few days, as his weakness increased, he saw several of his family and friends. On Friday evening, May 23, Sir Thomas Barlow returned from abroad and came straight from the station.

About midnight he became very restless. We stayed beside him. Dr. Cassidy came about 3 a.m. He was unconscious and breathing was difficult. We watched and prayed beside him. Mr. Ellison

came about 7 a.m., Sir Thomas Barlow soon after breakfast. All day long the difficult breathing. The Archbishop of Canterbury called and many others and beautiful flowers poured in for him. Sir Thomas and Dr. Cassidy were with us watching. We had the blinds up so that the evening light shone in upon him. And so the hours went on; we said prayers and hymns at intervals, and Mr. Ellison said the Commendatory Prayer; at about 12.30 the breathing grew quieter, and at 1.5 a.m. on Rogation Sunday morning it gently ceased.

When we saw him again a few hours later, dressed in his robes, he lay wrapped in peace, looking so young, so quiet, so 'satisfied'.

As the Archbishop himself wished, he was buried at Canterbury. The Dean of Westminster had at once offered Westminster Abbey, a fitting mark of the national esteem. But the Archbishop's own known wish was observed. The first part of the funeral was held in the Abbey on Ascension Day, Thursday, May 29. The Duke of Gloucester attended on behalf of the King, and all the main branches of public life were represented by the Pallbearers.[1] The same evening the body was borne by car to Canterbury. A few moments' pause was made outside Lambeth Palace, where were gathered the Bishops of Southwark and Kingston and a group of South London clergy. The little procession was met at the Westgate of Canterbury by the Mayor and Corporation, the City Clergy, and the students of St. Augustine's College. It passed through the crowded but silent streets, reaching the West Doors of the Cathedral at 9.15 p.m. in the after-glow of a lovely sunset. There it was met by the Dean and Chapter and Choir, and, to the singing of 'I am the Resurrection and the Life', the coffin was carried through the Nave, down to the Crypt, where it lay all night before the Altar in the Undercroft Chapel of Our Lady, the Chapel linked to the Archbishop and Lady Davidson by special associations. Here next morning the Holy Communion was celebrated in the presence of a large congregation. Then the coffin was taken to the Choir below the High Altar.

The Burial Service in the afternoon was taken by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Dover, and the Dean of Can-

[1] The Pallbearers were Mr. Stanley Baldwin, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Lord Stamfordham, the Earl of Selborne, Sir Lewis Dibdin, Sir Frederic Kenyon, the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, D.D., and Sir Thomas Barlow.

terbury. A very large number of Bishops and clergy were present. There was a remarkable gathering of the Archbishop's former chaplains, the Bishop of Chichester carrying the Crozier given to the Archbishop in 1920 by the Bishops attending the Lambeth Conference. The Cathedral was crowded, and those who could followed the procession to the Cloister Garth. The grave is opposite the Chapter House, under the shadow of Bell Harry Tower, and near to the Old Palace. It was lined with flowers, as also were the Cloisters and the Garth.

Lady Davidson and those nearest to her stood on the South side of the grave, the bishops facing her, and the chaplains gathered near by.

As the Archbishop of Canterbury read the words of Committal the rain fell in torrents. But it was a day of peace and thanksgiving for a long life nobly, patiently, and courageously lived in the service of the Church of England, and indeed of the whole Catholick Church of Christ.

APPENDIX I

PRINCIPAL DATES

1848 Randall Thomas Davidson born in Edinburgh (April 7).
1857 The family moved to Muirhouse.
1862 Entered Harrow.
1866 Serious shooting accident (August).
1867 Entered Trinity College, Oxford. (First Lambeth Conference.)
1868 Dr. Tait appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.
1871 B.A. Third Class Law and Modern History.
1872 Italian Tour. Commenced training for ordination at the Temple.
1872–3 First visit to Palestine.
1874 Ordained Deacon (March 1). Curacy at Dartford.
1875 Ordained Priest (February 21).
1876 Second visit to Palestine.
1877 Went to Lambeth Palace as Resident Chaplain to Archbishop Tait.
1878 Second Lambeth Conference.
1878 Married Edith Tait (November 12).
1882 Death of Archbishop Tait (December 3).
1882 First interview with Queen Victoria (December 9).
1883 Dr. Benson appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.
1883 Installed Dean of Windsor (June 25).
1888 Third Lambeth Conference.
1888–90 Trial of Bishop of Lincoln (Edward King).
1889 Publication of *Lux Mundi* (*editor* Charles Gore).
1891 Consecrated Bishop of Rochester (April 25). Serious illness (May 6). Publication of *Life of Archbishop Tait* (R. T. D. and W. Benham).
1894 Viscount Halifax and Abbé Portal: first attempt at rapprochement with Rome.
1895 Appointed Bishop of Winchester. Resignation of Rev. R. R. Dolling.
1896 *History of the Lambeth Conferences, 1867, 1878, 1888* published.
1896 Death of Archbishop Benson (October 11). Dr. Temple appointed Archbishop of Canterbury.
1897 Fourth Lambeth Conference.
1898–1900 Ritual Controversy. Sir William Harcourt's Letters.
1899 Charge to Diocese of Winchester.
1899–1902 South African War.

1900 Archbishop Temple's Decision on Reservation (Lambeth Hearing).
1901 Death of Queen Victoria (January 22). Accession of King Edward VII. Dr. Winnington Ingram appointed Bishop of London.
1902 Canon Charles Gore consecrated Bishop of Worcester. Education Act. Death of Archbishop Temple (December 23).
1903 Appointed Archbishop of Canterbury (confirmed February 6).
1904 Visit to Canada and U.S.A. *The Christian Opportunity* (Addresses and Sermons) published.
1904–6 Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline.
1906 Royal Letters of Business issued to Convocations (Prayer Book Revision).
1906 Mr. Birrell's Education Bill. Rejection by House of Lords.
1907 Deceased Wife's Sister's Marriage Act.
1908 Fifth Lambeth Conference.
1908 Mr. Runciman's Education Bill withdrawn.
1909 Dr. Lang became Archbishop of York.
1909 Mr. Lloyd George's Budget rejected by House of Lords.
1910 Death of King Edward VII (May 6).
1911 King George V crowned (June 22).
1911 *Captains and Comrades in the Faith* (Addresses and Sermons) published.
1911 Parliament Act.
1912 Charge to the Diocese of Canterbury. *The Character and Call of the Church of England.*
1912 Publication of *Foundations* (*editor* B. H. Streeter).
1913 Conference at Kikuyu, East Africa.
1914 Canterbury Convocation. Resolution on Clerical Orthodoxy (April).
1914 European War commenced (August 4).
1916 National Mission of Repentance and Hope.
1916 Canterbury Convocation. Resolution on Reprisals (February).
1916 Archbishop's visit to the Front (May).
1917 Canterbury Convocation. Resolution on Reservation (February).
1917 Russian Revolution.
1918 Dr. Henson consecrated Bishop of Hereford.
1918 European War ceased (November 11).
1919 Archbishop's second visit to the Front (January).
1919 *The Testing of a Nation* (Addresses and Sermons) published.
1919 National Assembly of the Church of England (Powers) Act.
1920 Convocations' Answers to Royal Letters of Business completed.

1920 Appointment of Committee of the Church Assembly to report on the Answers.
1920 Disestablishment of the Welsh Church took effect.
1920 Mr. H. A. L. Fisher's Proposals (Elementary Schools) published.
1920 Lord Buckmaster's Matrimonial Causes Bill carried in House of Lords (June).
1920 Sixth Lambeth Conference.
1921 Irish Settlement.
1921 The Malines Conversations began under presidency of Cardinal Mercier.
1922 Oecumenical Patriarch, Meletios, enthroned at Constantinople.
1922 Russian Patriarch Tikhon arrested. Archbishop's Protest to Lenin.
1922 Archbishop preached at Geneva before the opening of Third Assembly of League of Nations.
1922 Appointment of Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission.
1923 Treaty of Lausanne.
1923 Duke of Devonshire's White Paper on Indians in Kenya.
1925 House of Bishops commenced Revision Stage of Prayer Book Assembly Measure (October).
1926 Death of Cardinal Mercier.
1926 General Strike (May 3–12).
1927 Prayer Book Measure approved by Church Assembly (July 6).
Prayer Book Measure approved by House of Lords (December 14).
Prayer Book Measure rejected by House of Commons (December 15).
1928 Prayer Book Measure (amended) approved by Church Assembly (April 27).
Prayer Book Measure (amended) rejected by House of Commons (June 14).
Received Freedom of City of London (October 22).
Resignation (November 12).
1929 Addressed first Reunited General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (October 3).
1930 Death (May 25).

APPENDIX II

A LIST OF APPOINTMENTS TO DIOCESAN SEES IN THE PROVINCES OF CANTERBURY AND YORK BETWEEN FEBRUARY 6, 1903, AND NOVEMBER 12, 1928

Date of Confirmation of Election or Investiture	*See*	*Name of Bishop*	*Name of Prime Minister*
1903			
April 3	Winchester	Herbert Edward Ryle	The Rt. Hon A. J. Balfour
April 30	Exeter	Archibald Robertson	,,
May 12*	St. Albans	Edgar Jacob	,,
June 4	Newcastle	Arthur Thomas Lloyd	,,
November 26	Manchester	Edmund Arbuthnott Knox	,,
1904			
November 14	Southwell	Edwyn Hoskyns	,,
1905			
January 27	Birmingham	Charles Gore	,,
February 1	Carlisle	John William Diggle	,,
February 24	Worcester	Huyshe Wolcott Yeatman-Biggs	,,
May 24	Southwark	Edward Stuart Talbot	,,
May 30	Gloucester	Edgar Charles Sumner Gibson	,,
May 30	Llandaff	Joshua Pritchard Hughes	,,
July 5	Rochester	John Reginald Harmer	,,
October 17	Ely	Frederic Henry Chase	,,
1906			
November 29	Truro	Charles William Stubbs	The Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman
1907			
September 12	Newcastle	Norman Dumenil John Straton	,,
November 30*	Sodor and Man	Thomas Wortley Drury	,,
1908			
January 24	Chichester	Charles John Ridgeway	,,

Date of Confirmation of Election or Investiture	*See*	*Name of Bishop*	*Name of Prime Minister*
1909			
January 20	York	Cosmo Gordon Lang	The Rt Hon. H H. Asquith
1910			
April 22	Norwich	Bertram Pollock	,,
June 23	Lincoln	Edward Lee Hicks	,,
1911			
May 1	Winchester	Edward Stuart Talbot	,,
May 25*	Southwark	Hubert Murray Burge	,,
October 17	Oxford	Charles Gore	,,
October 17	Salisbury	Frederic Edward Ridgeway	,,
October 28*	Birmingham	Henry Russell Wakefield	,,
1912			
January 19	Ripon	Thomas Wortley Drury	,,
March 25*	Sodor and Man	James Denton Thompson	,,
July 24	Truro	Winfrid Oldfield Burrows	,,
1913			
June 13	Lichfield	John Augustine Kempthorne	,,
1914			
February 24*	Chelmsford	John Edwin Watts-Ditchfield	,,
February 24*	St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich	Henry Bernard Hodgson	,,
March 21	Sheffield	Leonard Hedley Burrows	,,
June 12	Bristol	George Nickson	,,
1915			
November 30*	Newcastle	Herbert Louis Wild	,,
1916			
September 20	Peterborough	Frank Theodore Woods	,,
December 20	Exeter	Lord William Gascoyne Cecil	,,
1918			
January 23	Hereford	Herbert Hensley Henson	The Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd George
October 23	Coventry	Huyshe Wolcott Yeatman-Biggs	,,
1919			
February 19	Worcester	Ernest Harold Pearce	,,
July 9	Chichester	Winfrid Oldfield Burrows	,,
July 31	Chester	Henry Luke Paget	,,
August 6	Oxford	Hubert Murray Burge	,,

Date of Confirmation of Election or Investiture	*See*	*Name of Bishop*	*Name of Prime Minister*
1919			
October 8	Truro	Frederic Sumpter Guy Warman	The Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd George
October 18*	Southwark	Cyril Forster Garbett	,,
1920			
January 2	Lincoln	William Shuckburgh Swayne	,,
February 2*	Bradford	Arthur William Thomson Perowne	,,
April 19	St. Albans	Michael Bolton Furse	,,
July 27	Durham	Herbert Hensley Henson	,,
August 23	Carlisle	Henry Herbert Williams	,,
August 23	Ripon	Thomas Banks Strong	,,
October 5	Hereford	Martin Linton Smith	,,
1921			
January 24	Manchester	William Temple	,,
July 25*	St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich	Albert Augustus David	,,
October 31	Bath and Wells	St. John Basil Wynne-Willson	,,
December 16	Salisbury	St. Clair George Alfred Donaldson	,,
1922			
June 24*	Coventry	Charles Lisle Carr	,,
1923			
January 24	Gloucester	Arthur Cayley Headlam	The Rt. Hon. A. Bonar Law
October 9	Chelmsford	Frederic Sumpter Guy Warman	The Rt. Hon. S. Baldwin
October 18	Liverpool	Albert Augustus David	,,
October 26	Truro	Walter Howard Frere	,,
November 1*	St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich	Walter Godfrey Whittingham	,,
December 28	Winchester	Frank Theodore Woods	,,
1924			
January 30	Peterborough	Cyril Charles Bowman Bardsley	,,
March 24	Ely	Leonard Jauncey White-Thomson	,,
Sept. 29*	Birmingham	Ernest William Barnes	The Rt. Hon. J. Ramsay Macdonald

Date of Confirmation of Election or Investiture	*See*	*Name of Bishop*	*Name of Prime Minister*
1925			
February 24*	Sodor and Man	Charles Leonard Thornton-Duesbery	The Rt. Hon. S. Baldwin
October 13	Oxford	Thomas Banks Strong	,,
1926			
January 5	Ripon	Edward Arthur Burroughs	,,
March 25*	Southwell	Bernard Oliver Francis Heywood	,,
1927			
January 26	Blackburn	Percy Mark Herbert	,,
February 15	Leicester	Cyril Charles Bowman Bardsley	,,
March 23	Peterborough	Claude Martin Blagden	,,
June 28	Guildford	John Harold Greig	,,
July 13	Portsmouth	Ernest Neville Lovett	,,
October 5	Newcastle	Harold Ernest Bilbrough	,,
October 12	Derby	Edmund Courtenay Pearce	,,
1928			
June 11*	Sodor and Man	William Stanton Jones	,,
September 27	Southwell	Henry Mosley	,,
November 1*	Wakefield	James Buchanan Seaton	,,

NOTE

The date given in the foregoing Table is that of the Confirmation of the Election of the Bishop-designate, or of his Investiture, except where the date is marked by *, which signifies the date of consecration. Confirmation on behalf of the Archbishop of the Province takes place after an election by the Dean and Chapter. In dioceses where there is no Dean and Chapter, and the Bishop-designate is being translated from another see, the Archbishop invests the Bishop-designate The material parts of the Investiture consist of the Bishop-designate taking the oaths of Allegiance and Canonical obedience, and making the Declarations of Assent and against Simony. The Archbishop then formally accepts the Bishop-designate as Bishop of the new see, and invests him so that he may enjoy all the rights, privileges, jurisdictions, and emoluments belonging to the Bishopric. In dioceses where there is no Dean and Chapter, and when the Bishop-designate is a priest, there is no investiture; the Bishop-designate becoming Bishop of his see by his consecration.

SUMMARY

Number of Diocesan Bishops appointed Feb 6, 1903–Nov. 12, 1928 . . 80
under King Edward VII 20
under King George V 60

EPISCOPAL APPOINTMENTS 1903–28

Number appointed in	Premiership of	Mr. A. J. Balfour	14
„	„	Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman	4
„	„	Mr. H. H. Asquith	19
„	„	Mr. D. Lloyd George	20
„	„	Mr. A. Bonar Law	1
„	„	Mr. S. Baldwin	21
„	„	Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald	1

INDEX

NOTE. To facilitate identification and to avoid confusion, some of the *dramatis personae*, variously designated in the text of the book, are entered in this Index under their original names, and their chief subsequent titles or positions are added—e.g. 'Gore, Charles (successively Canon of Westminster, Bp. of Worcester, Bp. of Birmingham, and Bp of Oxford)'. For the same reasons, and also to save space, frequent use is made, in the earlier part of the Index, of the initials 'R.T.D.' to indicate the principal *persona* of the book. Various contractions are also employed, e g. 'Q. Victoria' for Queen Victoria

The entries in the Index under Randall Davidson's name, while they are primarily pointers to the pages of the text, are also intended to form a brief summary of his whole life.

Abbot, H. N , i. 20, 20*n*.
Acton, Lord, i. 170, 244.
Ad Anglos, i 237
Adderley, Hon and Rev. J , i 226.
Addington Park, Croydon, i 297–8.
Adeney, Rev J. H , ii. 1108–10
Adler, Dr , Chief Rabbi, thanks R.T.D. for letter expressing sympathy with sufferers by Jewish persecution in Russia, i. 485–6
Africa, British East, linguistic problem in, i 563–6, the rights of natives, ii 1229–35 (*see also* 'Native Education in British Tropical African Dependencies')
Aged Poor, R. Commn on, i 223
Ainger, Canon, i. 407.
Albani, Madame, i 357.
Albanian Church, ii. 1111–12.
Albany, Duke of (son of Q. Victoria), i. 80, death, i 81.
Albany, Duchess of, i 78, 89, 153; at Q. Victoria's death, i 352
Albert Victor, Prince, i. 160.
Alexander, W , Bp of Derry, i. 40
Alexandra, Queen (as Princess of Wales), i. 119, 354, (as Queen), i. 357, (as Queen Mother), i. 609, 610
Alverstone, Visct , Ld Chief Justice of Eng. i. 366, 407, is a member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline (1904), i. 462.
America—visit of Abp and Mrs. Davidson to, i. 442–53.
Andrewes, Bp. Lancelot (1555–1626), i. 259, 330, 338, 441.
Andrews, Rev. C. F., ii. 1231–5
Anglican Orders, validity of, i. 228 *et seq.*, ii. 1106–7.
Anglo-Catholic Congress (1920), ii. 1034–6, 1136, 1154.
Anglo-German friendship, efforts to promote, i 498, 590–3, 655–61.
Anne, Queen, i. 1; infant child of, buried in royal vault at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, i 98.
Anson, Canon F., i. 69.
Anson, Sir Wm., i. 407; on the Parliament Act (1911), i. 630; Report (1912) of R. Commn on Marriage Laws (1909), ii 991, opposes Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii 992.
Anthony, Metropolitan of St Petersburg, i. 484–5
Antonine, Pres of so-called Supreme Ch Council of the Russian Orthodox Ch. ii 1082–4
Antony, Metropolitan of Kieff, ii. 1068 *and n*, ii 1113.
'Appeal to all Christian People' (*see* 'Reunion, Christian')
Archbishops' Western Canada Fund, launched 1910, i 575–6
Argyll, Duke of, i 388, 832.
Armenian Christians, persecution of, i. 305–6, ii 1029, 1090.
Armes, Miss, i 35
Army Chaplains during the War, ii. 738, 761, 816, 848–50, memorial service in Westminster Abbey (1919), ii 950.
Arthur, Dr., ii. 1230.
Arthur, Sir Geo , ii. 740.
Ashton-Gwatkin, Canon W. H. T., i. 677
Asquith, Rt. Hon H. H., M.P., Prime Minister (afterwards Ld Oxford and Asquith) i. 153, 407, 432, Education Bill (1906), i 513–30, Education Bill (1908), i 532–40; the People's Budget (1909), i. 597, 605; the constitutional crisis (1910), i. 604–7; the Sovereign's

Declaration, i. 612–19; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 620–33, Tercentenary of the Bible, i. 638; alleged British naval attack on Germany, i. 656–7; Abp. Davidson's intimacy with him, i. 710; Irish crisis, i. 721–30; the outbreak of the Great War, ii. 733 *et seq.*; Old Palace, Canterbury, ii. 751; untrue statements under Govt. authority, ii. 753–4, use of poison gas by British soldiers, ii 758–60, 762–3; loses a son in the War, ii. 790, his fall, ii 791–3; Upsala peace conf., ii. 886–7, Russia, ii. 898–9; in retirement, ii. 898, 900, 914, 1081–2; death (1927) and question of burial in Westminster Abbey, ii. 1178; ii. 1218, his episcopal appointments, ii 1240–2; his condemnation of the General Strike (1926), ii. 1305.
Assyrian Church, ii. 1179–92.
Astbury, Mr. Justice, ii. 1314
Athanasian Creed, discussions in Convocation, i. 434–6, 487 (*see also* 'Prayer Book Revision').
Athenaeum Club, R. T. D.'s election to, i. 159, its dangers for R.T D. as Archbishop, i. 406, 407, ii. 1370–1.
Atholl, Duchess of, i. 79, ii. 1350
Atlay, J., Bp. (of Hereford), i. 133*n*, 241*n*.
Auckland Castle, i. 247.
Australian Church, 'legal nexus' with the Ch. of Eng., i 560–2
Australian Primacy, i. 106–7.
Australia, Western, treatment of aborigines in, i. 487–8.
Awdry, W., Bp successively of Southampton, Osaka, and South Tokyo, i. 255, 586.
Axham, Dr., ii. 1031.

Baker, J. Allen, M.P., i. 592, 657, ii. 733.
Baldwin, Rt. Hon. Stanley, M.P, Prime Minister (1923, 1924, and 1935), ii 1169, 1174, episcopal appointments, ii. 1250–1; General Strike (1926), ii. 1304–18; ii. 1364–6, 1369, pallbearer, ii 1380*n*.
Balfour, Lady Frances, i. 321.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., M P., Prime Minister (1902–5), (afterwards Ld. Balfour), i. 244, 336; ritual controversy (1888–90), beginning of R. T. D.'s intimacy, i. 346–50; death of Q. Victoria, i. 354; Education Act (1902), i. 372–81; nominates R T. D. for the Primacy, i. 384–5; i. 390, 400, 407; correspce. with R. T. D. about Turkish persecution of Macedonian Christians, i. 421–3; suggested apptmt. of R. Commn. on Marriage Laws, i. 425–9; R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline (1904), i. 454–61; replies to R. T. D. about possibility of intervention in Russo-Japanese War, i. 482; political crisis (1905) and Ch. questions, i. 495–6; resigns Premiership, i. 502; Education Bills (1906 and 1908), i. 529; constitutional crisis (1910), i 605, 607; attends Privy Council, i. 609; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 626, fresh revision of New Test., i. 639; intimate friendship with Abp Davidson, i. 710, Irish question, ii. 785; Ld Lansdowne's peace letter, i 847, Upsala peace confs., ii. 885; ii. 900, letter to Abp. Davidson on spiritual independence of the Ch. alongside national recognition of religion, ii. 957–9; attends Third Assembly of League of Nations, ii. 1207; his episcopal apptmts., ii. 1238–9
Balfour of Burleigh, Ld., i. 407, 414, 432, 720, 722; ii. 743.
Balmoral Castle, i. 75, 90.
Bamster v *Thompson* case, i. 555–7; ii. 999.
Barclay, Bp (*see* 'Jerusalem Bishopric').
Barker, H. A. (afterwards Sir Herbert Barker), ii. 1031–4.
Barlow, Sir Thomas, physician, i. 205, 245, one of the three doctors attending Q. Victoria in her last illness, i. 353–4, advises against R. T. D. accepting Bpric of London, i 360–1, i. 367–70, 581, 709–10, elicits from the Abp. a statement of his attitude with regard to reprisals in the War, ii. 832–4, ii 1054, attends the Abp in his last illness, ii. 1378 *et seq.*; pallbearer, ii. 1380*n*.
Barnes, E. W, successively Master of The Temple, Canon of Westminster, and Bp. of Birmingham, ii. 1253; his 'open letter' to the Abp. of Canterbury, ii. 1319–24; opposes the new Prayer Book, ii 1339.
Barnes, G. N, M.P., ii. 750.
Barry, Alfred, Abp of Sydney, i. 106.
Barry, F. R., Rev., Principal of Knutsford, later Canon of Westminster, ii. 944.
Batiffol, Mgr. Pierre, Malines 'Conversations', ii. 1280, 1291.
Battenberg, Princess Henry (*see* 'Beatrice, Princess').
Battin, Dr., ii. 918–19, 934.
Baynes, Bp. A. Hamilton, ii. 1119*n*.

Beaconsfield, Ld., Prime Minister, i. 77, 244.
Beal, Canon T. G., i. 576.
Beatrice, Princess (Q. Victoria's daughter), Princess Hy. of Battenberg, i. 78; marriage, i. 112; 150, 311, the Queen's death, i. 352–7; R. T. D.'s apptmt. to Primacy, 1 387.
Beauchamp, Earl, i. 1172.
Beeching, H. C., Dean of Norwich, i. 639.
Bell, G. K. A., resident chaplain to Abp. Davidson, afterwards Dean of Canterbury and, later, Bp. of Chichester, i. 46; ii. 1029, 1075–6, 1182–3, 1364, 1373, 1380.
Benham, Canon Wm., Archbishop Tait's *Life*, i. 159, 440–1.
Benjamin, Met. of Petrograd, ii. 1076–8.
Benson, Arthur C., son of Abp. Benson, i. 103, 281–2, 288–9; becomes joint editor with Ld. Esher of the 1st and 2nd Series of *Letters of Q. Victoria*, i. 412.
Benson, Edward White, successively Headmaster of Wellington, Bp. of Truro, and Abp. of Canterbury—the Primacy, 1. 52, 56–8, 60–2, consulted by Q. Victoria about apptmt. of R. T D. to Deanery of Windsor, 1. 63–6; opposes Decd Wife's Sister's Bill (1883), 1 96, his Ladies' Bible Class at Lambeth Palace, 1 96–7, on becoming Primate desires R T. D. to continue chaplaincy at Lambeth Palace, 1. 101, contrast between Tait and Benson in characteristics, 1. 101, in the manner of their death, 1. 282, relationship between Benson and R. T. D., i. 102 *et seq*, 202, 213; the Lambeth Conference of 1888, 1. 120; the Archbishop's Court and the Lincoln Judgement, 1. 124–49; is consulted by Q. Victoria about the possibility of R. T. D. becoming Bp. of Winchester, 1. 189–90; on Rev. C. G. Lang, 1. 207, the validity of Anglican Orders, 1. 229–37, influenza epidemic, 1. 238; sudden death at Hawarden (1896), 1. 281–2, Lincoln Judgement re-called, 1 466, Benson's views on prayers in the H. of Lords, 1 557.
Benson, Mrs., wife of Abp. Benson, 1. 63, death of the Abp., 1 281, 1. 289, letters to R. T. D.—on his apptmt. to the Primacy, 1. 388, on her youngest son's joining Ch. of Rome, 1. 412–13; (*also*, 1. 720; ii. 763, 773, 883).
Benson, Margaret, daughter of Abp. Benson, 1. 500.
Benson, Rev. Robert Hugh, youngest son of Abp. Benson, i. 412–14.
Bentley, Richard, i. 161.
Berry, Rev. Dr. S. M., ii. 1119*n*.
Besant, Mrs., interview with Abp. Davidson, i. 637–8.
Bethune-Baker, Rev. Dr. J. F., i. 677.
Bevan, Miss G. M., i. 500.
Biarritz, Q. Victoria's visit to, i. 153.
Bible, The—completion of Revised Version (1885), i. 112; tercentenary of Authorized Version (1611), i. 638, a question of copyright, i. 638–9; suggested fresh revision of the New Testament, i. 639
Bickersteth, Edw. H. (Bp.), nomination to the See of Exeter, i. 173, 175; Sunday opening of Museums, 1 222.
Bickersteth, Rev. Dr S., successively Vic. of Leeds and Canon of Canterbury, 1. 397.
Bigge, Sir Arthur (afterwards Ld. Stamfordham), *see* 'Stamfordham, Lord').
Bilbrough, H E., successively R. of Liverpool, Bp. Suffragan of Dover, and Bp. of Newcastle, ii. 771, 884, 1009, 1163, 1173
Birkbeck, W J., his help in the development of relations between the Ch. of Eng and the Orthodox Ch., ii. 1104.
Birkenhead, Ld. (Lord Chancellor), Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 992
Birmingham Bishopric, constitution of (1904), i. 492.
Birrell, Augustine, M.P., Pres of Bd of Education, his part in the Education controversy (1906–8), 1 510–30; attacks the Bps. for their attitude on social questions, 1. 541–5.
Bishoprics Bill (1913), 1 644–6, 721 *and n*.
Bishops' (private) Meetings at Lambeth Palace, 1. 507–9.
Bishops, apptmt. of, i. 162 *et seq*.; ii. 1236 *et seq*.
Bismarck, Prince (*see* 'Frederick, Empress of Germany').
Blackburne, Rev. H. W., Assist. Chap.-Gen. in France, afterwards Dean of Bristol, ii. 781.
Blomfield, C. J., Bp of London, i. 125, 128.
Blyth, Popham, Anglican Bp. in Jerusalem, i 116–18, ii 1226.
Board Schools (*see* 'Education, Religious').
Body, Geo., Canon of Durham, i. 279–80.
Bolton, Mr. T., i. 250.

Booth, Chas., i. 208, 223; *also* i. 720.
Booth 'General' Wm. (*see* 'Salvation Army').
Booth, 'General' Bramwell, ii. 832 (*see also* 'Salvation Army').
Bosanquet, B., i. 20*n*.
Botha, General, i. 480.
Bourne, Cardinal, R. C. Archbp. of Westminster, i. 517; ii. 749, 752, 951; disapproves of the Malines 'conversations', ii 1260; issues decided pronouncement against General Strike (1926), ii. 1312.
Boutflower, Cecil, Bp. of Dorking, S. Tokyo, and Southampton, i 716.
Bowlby, Canon, V. of Dartford, i. 34.
Boyd, Preb. F. L., ii 1034–6.
Boyd, W. G., Rev., i. 576.
Boyd-Carpenter, W., Canon of Windsor, afterwards Bp. of Ripon, i. 56, 64, 65, 69, 82, 88, 151, 166, 173, 181, 184, 188, 225, 356, 458, 460, 591–2, 661; death, ii 914.
Bradford, Sir E., i. 160.
Bradlaugh, Chas., i. 47.
Bradley, A. C, i. 639.
Bradley, Dean, of Westminster, i. 53, 370.
Braye, Ld., ii. 1001.
Brent, C. H., Bp. of Western New York, ii. 892, 896–7, 1011, 1368.
Bridgeman, Rev. M V. O., i. 545–6.
Bridgeman, Rt. Hon. W C., later Visc Bridgeman, Sec. of Mines, correspce with Abp. Davidson about Bishops' speeches in Convocation on coal strike (1921), ii. 1046–8.
Bridges, Robt:, Poet Laureate, i. 639
Bright, John, M.P., i. 153.
Bright, Rev. Dr. Wm , i. 108, 142.
British Broadcasting Company, ii. 1210; during General Strike (1926), ii. 1308–12.
British Gazette, ii. 1311–12.
British Museum—R. T. D. as Trustee, i. 109; ii 1195–9; Sunday opening question, i. 109; religious belief among younger scientific men at, i. 153–4, proposal that the B.M. should be taken over to house the Air Board during the War, ii. 867–8; the bringing back of treasures buried underground during the War, ii 915.
Broadhurst, Mr., M.P., i. 111.
Brooke, Canon C. E., i. 532, 534.
Broomhall, B., i. 436–8.
Brown, John, Victoria's servant, i. 81.
Browne, E. Harold, Bp. of Winchester, i. 52–3, 55–60, 135, 252 (*see also* 'Dolling, Father').
Browne, G. Forrest, successively Canon of St. Paul's, Bp. of Stepney, and Bp. of Bristol, i. 290, 596, 654.
Brownjohn, Rev. S. D., i. 292.
Brunel, Chancellor, i. 42.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. J., afterwards Ld. Bryce, i. 223–4; ii. 777, 900, 9e4.
Buckle, G. E., sometime editor of *The Times*, i. 407; ii. 1216.
Buckmaster, Visct., Ld. Chancellor, ii. 787–9; ii. 792; his Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 991–1002.
Bulgarian Atrocities in Macedonia, i. 548.
Bull, Rev. H. P., ii. 1025.
Buller, Lady Audrey, i 315–16.
Buller, Sir Redvers, commander-in-chief of Brit. Forces in early part of S. African War, i. 315–16.
Bullock-Webster, Canon, ii. 736, 1320.
Burge, H. M., successively Bp. of Southwark and Bp. of Oxford, his part in Convocation debates on clerical orthodoxy, i 687, 689; ii. 853; takes leading part in proposal of a Doctrinal Commn , ii. 1136 *et seq.*, and serves as Chairman of the Commn. until his death (1925), ii. 1150
Burnaby, Dr., Vicar-Gen. in 1868, i. 295
Burnham, Ld., ii. 883
Burroughs, E. A., Bp. of Ripon, ii. 767.
Burrows, W. O , Bp. of Chichester, ii. 1005.
Bury, Herbert, Bp. in N. and Central Europe, ii. 953.
Bury, Rev. Wm., i. 10–12.
Butler, Rev. Dr. Hy. Montague, successively headmaster of Harrow and Master of Trinity Coll., Cambridge, i. 16, 17, 20*n*; preaches sermon at R. T. D.'s consecration, i. 205; ii 764.
Butler, Dr. N. Murray, Pres of Columbia Univ., i. 445, ii. 1172.

Cabrera, Senor (*see* 'Plunket, Lord').
Cadogan, Ld., i. 630.
Caine, Hall, ii 832–8
Calderon, Philip, R.A., i. 160.
Cambridge, Duchess of, death, i. 153.
Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir Hy , M.P., i. 244, Abp. Davidson's letter of congratulation on his becoming Prime Minister (1905), and his reply, i. 502–3, the Education Bill of 1906, i. 513 *et seq.*; initial stage of Prayer Book Revision, i. 647–9; resigns Premiership, i. 532; death, i. 532, 579; the Abp.'s personal minis-

try to, i. 579–80; i. 710; episcopal apptmts., ii. 1239–40.
Canterbury, Archbishops of, referred to in this work: Stratford, J. (1333), Cranmer, T. (1533), Laud, W. (1633), Wake, W. (1716), Cornwallis, F. (1768), Moore, J. (1783), Manners-Sutton, C. (1805), Howley, W. (1828), Longley, C. T. (1862), Tait, A. C. (1868), Benson, E. W. (1883), Temple, F. (1896), Davidson, R. T. (1903), Lang, C. G. (1928). *See under* their respective names.
Canterbury City—R. T. D.'s first visit to, i. 27; offer to R. T. D of St. Mary Breadman, i. 37; Freedom of the City presented to him on his resignation of the Primacy, ii. 1365.
Canterbury Cathedral, restoration of John de Stratford's tomb in, by Abp. Davidson, i. 495, the appearance of the Cathedral in War time, ii 771, gathering of the whole of the clergy of the Dio. addressed by the Abp., ii. 771–4, the Abp.'s farewell sermon, ii. 1367.
Canterbury, Diocese of, alteration of boundaries, i. 492–4; *also* ii. 1161–2.
Canterbury, Old Palace—Abp. Temple secures its substitution for Addington, i. 297–8, visit of Mr. and Mrs Asquith, ii. 751 (*see also* ii. 1162).
Carnegie, Andrew, i. 161.
Carnegie, Canon W. H., ii. 846.
Carr, Lisle, afterwards Bp. of Coventry, ii. 854
Carrington, Ld., i. 475–6.
Carter, Canon T. T., i. 102, 131, 142, 279, ii. 803
Casement, Sir Roger, Congo Free State, i 546; the Irish Rebellion (1916) ,ii. 786–9.
Cassels, W. W., missionary Bp. of Western China, ii. 1227.
Cassidy, Dr., afterwards Sir Maurice—with Sir Thos. Barlow attends Abp. Davidson in his last illness, ii. 1375 *et seq.*
Cave, Visct., Home Secy., afterwards Ld. Chancellor, ii 888, 1031.
Cecil, Ld. Hugh, M.P., is consulted about apptmt. of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline (1904), i. 459; the education controversy (1906–8), i. 534; his part in securing passage through Parl. of Bishoprics Bill (1913), i. 644–6, ii. 1028, 1288, 1300, takes part in the Commons debates on Prayer Book Measures, ii. 1346, 1350.
Cecil, Ld. Robt., M.P., later Viscount Cecil, i. 532, 645; his support of peace efforts and proposed League of Nations, ii. 885, 910, 935; ii. 945–6; resigns from the Govt. (1919) on their post-War policy in regard to Welsh Disestabt., ii. 982; the Albanian Ch., ii. 1111–12; attends the Third Assembly of League of Nations, ii. 1207; *also* ii. 1360.
Cecil, Ld. Wm., Bp of Exeter, ii. 1339.
Cenotaph in Whitehall, unveiling of, ii 1037.
Challoner, Col , M P., i. 645.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Sir Austen, M.P , Foreign Minister , (1924–9), ii. 750.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, M.P., i. 153, 414.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Neville, M.P., as Director-General of National Service during the War, ii. 817; as Chancellor of the Exchequer, ii. 1175.
Chaplin, Visct., ii. 978.
Charges (R. T. D.'s), of 1894, i. 226–8; of 1899, i. 257–62; of 1912, *The Character and Call of the Church of England*, i. 544.
Charles I, relics of, replacement in royal vault at St George's Chapel, Windsor, i. 98–100.
Chase, F. H., successively Pres. of Queen's Coll. Cambridge, and Bp of Ely, i. 500, his part in Convocation debates on clerical orthodoxy, i. 672–89, ii. 736; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 867; ii. 1005.
Chavasse, Rev. C. M., Rect. of St. Aldate's, Oxford, ii 1301.
Chavasse, F. J., Bp. of Liverpool, i. 500; ii. 829–30.
Chelmsford Bpric., i 644–6.
Cheyne, Rev. Dr. T. K., Canon of Rochester, on Biblical criticism, i. 214–18, 396.
China, the development of the Anglican Ch in, ii. 1227–9.
Chinese Labour in the Transvaal, i. 474–80.
Christian, Princess, Q. Victoria's daughter, i. 78, 311.
Christian Socialism, i. 46.
Chrysanthos, Met. of Trebizond, ii. 1093–6.
Church Assembly: first session (July, 1920), ii. 1024, second session (Nov. 1920), ii. 1037, division of diocese of Winchester, ii. 1170–2, debates on Prayer Book Revision, ii. 1328–40 (*see* Enabling Act).

Church Association—the Lincoln Trial, i. 126 *et seq.*; i. 143–5.
Church Congress, Croydon (1877), i. 39–40.
Church, R. W., Dean of St. Paul's, i. 52, 116, 131, 149.
Churchill, Lady, i. 79
Churchill, Ld. Randolph, i. 26, 27.
Churchill, Winston, Colonial Secretary —dispatch (1921) on the policy of the Govt. as regards compulsory labour in British Colonies and Protectorates, ii. 1231; edits the *British Gazette*, the news-sheet issued by the Govt. during the General Strike (1926), ii. 1311.
Church Schools (*see* 'Education, Religious').
Cieplak, Monsignor, R. Cath. Abp. of Petrograd, ii. 1078–9.
Cilicia, famine in, i. 587
Clarence, Duke of, death and funeral, i. 238.
Clark, Francis, Highland attendant of Q. Victoria, i. 244.
Clark, Thos. M., Bp of Rhode Island, U.S.A., i. 442.
Clarke, Sir Edw., member of R Commn on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462; deprecates reprisals for German Zeppelin raids, ii. 777; presents to Abp Davidson largely-signed memorial in favour of postponing consideration of Prayer Book Revision until after the War, ii. 799–800.
Clayton, Rev. P. B., founder of Toc H in Eng., ii. 780; his organization of the Test School at Knutsford, ii. 944
Clements, Canon, Sub-Dean of Lincoln, i. 134.
Clergy, War service and National service, ii. 738–9, 762, 764–6, 775–6, 817, 887–90.
Clerical contumacy—Abp. (Thomson) of York requested to introduce into Parl a Bill substituting deprivation for imprisonment in cases of, i. 145–8
Clerical orthodoxy—debate and resolution of Canterbury Conv. on modern criticism and the creeds, i. 671–89, the subject avoided at the Lambeth Conf. (1920), ii. 1003–7
Cleworth, Canon, i. 534.
Clifford, Rev. Dr. John, attends conf. on industrial affairs, i. 225, his onslaught upon the Education Bill of 1902, i 376 *et seq.*; supports Education Bill of 1906, i. 514 *et seq.*; his attitude towards Education Bill of 1908, i. 534; is congratulated by R. T. D. on jubilee of his pastorate, i. 578–9; ii. 743, 744; opposed to the Enabling Bill (1919), ii. 974; takes part in, but withdraws from, conf. on the Fisher Proposals (1919) on religious education in elementary schools, ii. 1126.
Club, The—Abp. Davidson's justification of membership, ii. 1024; reminiscence of a dinner at, ii. 1028.
Coal Strikes—(1912), Abp. Davidson's speech in Convocation, i. 662; (1921), the Abp.'s proffered mediation and Bishops' speeches in Conv. debate on the strike, ii 1045–8; national stoppage (1926), leading to General Strike, ii. 1304.
Cockburn, Elizabeth, sister of Ld. Cockburn, second wife of Thomas Randall the younger, and grandmother of R T. D., i 4.
Cockburn, Ld , i. 5, 9.
Coleman, W. T., i. 394–5.
Coleridge, Ld , i. 223, 477, 479.
Collier, Hon. G., ii 818.
Collins, Sir Richard Henn, Master of the Rolls, i. 407
Collins, W. E., Bp of Gibraltar, ii. 1104.
Colvin, Rev Dr , minister of Cramond Parish Ch., i. 8
Colvin, Sir Sidney, i. 720.
Compton-Rickett, J., Pres. of Free Ch. Council, ii. 749.
Confession, R. T D 's Charge on (1899), i. 257.
Confirmation of the Election of Bishops, i. 292–7, 365–7.
Congo Free State, i. 546–7.
Connaught, Duke of, son of Q. Victoria, i 239, his presence at her death, i 353, i. 717.
Connaught, Prince Arthur of, i. 637; ii 990
Connor, Dean, of Windsor, i. 63, 65–7, 69, 76.
Conrad, Joseph, ii 1163.
Conscientious objectors, ii. 817–22; ii. 952–3
Conscription, first stage towards, ii. 761; second stage towards, ii. 764; further extension of age for compulsory military service, ii. 887.
Constantinople, the Patriarch (Joachim) of, i 416–20, 548
Consultative Body (*see* 'Lambeth Conference, 1897').
Convocation Bill, i 487.
Convocations of Canterbury and York, revival of, i. 107; R. T. D.'s début in Lower House of Canterbury Conv.

and subsequent speeches in, i. 108–9; Prayer Book Revision before the War, i. 647–54; the Letter of Business issued to the Conv. of Canterbury, i 649–50; the Ornaments Rubric, i. 651–3; Reservation, i. 654, Order of Holy Communion, *ib.*; joint comee. of both Houses of Canterbury Conv. apptd (1914) to 'harmonize material', with a view also to agreement with York Conv., *ib.*; resolution of Upper House of Canterbury on Orthodoxy, i 682–7; Prayer Book Revision after the War, ii. 1325–7; the official Answer of both Convocations to the R. Letters of Business, ii. 1328, further discussions by the Convocations and by the Ch. Assembly, ii. 1329–40.

Conybeare, Rev. W. J., afterwards Archdn. of Nottingham and Provost of Southwell Cathedral, i. 366.

Coptic Ch. of Egypt, ii. 1225–6.

Cornwallis, F., Abp. of Canterbury (1768), ii. 962.

Courmayeur, R. T. D.'s holidays at, i. 522, 581.

Courtenay, Canon the Hon. C L., i. 69; ii. 881.

Courthope, George, i. 29.

Cowell, Sir John, i 75, 79; death, i 240

Cox, Rev. J Bell, rect of St. Margaret's, Liverpool, prosecuted for ritual offences (1887), i. 126 *et seq.*

Craik, Sir Hy., i. 407; ii 1315.

Cranmer, Thos., Abp. of Canterbury (1533), i. 258, 261*n.*

Creighton, Mandell, successively Bp of Peterborough and Bp. of London—consecrated at the same time as R T. D., i. 205, votes in Convocation against resolution in favour of Sunday opening of Museums, i. 222, is suggested for the Primacy, i. 284, but succeeds Bp. Temple in the See of London, i. 285; scene at confirmation of his election to the London Bpric., i. 294–5; i. 328, i. 347, death, i. 350–1; his unlikeness to R. T. D., and the latter's appreciation of his qualities, i. 358–9.

Creighton, Mrs., i. 351, 359, 582–3, 717–18; ii. 1170.

Crewe, Marquess of, and the Education Bill of 1906, i. 513 *et seq* , i. 594; the People's Budget, i. 595–7; the Sovereign's Declaration, i. 614; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 624–7; ii. 900.

Criminal Law Amendment Bill (1885), i. 115, 663.

Cripps, Rev. A. S., ii. 1229.

Cripps, C A., afterwards Ld. Parmoor, apptd. Vicar-General (1902), i. 365; conducts confirmation of Gore's election to Bpric. of Worcester, i. 365–7; fathers Bill for dealing with disobedient clergy, i. 398; resigns Vicar-Generalship on educational issue in 1908, but subsequently withdraws resignation, i. 577–8; charges R. T. D with lukewarmness in regard to Welsh Disestabt. and religious education in schools, i. 602–4; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 870; his part in the movement to secure the spiritual independence of the Church, ii. 957, the parliamentary debates on the Enabling Bill, ii. 978.

Cromer, 1st Earl, Consul-General in Egypt, i 567–8, the H. of Lords debate on the People's Budget, i. 595; *also* i. 710.

Cromer, 2nd Earl, Ld. Chamberlain, asks Abp. Davidson's advice on the production of certain religious plays, ii. 1213–15.

Crown Patronage, the Sovereign's personal power, i 162 *et seq.*

Cunningham, Rev B. K , successively Warden of Bishop's Hostel, Farnham, Hon. Canon of Winchester, and Prin. of Westcott House, Cambridge, i 250–1.

Curtis, J , Bp. in Chekiang (1929), first English bp. consecrated in China, ii. 1229.

Curzon, George, afterwards Marquess Curzon of Kedleston, i. 153; the Parliament Act (1911), i 630, a fresh revision of the New Testament, i. 639, talk with the Abp on War topics, ii. 762–3, the Irish crisis, ii. 785–6, ii. 900, 1029, near-Eastern questions and Lausanne Conf , ii. 1100–3.

Curzon, Hon. Robt (1837), ii. 1087.

Dale, Rev. F. S., vicar of Dartford, i 34.

Dalrymple, Sir Chas., i. 407.

Dalton, J. N., Canon of Windsor, i. 70*n*, 99, 239

Damianos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, ii. 1113.

Danbury Palace, i. 210.

D'Arcy, C F , Abp of Dublin, ii. 990.

Darling, Mr. Justice, ii 787.

Dartford, R. T. D.'s curacy at, i. 34–7.

David, A. A., successively headmaster of Rugby, Bp. of St. Edmundsbury, and Bp. of Liverpool, ii. 851, 963.

Davidson, Ernest, brother of R. T. D.,

i. 7, 13, 155, 157, 195; ii. 629; his wife (Mary), i. 157, 195.
Davidson, Henrietta (née Swinton), mother of R. T. D., i. 1, 6, 7, 11, 21; death (1881), i. 50.
Davidson, Henry, father of R. T. D, i. 1, 4, 5, 6; letters to and from his son, i. 10–12, 14–17, 19, 21; his account of R. T. D 's serious seaside accident, i. 12–13; death of, i 157–8
Davidson, Henry, brother of R T. D, i. 7, 12, 13; his wife, i. 118.
Davidson, Rev Hugh Randall, younger son of Rev. Thomas Davidson, and rect. of Kirby Misperton, Yorks, i. 2.
Davidson, Mary, daughter of Rev. Thomas Davidson, married Thomas Randall the elder, minister of Inchture, i 2.
Davidson, Mary, sister of R. T. D (Mrs. Elliott), i. 7, 12.
Davidson, Norman, R. T. D 's nephew, who fell in the War, ii. 780.
DAVIDSON, RANDALL THOMAS, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.
His childhood· birth, i. 1, 5, baptism, i. 1, 5; ancestors, i. 1–5; parents and early home and school life, i. 1–12.
Harrow School, i. 14 *et seq.*; confirmation, i 14, serious accident, i. 18
Trinity College, Oxford, i 21–5; ill-health while there, i 21, 24, 25, wish for ultimate ordination, i. 22.
Further ill-health, i. 26, first visit to Canterbury, i. 27.
The Temple, preparation for ordination, i. 27 *et seq.* (*see also* 'Vaughan, C. J.').
Dartford, curacy at, i. 34–6, offer of St. Mary, Breadman, Canterbury, i. 37
Lambeth Palace, resident chaplaincy at, i. 37 *et seq.*, personal appearance and characteristics, i. 38, 39 (*also* i. 182–3, 256–7); engagement and marriage to Edith Murdoch Tait, i. 41, 44; offered vicarage of Maidstone, i. 42, his interest in the Salvation Army, i. 47–8, examining chaplain to Bp. Lightfoot of Durham, i 48, appointed a 'Six Preacher' in Canterbury Cathedral, sub-almoner to Q. Vict., and chaplain to H.M., i. 50; death of his mother, i 50, death of Abp. Tait, i. 51; offered canonry at Durham, i. 62; offered vicarage of St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, i 63.
Letters to and from Queen Victoria, and interviews with, i. 53–6, 58–61 (*also* i. 195–9, 203–4, 238–43, 248, 305–16, 335–6, 351).
Deanery, Windsor, appointment to, i. 66–8; life and work as Dean, i. 68 *et seq.*; his description of the Queen and H M.'s entourage, i. 77 *et seq.*; i. 98–100; R. T. D. as Churchman, i. 101 *et seq.*; his relations with Abp. Benson, i. 101–6; début in Convocation and participation in debates, i. 107; trustee of British Museum, i 109; advocacy of Sunday opening of museums, i. 109–12 (*also* i. 221–2); his part in Jubilee celebrations (1887), i. 118, his part in Lambeth Conferences, i. 120–1; declines tentative offer of Abpric. of Sydney, N S.W , i. 121, writes *Life of Abp. Tait*, i. 122 (*also* i 158–9, 206, 715), adviser of Abp. Benson in Lincoln Trial, i. 127 *et seq* ; letters to *The Times* ('Ritualists and the Law'), i. 136–9; question of his future and his desire to become 'unmuzzled', i. 152; visit to Denmark and Sweden, i. 154–7, death of his father, i. 157–8; R T. D.'s advisory position with regard to episcopal and other ecclesiastical appointments, i 163 *et seq* ; his reluctance to leave Windsor for a bishopric, but desire for wider service to the Church, i. 184–5; is suggested for the Sees of Durham, St. Alban's, Winchester, Rochester, and Worcester, i. 184–92.
Rochester Bishopric, R T. D.'s appointment to (1890), i 194 *et seq.*, farewell to Windsor, i. 182 *et seq.*; consecration to the Bishopric of Rochester, i 205; illnesses, i. 205, 214, 240; Bishop's House, Kennington, i. 206, 209–10; work for the revival of the Order of Deaconesses, i. 211–12; visitation of individual parishes, i. 212; rescue and preventive work among women and girls, i. 212; relations with Free Church leaders, i. 212–13; appointed Clerk of the Closet by Q Vict., i. 214; attends (and pronounces Benediction at) C. H. Spurgeon's funeral, i. 218–19; his active interest in the R. Commn. on the Aged Poor, i. 223–4; Welsh Disestablishment, i. 224–5; takes part in conference

DAVIDSON, R. T. (*contd.*)
on industrial situation, i. 225–6; primary Charge (1894), i. 226–8; advises Abp. Benson on Ld. Halifax's desire for rapprochement with Rome and on the Pope's investigation of Anglican Orders, i 229 *et seq.*; takes part in marriage of Prince George and Princess May, i. 238–9; talk with the Emperor Wm. of Germany, i. 239–40; talk with the Tsarevitch, i. 240; succeeds to a seat in the H. of Lords, i. 241*n.*
Winchester Bishopric, R. T D.'s appointment to (1895), i. 244–6, enthronement, i. 248; life at Farnham Castle, i. 247–8; work in Winchester Diocese, i. 249–50; founds hostel at Farnham for training candidates for H. Orders, i. 250–1; continued interest in Order of Deaconesses, i. 252–4; clergy wives' days at Farnham Castle, i. 255; visitation of Winchester Cathedral, i 256, visitation of the Diocese and Charge (1899) on Eucharistic Worship and Confession, i. 257–62, R. T. D.'s conflict with Father Dolling, i. 263–80; death of Abp. Benson names Temple (Bp. of London) as foremost for succession, and welcomes his acceptance of the Abpric., i. 282–4; Ld. Salisbury desires that R. T. D. should succeed to the See of London, i. 285, but Q. Vict. objects on grounds of health, *ib.*, cessation, during Temple's Primacy, of R. T. D.'s direct association with Lambeth work, i. 287; Davidson's description of Temple's methods of work, i. 290–2; R. T. D. urges amendment of form of confirmation of election of bishops, i. 293–7; his attitude towards proposed sale of Addington Park, Croydon, and towards transfer of Lambeth Field to London County Council, i. 297–9; Lambeth Conference (1897), R. T. D.'s general impressions of the Conference and of the President (Abp. Temple), i. 303–4; Diamond Jubilee service at St. Paul's Cathedral (1897), i. 308–10; R. T. D. accompanies Q. Vict. to Cimiez, i. 311; S. African War, i. 312–16; Charge to the clergy of Winchester Diocese (1899), i. 317; membership of the H. of Lords: R. T. D.'s conception of a Bishop's duties in the 'secular' field, i. 317–18; successfully opposes a Bill for legalizing Sunday entertainments, i. 320; the Benefices Act (1898), i. 320; Seats for Shop Assistants Bill (1899), i. 321–2; efforts in the direction of reforming the liquor trade, i. 322–6, ritual controversy and the crisis (1898) which led to appointment of R. Commn. on Ecclesiastical Discipline (1906), i. 327–50; R. T. D.'s unsuccessful effort (1896) to get legal authority for liturgical revision by means of an Enabling Act, i. 327, voluminous correspondence between him and Sir Wm. Harcourt on ritual practices, i. 329 *et seq*, his directions to incumbents of Winchester Dio. on ritual irregularity and on Reservation, i. 338–40, his last letter to Q. Vict., i 351; his detailed account of her illness, death, and funeral, i. 351–7, desire of K. Edw., Abp Temple, and Ld. Salisbury that R T. D. should succeed Bp. Creighton in London, i. 359–60, R. T. D declines on medical advice, i. 361, renewal (by K. Edw) of his appointment as Clerk of the Closet, i. 362, correspce. with Canon Gore on obedience to eccles. law, i. 362–5, difficulty about confirmation of election of Canon Gore to the See of Worcester, i. 365–6, R. T. D. defends doctors against Gore's accusation that they had issued misleading bulletins about K. Edw 's illness, i. 367–70; acts as intermediary between Abp. Temple and the King in Coronation arrangements, i. 370, is warmly thanked by the King and the Abp. and awarded the rank of K C.V.O , i. 371; the Education Act (1902), i. 372; Mr. Balfour nominates him for the Primacy on the death of Abp. Temple, i 383–5; R. T. D.'s letter of acceptance to K. Edw. and the King's reply, i. 385–7; a breathing-space at Biarritz, i. 389; the varied responsibilities of an Abp of Canterbury, i. 391–2.
The beginning of the Primacy: official civic welcome at Canterbury, and enthronement, i. 393; farewell to Farnham and its Castle, i. 394, financial burdens of succeeding to

DAVIDSON, R. T. (*contd.*)
the Primacy, i. 395; authoritative declaration on the Creeds provides first test of his strength and resourcefulness, i. 395–7; fresh outbreak of ritual controversy: new Abp.'s declaration that 'stern and drastic action is essential' in dealing with disloyal clergy, i. 398–9; initial stages in proposed Representative Church Council for the Ch. of Eng., i. 402–3; is entertained to dinner by representative members of Athenaeum Club, i. 406–7; is consulted about proposed *Life* of Q. Victoria, i. 410–11; nominates Canon Pereira first Bp. Suffragan of Croydon, i. 415; silver wedding, i. 415; correspce. with Patriarch of Constantinople and with Greek Orthodox Bp of Beirut, i 416–20; his sympathy with persecuted Macedonian Christians, i 421–4; suggests R Commn. on Marriage Laws in Eng., i. 425–9, i. 429–30, R. T. D.'s offer to mediate in difficulties between U. Free Ch of Scotland and the 'Wee Frees', i 430–4; Athanasian Creed debates in Convocation, i. 434–6; correspce. on opium traffic, i 436–8, R. T. D.'s disappointment with Licensing Bill (1904), i. 438–9; intervention in a Kent parliamentary election, i. 439–40; deals with reported statement that he had 'said prayers for the dead' before Q. Victoria at Windsor, and states his views about the use of such prayers, i. 440–1.
Visit to America to attend the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of U.S.A.; dines with Pres. Theodore Roosevelt, is received as an honoured guest at the General Convention, visits also Canadian cities and Niagara, i. 442–53.
Member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline (1904): his evidence, i. 454–69, the Commn.'s report, i. 469–73, Chinese Labour in the Transvaal (1904–6), the Abp.'s attitude towards, i. 474–80; Russo-Japanese War, Abp. suggests possibility of British intervention, i. 481–2; expresses to Chief Rabbi in Eng and to Metropolitan of St. Petersburg abhorrence of persecution of Jews in Russia, i. 484–6; presses for inquiry into treatment of aborigines in Western Australia, i. 487–8; declines to receive at Lambeth deputation of unemployed marchers, i. 488–92; his attitude towards alteration of boundaries of Kentish dioceses, i. 492–4; restores John de Stratford's tomb in Canterbury Cathedral, i. 495; Anglo-German Conciliation Committees for co-operation in friendship between G. Britain and Germany, i. 498; initiation of scheme for training and testing women teachers of theology, and institution of a Lambeth Diploma, i. 500–1; Welsh Disestablishment, i. 504–5; marriage of the daughter of Princess Beatrice of Battenberg to the K. of Spain: the Abp.'s intervention, i. 505–6.
The Education controversy (1906–8), i. 510–40, the Abp.'s disappointment at failure of Runciman Education Bill (1908), i. 539; his rejoinder to Mr Birrell's attack on Bishops for their attitude on social questions, i. 541–5; on old age pensions, i. 545–6; on the Belgian administration of the Congo Free State, i. 546–7; on Bulgarian atrocities in Macedonia, i. 548; on peace efforts, i. 548–50; Deceased Wife's Sister's Act (1907). the Abp.'s letter to the Dio. of Canterbury, i. 550–4; the *Banister* v. *Thompson* case: prayers in the H. of Lords, i. 557–8.
Lambeth Conference of 1908, i. 569–70; Pan-Anglican Congress (1908), i. 568–9; World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh (1908), i. 572–5; Archbishops' Western Canada Fund, i. 575–6, takes unpopular line on Old Age Pensions Bill (1908), i. 593; supports Liberal Govt.'s Licensing Bill (1908), i. 594; urges action on Report of R. Commn. on Poor Law, i. 594; the People's Budget (1909), i. 593–7, the Constitutional Crisis (1910), i. 604–7; correspce. with Dr. Scott Lidgett, i. 598–602.
Illness and death of King Edward: address in Westminster Hall, i 608–11. Accession of King George: the Archbishop's help in a revision of the Sovereign's Declaration required by the Act of Settlement (1700), i. 612–17; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 620–33; coronation

DAVIDSON; R. T. (*contd*)
of K. George and Q. Mary, i. 634; is appointed a 'Counsellor of State' to transact Crown business during the King's absence from Eng. for the Delhi Durbar, i. 637, speaks at Albert Hall meeting to commemorate tercentenary of Authorized Version of Bible, i. 638; actively opposes Bill for disestabt of Welsh Church, i. 640–4; curious facts connected with passage through parliament of a Bishoprics Bill, i. 644–6.

Prayer Book Revision before the War (1903–14): Abp. Davidson's part in the various stages of discussion in the Upper H. of Convocation of Canterbury, i. 647–54, his desire for friendly relations with Germany and his efforts to promote them (1911–13), i. 655–61; great industrial unrest (1912): his outburst against the nefarious White Slave Traffic, i. 663; his attitude towards the Women's Suffrage movement, i. 663–70; clerical orthodoxy and Modernism. debates in Convocation, i. 671–89; Abp. Davidson's handling of the Kikuyu controversy (1913–14) and decision to refer the matter to the Consultative Body of the Lambeth Conf., i. 690–702, the Consultative Body's advice and the Abp 's final answer to the questions raised, i. 702–8.

Abp. Davidson at 65 years of age, after eleven years of the Primacy. health, friendships, counsellors, chaplains, secretaries, methods of work, sermons, range of interests, i. 709–19; he and Mrs. Davidson entertain K. George and Q. Mary to dinner at Lambeth Palace (Feb. 23, 1914), i. 720, grave anxiety about the Irish crisis, following the passing of the Home Rule Bill, i 720–30.

The outbreak of War: a period of suspense, the Abp.'s sermon in Westr. Abbey, ii. 731–5; the issue of special prayers, ii. 736–8; the supply of chaplains, ii. 739, 761; the question of combatant service for the clergy, ii. 739, 761–2, 764–6, 775–6; an 'appeal to evangelical Christians abroad', from German theologians, ii. 740; statement in reply issued by the Abp. and many co-signatories, ii 741–3; conference, at Lambeth Palace, of Christian ministers and laymen on the rightfulness of war, ii. 744; problems of drink and immorality in neighbourhood of British camps and elsewhere, ii. 746–9; a question as to publication of untrue statements under Govt. authority, ii. 753; 'un-Christian hate', and the growth of a fiercer war spirit, ii. 755–6; German atrocities, including use of asphyxiating gas, and the Abp.'s opposition to retaliation, ii. 756–60; the Abp.'s serious illness, ii. 763; publication of his war sermons (*Quit you like Men*), ii. 764; Lord Derby's recruiting scheme, ii. 764; the National Mission, ii. 767–74; agitation in favour of Govt. declaring 'a policy of air reprisals for Zeppelin raids on London and other open cities', and the Abp.'s opposition, ii. 777–8; Abp.'s first visit to British troops in Belgium and France, ii. 778–84, division in Cabinet on Irish question, ii. 785; case of Sir Roger Casement, ii. 786–9, his sympathy with Lord Haldane in unfair attacks, ii. 789–90; development of Ministerial crisis and the fall of Mr. Asquith, ii. 791–3, the Abp. again ill (end of 1916), ii. 795, his memorandum as to the aims he had set himself as regards Church administration during the fourteen years of his Primacy, ii. 795–9, progress of Prayer Book revision (1914–16) and the subject of Reservation, ii. 799–815.

Third year of the War, bringing plans for additional national service for the clergy, ii. 817, the case of the 'conscientious objector,' ii. 817–22, a new Sunday question—proposal that to increase the food supply of the country Sundays as well as week-days should be used for tilling —and the Abp.'s limited acquiescence, ii. 822–7, further demand for a Day of Humiliation and Prayer to be appointed by Royal proclamation, ii. 827–8; a form of prayer for the departed issued, by authority, ii. 828–31, further agitation for reprisals, ii. 831–8; the Russian collapse, ii. 839–44; the Abp.'s attitude to peace, ii. 847–8; fresh effort to provide adequate number of chaplains for the Front, ii. 848–50

The Hereford Bishopric: nomination of

DAVIDSON, R. T. (*contd.*)
Dr. Hensley Henson; the Abp.'s great anxiety and ultimate decision to consecrate Dr. Henson, ii. 857–82; apptd. a member of the Speaker's Conference on Reform of Second Chamber, ii. 883.
Last year of the War (1918): *Abp. Davidson's seventieth birthday*, ii. 887: the new Man Power Bill, i. 887; decision of the Bishops to facilitate voluntary combatant service of clergy, ii. 889–90; peace proposals from Upsala, ii. 884–7, suggested League of Nations, strongly supported by Abp. Davidson, ii. 891; problem of venereal disease among troops in France, ii. 891–7, letter from the Abp. to Sir Roger Keyes after attack on Zeebrugge, ii. 897–8; his renewed appeals in Parliament on behalf of prisoners of war, ii. 899; his help in placing the Education Act of 1918 on the Statute Book, ii. 900, his attitude towards a proposed lottery to aid Red Cross funds, ii. 901–3; preaches at St. Margaret's, Westminster (Aug. 4, 1918) against the spirit of hate, ii. 903–4.
The coming of peace, ii. 910–16; the Abp.'s letter to *The Times* supporting President Wilson's appeal for a League of Nations, ii. 911; the signing of the Armistice, ii. 913–16.
The Church in Germany: Abp. feels obliged to controvert Dr. Deissman's view of the situation as expressed in a telegram to the Abp. of Upsala, ii. 934–9, the problem of German missions in British territory during and after the War, ii. 919–34; receives at Lambeth the Metropolitan of Athens, Abp. Meletios Metaxakis, ii 941–2; regards the holding of the General Election (at the end of 1918) as harmful before the sitting of the Peace Conference, ii 942; his second visit to the Front, ii 943; scheme for the training of service candidates for ordination, ii. 944; secures insertion in the Covenant of League of Nations of a provision for freedom of conscience or religion, ii. 945; anxieties about terms of peace: the Abp.'s letter to the Prime Minister, ii. 946–9, preaches at Thanksgiving Service at St. Paul's on the signing of the Treaty, ii. 949–50; the Abp. offers mediation in railway strike (1919), ii. 951; successfully protests against another attempt to issue premium bonds, ii. 952; claims fair treatment for conscientious objectors on their return to Civil Service employment, ii. 952–3.
The Enabling Act (*1919*) with resulting changes in relations of Ch. and State, ii. 956; the origin of the change, and the passage of the Bill through Parl. under the Abp.'s guidance, ii. 956–80; final stages in Welsh Disestabt., ii. 981; Abp. Davidson enthrones Bp. of St. Asaph as first Abp. of Wales, ii. 990; Ld. Buckmaster's Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), extending the grounds for divorce, opposition to the Bill led by Abp. Davidson, ii. 991–1002; famous case of *Bamster* v. *Thomson*, raising the question of admission to Communion of divorced persons, ii. 999–1001.
Sixth Lambeth Conference (*1920*): the 'Appeal to all Christian People', ii. 1007–15; the Abp.'s chairmanship of the Conf., ii. 1011; the extraordinary career of Bp. Arnold H. Mathew (1907–19), and Abp. Davidson's attitude, ii. 1016–23.
First meeting of the National Assembly of the Ch. of Eng., ii. 1024, receives deputation from Federation of Catholic Priests abt. Reservation and recent cases of prosecution of clergy by bishops, ii. 1024–6; Lambeth Degrees, and particularly the petition that a Degree should be given by the Abp. to Mr. H. A Barker, the distinguished manipulative surgeon, ii. 1030–4; misrepresentation of the Abp.'s attitude towards the Anglo-Catholic Congress, ii. 1034–6; his apptmt. as Pres. of World Alliance for promoting friendship through the Churches, ii. 1036–7; takes part in the unveiling of the Cenotaph in Whitehall, ii. 1037, first conf. between the Abps. and Bps. and the Nonconformists on the Lambeth Appeal (Dec. 1920), ii. 1039; Student Christian Movement and the question of inter-communion, ii. 1042–3; Abp. Davidson's advice sought by the Ld. Chamberlain on the public presentation of religious plays, ii. 1044–5; the coal strike of 1921: the

DAVIDSON, R. T. (*contd.*)
Abp.'s offer of mediation, and debate in Convocation, ii. 1045–8; visit of the Abp. of Upsala to Lambeth, ii. 1048–51; visit of Abp. Davidson to Edinburgh to expound the Lambeth Appeal, ii. 1051; another illness, ii 1054
The Irish Crisis (1920–1): Abp. Davidson's criticism (in a letter to the Prime Minister) of the attitude of the R. Catholic Bps, ii 1055–8; firm speech in H. of Lords, denouncing outrages against police and loyalists, but remonstrating against disorderly reprisals by the Black and Tans, ii. 1058–60, is critical of the Government's handling of the situation, ii. 1060–1; issues message of thanksgiving when peace begins to emerge, and incurs some abuse from advocates of strong repressive measures, ii. 1062–6.
The Russian Church: rapid development of persecution follows upon the Bolshevik Revolution, ii. 1067; tragic appeals to the Abp. of Canterbury from all parts of Russia to protect the Orthodox Church, ii. 1068; the great famine, and the launching in Eng. of a Russian Famine Relief Fund: the Abp.'s support, ii. 1070; followed by the arrest of the Patriarch Tikhon, ii 1070–2; Abp. Davidson's untiring efforts on behalf of the persecuted Church, and his dispatch to Lenin of a joint telegram of protest from the heads of all the Christian Communions in Gt. Britain, ii. 1072–3; the Bolshevik reply and the immediate rejoinder of the Abp. suggesting visit to Moscow of delegation from the Churches to investigate, ii. 1074–5; this being refused, Abp. sends further message to Bolshevik Govt. denying their allegation that the joint protest had been actuated by political or class considerations, ii. 1076–8; his further efforts to prevent executions of Russian clergy, including the R. Cath. Abp. of Petrograd, ii. 1078–9; the war against religion continuing and increasing, the Abp. of Canterbury promotes most weighty appeal, signed by all religious leaders in England, 'to all men and women of goodwill,' earnestly protesting against the savage religious persecution carried on by the Soviet Govt., ii. 1079–81; the Patriarch Tikhon's recantation and release, ii. 1084–5; Tikhon's gift of an Ikon to the Abp. of Canterbury, ii 1085; his death (1925), ii. 1086.
Relations with Patriarch of Constantinople: many visits to Abp. Davidson of heads of the Orthodox Church, ii. 1087–1103; the Abp.'s interview with M. Venizelos about conflict between Turks and Greeks, ii. 1097–9, recognition by the Orthodox Ch. of validity of Anglican Orders formally communicated to the Abp. of Canterbury by the Patriarch of Constantinople, ii. 1106–7; the 1600th anniversary of the Council of Nicaea celebrated at Westminster Abbey (1925), at which the Abp. of Canterbury preaches, ii. 1112–14.
Relations with the Free Churches: friendly response of Free Churches to the Lambeth 'Appeal to all Christian People' (1920), ii. 1115; beginning of conferences at Lambeth between Free Ch. delegates and Dio. Bps., ii. 1116; history of the conversations and conclusions reached, ii. 1117–23, Abp. Davidson visits Conf. of Wesleyan Methodists at Bristol, ii. 1123; also visits Gen. Assembly of Presbyterian Ch. of Eng., ii. 1124.
The Fisher Proposals, New attempt in 1919 (by Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, Pres. of Bd of Education) to solve the denominational problem in English education: the Abp.'s welcoming attitude, ii. 1125; his statement of the fundamental principles of the Church position, ii. 1127, his general agreement with the Fisher Proposals, ii. 1128; his disappointment at the refusal of a majority of National Socy. to support the Proposals, ii. 1133; Fresh endeavours on the part of theologians to find a basis of doctrinal agreement between the various parties in the Ch. of Eng. leads to definite request to the Abp. for the appointment of a Commn. on Christian Doctrine, ii. 1134–46; Commission appointed, ii. 1147–50.
Archbishop Davidson at seventy-five: his retrospective view of the work of his predecessors—Tait, Benson, Temple

DAVIDSON, R. T. (*contd.*)
—and of his own efforts since he became Primate, ii. 1154; increasingly leans on Abp. Lang (of York) for counsel, ii. 1156–7; Abp. Lang's own view of their constant and intimate consultations, ii. 1156–7; Bp. Gore's 'impression' of Abp. Davidson, ii. 1157–9; Davidson's leadership, the care of his diocese, his counsellors and most intimate friends, and his personal religion, ii. 1160–8; twentieth anniversary (1923) of his accession to the Primacy, ii. 1169; he is greatly impressed by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, Prime Minister of the first Labour Govt., and writes a cordial and sympathetic letter to him, ii. 1175–6; ii 1176; death of Mr. Bonar Law· the Abp.'s views as regards burial in Westminster Abbey of the Nation's great men, ii. 1176–8.

The story of the Assyrian Church and of the Abp. of Canterbury's Mission (founded 1886 by Abp. Benson) to the Assyrian Christians, ii. 1179; their disastrous experiences during the War and the question of their future settlement, ii. 1180–92; Abp. Davidson's personal assistance strenuously invoked—first by the Lady Surma, sister of the murdered Assyrian Patriarch, and, later, by Mar Timotheus, Metropolitan of Malabar, a kinsman of the Lady Surma, both of whom visited England for conference with the Abp. and the British Govt, ii. 1181–8, much subsequent correspce. on the subject between the Lady Surma, the Abp. of Canterbury, and British statesmen, fails to bring a solution of the settlement problem, ii. 1188–92.

Abp. Davidson helps to defeat proposal for demolition of Whitgift Hospital, Croydon, ii. 1193–4; his views on episcopal palaces, ii. 1195; his work as a Principal Trustee of the British Museum, ii. 1195–9; his attitude towards the fantastic proposals of the followers of Joanna Southcott as to the opening of her mysterious box of writings, ii. 1199–1201; his rulings in various personal marriage problems, ii. 1201–6; his firm support of the League of Nations, ii. 1207; preaches in the pulpit of John Calvin at Geneva prior to the opening of the third Assembly of the League, ii. 1207–9.

Abp. Davidson comes into touch with the new public service of broadcasting, ii. 1210; his interviews with Mr. J. C. W. Reith, Gen. Manager of the B.B.C. and conference with religious leaders about Sunday broadcasting, ii. 1210–11; writes for *The Times* a short article on Q. Victoria, on the eve of publication of the 2nd Series of the Queen's *Letters*, ii. 1215–16; is sounded as to allowing himself to be nominated as Chancellor for the University of Oxford, and states his reasons for declining, ii. 1217–18.

Missionary and Race problems handled by Abp. Davidson (1) in a Pacific diocese, (2) in Egypt, (3) in China, (4) in East Africa, particularly in Kenya, ii. 1222–35; the great influence exercised by him on episcopal appointments, and his relations with the Crown, through successive Prime Ministers, in that matter, ii. 1236–53; the seven different statesmen who occupied the position of Prime Minister during his Primacy, ii. 1237; the method of consultation followed when vacancies occurred, ii. 1237; its effectiveness with Mr. Balfour, ii. 1238; the greater independence of Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, ii. 1239; the wider knowledge of, and keener personal interest in, ecclesiastical matters possessed by Mr. Asquith, ii. 1240, the great contrast in those matters between Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George; ii. 1242; Mr. Bonar Law's voluntary promise always to consult the Abp. about such appointments, ii. 1250; Mr. Baldwin's constant consultation with the Abp., ii. 1250; Mr. MacDonald's eagerness to receive and consider the Abp.'s advice, ii. 1252; the aid of representative Churchmen in Parliament offered to and welcomed by Mr. Lloyd George, ii. 1243; Convocation passes a resolution in support of the already-established practice, ii. 1244; Abp. Davidson insists on the principle that the ultimate responsibility for all such appointments rests with the Prime Minister as the representative of the nation, ii. 1244–5,

DAVIDSON, R. T. (*contd.*)
but claims the right of the Abp. to settle with a newly-appointed bp. when he is to take up work in the new office, ii. 1249–50.
The Malines Conversations: visit of Ld. Halifax and the Abbé Portal to Cardinal Mercier at Malines to discuss the Re-union of Christendom, ii. 1254–5, Abp. Davidson's very guarded approval, ii. 1255, the first (private and informal) 'conversation', in Dec. 1921, between three Anglicans and three Roman Catholics, ii. 1255; rival influences at Rome: Abp. Davidson still cautious, and English Bps. divided as regards approval, ii. 1260, second 'conversation' (March 1923), in which questions of jurisdiction were discussed, ii. 1260–4; a proposal that recognition by the Pope of the jurisdiction of the Abp. of Canterbury should be signified by the gift of the pallium alarms Abp. Davidson, ii. 1264; his insistence that doctrinal issues should be fully discussed before questions of administration were considered further, ii. 1265; his uneasiness increased by a telegram of 'respectful greeting' from the Bp. of Zanzibar (on behalf of Anglo-Catholic Congress) to the Pope, ii. 1276; third 'conversation' (Nov. 1923), ii. 1280; greater measure of agreement on doctrinal matters, ii. 1281; question of publicity, and the Abp.'s decision to issue informative letter to Metropolitans of Anglican Communion, ii. 1281; storm of controversy aroused by the letter, ii. 1284–8; the fourth 'conversation' (the last), ii. 1289; the Abp.'s summary of the whole discussion, ii. 1293–6; reply of Card. Mercier, ii. 1296–7; further letters from Abp. and Card., ii. 1297–9; death of the Cardinal, ii 1299, and of the Abbé Portal, ii. 1300; publication of the Report of the 'conversations', ii. 1302.
The General Strike. stir aroused by the 'Appeal from the Churches' for conciliation, initiated by the Abp. ii. 1304; refusal of the B.B.C. to broadcast the appeal (which was, however, published in *The Times*), ii. 1308–11; public comments on the Abp.'s action, ii. 1312; strike terminated by Trades Union Council, who had called it, ii. 1314; much subsequent correspce. between the Abp. and his critics, ii. 1314–18.
'Open letter' from Bp. Barnes (of Birmingham) to the Abp., following upon a public protest in St. Paul's Cath. against Bp. Barnes's teaching, ii. 1319–21; the Abp.'s reply, ii. 1322–4.
The Prayer Book in Parliament, ii. 1325–60; summary of closing stages of P. B. Revision in the Convocations, ii. 1325–7; Abp. officially communicates (1920) to the Home Secy. the Answer of the Conv. of Canterbury to the Letters of Business, ii. 1328, further prolonged debates in Conv. and a torrent of rival proposals, specially as to changes in the Communion Office and to the practice of Reservation, ii. 1329, intense interest in the country, ii. 1339; final approval of the P B. Measure by the Ch. Assembly, ii 1340; Abp. moves in H. of Lords (Dec. 12, 1927) 'that the Prayer Book Measure be presented to His Majesty for Royal Assent', ii 1342; three-days debate in the Lords ends in the carrying of the Resolution, ii. 1344; last act of the drama played next day in the H. of Commons, the Measure being rejected, ii. 1344–6; the Abp.'s published pamphlet, *The Prayer Book: our Hope and Meaning*, ii. 1350; a second Measure submitted, first to the Convocations, then to the Ch. Assembly, and finally to the H. of Commons, where it was rejected, ii. 1349–51, statement by the Bps. asserting the inalienable right of the Ch. to formulate its Faith and to give expression to it in its forms of worship, ii. 1351; Abp. Davidson's speech on the subject to the last session of the Ch. Assembly over which he presided, ii. 1352–3; apptmt. by the two Abps. of a Commn. on the relations between Ch and State, ii. 1359–60.
The Archbishop's Resignation, ii. 1361–9; the determining factor in his decision, ii. 1361–2; reasons for and against resignation adduced, ii. 1363, date of resignation fixed (Nov. 12, 1928), the day of his golden wedding, ii. 1363, formal

DAVIDSON, R. T. (*contd.*)
announcement and procedure, ii. 1363–4; extraordinary outburst of gratitude and affection on all sides, ii. 1364; the whole volume of thankfulness finds expression in the National Tribute, ii. 1365; Corporation of Canterbury presents him with Freedom of the City, ii. 1365; the City of London confers upon him a like honour at the Guildhall, ii. 1366; the King, on the advice of the Prime Minister (Mr. Baldwin), nominates him to a peerage, ii. 1367; farewell sermon in Canterbury Cathedral, ii. 1367–8; his golden wedding celebrated at Lambeth Palace, in the Chapel where he had been married to Edith Tait fifty years before, ii. 1368–9, presentation of the Nation's gift by the Prime Minister, and of other gifts from the Dio. of Canterbury and from the Ch. in the United States, ii. 1369.
The End, ii. 1370–81; the Abp takes his seat in the H. of Lords as Baron Davidson of Lambeth, ii. 1370; by special arrangement he continues to be a Trustee of the British Museum, ii. 1370; entertained as the 'guest of honour' by the Athenaeum Club, ii. 1371; his new home in Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, ii. 1372; dictates memorandum about himself after resignation, ii. 1371; finds adjustment to the new life intensely difficult, ii. 1372; but has many interests and entertains many friends, ii. 1373; visits Bognor, and has long talks there with the King and the new Abp. of Canterbury, ii. 1373; makes some progress with autobiographical memoranda, ii. 1373–4, visits Scotland to take part in the final act of union of the Scottish Churches, and speaks at the first reunited General Assembly, ii. 1374; over-fatigue obliges him to cancel further promised visit to Scotland, ii. 1375; various physical ills bring much pain and discomfort and gradually increasing weakness, ending in a peaceful death on May 24, 1930, ii. 1375–80; burial at Canterbury, ii. 1380–1.
Davidson, Mrs. (afterwards Lady Davidson), seventh daughter of Abp. Tait, and wife of Abp. Davidson, i. 41; engagement and marriage, i. 41–4; i. 49; i. 50; i. 64; life at the Deanery, Windsor, i. 68 *et seq.*; i. 89, 113, 118, 119, 120, 122, 134, 154, 158, 160, 189, 193, 200, 203, 204, 206, 207, 240; life at Farnham Castle, i. 247 *et seq.*; i. 311; i. 316, 352, 355, 387, 389, 394, 414; silver wedding, i. 415; visit to Canada and the United States, i. 442, *et seq.*; Lambeth Conf. (1908), i. 570; i. 581; i. 629; illness, i. 675; i. 726; the eve of the War, ii. 735; during the War, ii. 763, 789, 791, 869, 884, 904, 909; the Lambeth Conf. (1920), ii. 1015; ii. 1157; ii. 1158*n*; ii. 1162; ii. 1164, 1181, 1189, 1363, 1365; golden wedding, 1368–9, 1372, 1375 *et seq.*
Davidson, Susannah (daughter of Wm. Davidson), i. 2.
Davidson, Thos., a Chaplain to Q. Anne, i. 1, 2.
Davidson, Wm., elder son of Rev. Thos. Davidson, Merchant at Rotterdam, i. 2.
Davies, Thos, M.P., introduces Bill on religious education in elementary schools (1921), ii. 1130.
Davies, Sir Walford, i. 69, 70; ii. 914.
Davis, Rev. T., i. 143–4.
Davison, Emily Wilding, i. 664 and *n.*
Davys, G., Bp. of Peterborough, i. 83.
Dawes, Rev N., afterwards Bp. of Rockhampton, i. 46, 47*n.*
Dawson, Geoffrey, Editor of *The Times*, i 720; ii 901.
Day, Emma, Mother Superior of Deaconess Community, i. 252–3.
Day, Rev. E. Hermitage, ii. 856, 857–8.
Deaconesses, revival of Order of, i. 211–12, 252–3.
Deane, Sir J. Parker, Vicar-General, i. 293–5.
Deceased Wife's Sister's Bills; the Bill of 1883, i. 96; the Act of 1907, i. 550–7. (*See also* 'Marriage Laws'.)
Deedes, Ven. Brook, Archn. of Hampstead, i. 29.
Deissmann, Dr. Adolf, his part in efforts for Anglo-German friendship, i. 661; ii. 740, 917–25; his telegram to the Abp. of Upsala after the Armistice, ii. 934–9; visits Abp. Davidson in Eng. (1923), ii. 1170.
Delhi, Coronation Durbar at, i. 636–7.
Demobilization, Church Council to consider problems of, ii. 884.
Denison, Ven. G. A., Archdn. of Taunton, i. 75, 108–9; ii. 877.
Denmark, visit of R. T. D., i. 156–7.

Departed, Prayers for the (*see under* 'Prayers').
Derby, Earl, Secretary of State for War, ii. 764; ii. 892–6.
Devonshire, Duke of, i. 380.
Devonshire, Duke of, Colonial Secretary, on Indians in Kenya (1923), ii. 1232.
Dibdin, Sir Lewis, Dean of the Arches, Master of the Faculties, and Vicar General of the Province of Canterbury, i. 103, 294, 425; member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462 *et seq.*; adjudicates upon the case *Banister* v. *Thompson* after the passing of the Deceased Wife's Sister's Act (1907), i. 555; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 870–4; the Enabling Bill (1919), ii. 977; Report (1912) of R. Commn. on Marriage Laws (1909), ii. 991; Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 992; ii. 1032; friendship with Abp. Davidson, ii. 1162–3; pallbearer at the Abp's funeral, ii. 1380*n*.
Dicey, Prof. A. V., i. 722.
Dickinson, Sir W. H., M.P., afterwards Lord Dickinson, i. 299, 592; ii. 741.
Dilke, Sir Chas., i. 547.
Dimitri, Abp. of Belgrade and Met. of Serbia, i. 588; ii. 845–6.
Disestablishment Campaign (1885), i. 103, 112, passage in 1914 of the Welsh Ch. Disestab. Act under the provisions of the Parliament Act (1911), i. 640–4.
Disraeli (*see* Beaconsfield, Lord).
Divorce Law (1857), i. 552; Report of R. Commn. on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (1912), ii. 991; Ld. Buckmaster's Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 991–1002.
Doane, W. C., Bp of Albany, i 445, 451, 571 (*see also* Lambeth Conferences, 1897 and 1908).
Doctrinal Commn. appointed (Dec. 1922), ii. 1134 *et seq.*
Dolling, Rev. R. R., priest-in-charge of Winchester College Mission, St. Agatha's, Landport, Portsmouth, his conflict with Bp. Davidson, i. 263 *et seq.*; resignation of Mission, i. 275–80; i. 335, 337, 468.
Donaldson, Rev. F. L., leads unemployed from Leicester to London, i. 488–90.
Donaldson, St. Clair G. A., Abp. of Brisbane (afterwards Bp. of Salisbury), i. 562; i. 716, i. 720; at the Anglo-Catholic Congress (1923), ii 1154; appointment to Bpric. of Salisbury, ii. 1248.
Dorington, Sir John, leads deputation to Abps. on ritual irregularities, i. 398; correspce. with R. T. D. on the subject, i. 400–1.
Dorotheos, Locum Tenens of the Oecumenical Patriarchate, visits Paris (1919), in connexion with the Peace Conf., to invoke aid for the persecuted Christians in Turkish territory, ii. 1089; second visit to Paris and London (1921) for the same purpose, and sudden death in London, ii. 1091.
Dositheos, Met. of Demotica, received at Lambeth Conf. (1920), ii. 1010.
Douglas, Rev. J. A., ii. 1105, 1112.
Doyle, Sir Arthur Conan, ii. 777, 832.
Drummond, Rev. D. T. K., i. 8.
Drunkenness in the neighbourhood of camps, &c., during the War, ii. 746–9.
Drury, T. W. (successively Prin. of Ridley Hall, Camb., Bp. of S. and Man, and Bp. of Ripon), member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462; ii. 1280.
Dryander, Dr., senior chaplain at German Court, i. 661; ii. 731–3, 740, 918–19.
Duff, Helen Gordon, marriage of, i. 158.
Dunedin, Visct. (formerly Graham Murray), i. 6, 16, 20, 20*n*.
Durnford, R., Bp. of Chichester, i. 222.
Dynamite Outrages (1885), i. 112.

Eastern Churches, R. T. D.'s first contact with, i. 416–24; Eastern Churches Comee., apptd., ii. 1104.
Ecclesiastical Courts, R. Commn. on (1883), i. 107; question in the Lincoln Case of the Jurisdiction of the Abp.'s Court, i. 124 *et seq.*, R. T. D. in his Charge of 1899, urges reconstruction of the Eccl. Courts, i. 344–5; the recommendations of the Report (1906) of the R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline (1906), i. 471–3.
Ecclesiastical Discipline, R. Commn. on (1904), i. 462 *et seq.*; Report (1906), ii. 647 *et seq.*
Eden, G. R., successively Bp. Suffragan of Dover and Bp. of Wakefield, i. 594–5; ii. 791.
Edinburgh (birthplace of Abp. Davidson), i. 1; *Edinburgh Review* (jointly founded by Lord Cockburn), i. 4; Edinburgh Academy, i. 5; University of, i. 5; St. Stephen's Ch., i. 1, 2, 5, 8; St. Thomas's Episcopal Ch.,

i. 8; Mr. Oliphant's School, i. 9; R. T. D. addresses World Missionary Conf. at, i. 572–4, the Abp.'s visit to the General Assemblies (1921) to expound the Lambeth Appeal, ii. 1051; the Abp.'s visit to reunited General Assembly, 1929, ii. 1373.
Edinburgh, Duke of, his illness, i. 311.
Education, Religious—London School Board controversy, i. 227–8, debates in Parl. on successive Education Bills: (1902), i. 372–81; (1906), i. 510–30; (1908), i. 532–40; (1918), ii. 899–900; the Fisher Proposals (1919), ii. 1125–33; other schemes in favour of denominational instruction, ii. 1130; Memorial Hall Conf., ii. 1131–2.
Edward VII (as Prince of Wales), i. 78–9, 89, 99, 203, 238, 284; (as King), i. 354–7; his illness and postponement of Coronation, i. 367, the Coronation, i. 370–2; Education Bill (1906), i. 524–6; constitutional crisis (1910), i. 604–7; illness and death (1910), i. 608–11.
Edwards, A. G., Bp. of St. Asaph and first Abp. of Wales, his communications with Mr. Lloyd George abt. Welsh Disestabt., i. 504–5; his Education Bill of 1908, i. 531; the Parliament Act, i. 630–1, Welsh Ch. Disestabt. Act (1914), i. 640–4; post-war procedure under the Act, ii. 981–90; separation of the four Welsh Dioceses as a separate Eccl Prov., ii. 986–90; first Abp. of Wales, ii. 990.
Edwards, Sir Fleetwood, assistant private secretary to Q. Victoria, i 80, 164, 191, 198, 352, 354.
Edwards, Lady, i. 352, 356.
Einstein, Prof., ii. 1052.
Elgin, Lord, i. 479.
Eliot, Mr. Arthur, ii. 1028.
Eliot, C. W., Pres. of Harvard University, U.S.A., i. 449.
Eliot, P. S., Canon (afterwards Dean) of Windsor, i. 99, 199, 204, 610.
Elizabeth, Queen, i. 163.
Ellicott, C. J., Bp. of Gloucester, i. 77, 120, 121, 222.
Ellis, Rt. Hon. J. E., M.P., i. 592.
Ellison, Rev. Douglas, i. 576.
Ellison, Rev. J. H. J., successively Assist. Chap. to Abp. Tait, vic. of St. Gabriel's, Pimlico, vic. of Windsor, vic. of St. Michael's, Cornhill, and Preb. of St. Paul's, i. 119, 154, 195; accompanies Abp. Davidson to America as chaplain, i. 443–53; is with him at his death, ii. 1379–80.
Ely, Lady, Lady-in-waiting to Q. Victoria, i. 53, 54, 74, 79.
Ely Theological College, address of sympathy from, with Bp. King on the Lincoln Trial, i. 141.
Embardt, Rev. W. C., American priest, ii. 1106.
Emin Pasha, i. 161.
Enabling Act (1919), ii. 956–80.
Enemy Aliens, agitation against, ii. 903.
English Church Union and ritual controversies—(1898–1900), i. 328 *et seq.*; i. 634; consecration of Dr. Henson as Bp. of Hereford, ii. 857, 879.
English Hymnal, i. 507–9.
Episcopal Appointments—Q. Victoria's action and practice in, i. 163 *et seq.*; the influence of R. T. D. as Abp., ii. 1236–53.
Errol, Lady, i. 79.
Esher, Visct., i. 357; *Letters of Queen Victoria*, i. 412; ii. 1216–17; *also* ii. 740.
Essays and Reviews (1860), i. 109, 877.
Eton College—R. T. D. as representative of the Masters on the Governing Body, i. 200.
Eton and Harrow Cricket Match (1885), i. 113.
Eucharistic Worship, R. T. D.'s Charge on (1899), i. 257.
Eulogius, Met. of Russian Ch., ii. 1113.
Evangelical Clergy, complaints of neglect of, in eccl. patronage, i. 178–9.
Eve, Sir Hy. T., ii. 832.

Faithfull, Miss Amy (afterwards Mrs. Armitage Robinson), ii. 752.
Farnham, Surrey—Castle, i. 247 *et seq*; ii. 1172, ii. 1195; Town, i. 247–52, Bishop's Hostel, i. 250–2.
Farquhar, Sir Walter, i. 151.
Farrar, F. W., successively Archn. of Westminster and Dean of Canterbury, i. 74, 152, 179, 244, 393.
Fearon, Rev. Dr. W. A., Headmaster of Winchester College, i. 277.
Ferdinand, Archduke, murdered at Serajevo, i. 728.
Fielding, Gen., ii. 780.
Finlay, Sir Robt., afterwards Ld. Chancellor, i. 432, ii. 870, 978, 1001.
Fisher, Rev. Edmund, i. 34.
Fisher, George Carnac, Suffragan Bp. of Southampton, i. 36, 255–6.
Fisher, Rt. Hon. H. A. L., Pres. of Bd. of Education, his Education Bill of 1918, ii. 899–900; attempt (1919)

to solve the denominational problem, ii. 1125–33.
Flower, Prof., on Religion and Science, i. 153–4.
Fog, Bp. of Seeland (Denmark), i. 156–7.
Forsyth, Rev. Dr. P. T., ii. 974.
Fortescue, G. K., i. 463.
Fowke, Gen. Sir Geo. (1916–19), ii. 783.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. H., i. 224, 244.
Fox, Col. George Lane, Minister of Mines, ii. 1311.
Fox, Francis W., i. 498.
Fox, Preb., i. 573.
Frederick, Emperor of Germany, i. 82.
Frederick, Empress of Germany, eldest daughter of Q. Victoria, i. 82, 150–1, 202.
Fremantle, W. H., Dean of Ripon, i. 63, 242, 396.
Frere, Ven. H. C., Archn. in Syria, i. 420.
Frere, W. H., successively head of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield, and Bp. of Truro, ii. 767, 1251, 1255 *et seq.*
Fry, Miss Ruth, ii. 1070.
Furse, M. B., successively Archn. of Johannesburg, Bp. of Pretoria, and Bp. of St. Albans, i. 476; ii. 851.

Gailor, T. F., Bp. of Tennessee, ii. 1009.
Gairdner, Canon W. H. T., ii. 1225–6.
Gardiner, Rev. T. G., successively Rect. of St. George's, Southwark, of Farnham, of Lambeth, and Canon of Canterbury, i. 250–2; ii. 1368.
Garvie, Rev. Dr. A. E., ii. 1117.
Gas, asphyxiating, use of by Germany, and proposals for retaliatory use by Eng., ii. 757–8.
Gedge, S., M.P., i. 340.
General Strike, ii. 1304–18.
George IV (as Prince Regent), i. 98.
George V, marriage to Princess May, i. 238–9; at death of K. Edward, i. 608; accession (1910), i. 609; at funeral of K. Edward, i. 610; revision of the Sovereign's Declaration, i. 612–17; Parliament Act (1911), i. 620–33; visit, with Q. Mary, to Lambeth Palace, i. 720; ii. 749; ii. 1363–4; confers a peerage on the Abp., ii. 1367.
George, Henry, author of *Progress and Poverty*, i. 47.
German Missions in E. Africa, ii. 816; unfounded allegations of ill-treatment of German missionaries in the Cameroons, ii. 920–1; internment of German missionaries in India, ii. 926; question of German Missions in British territory during and after the War, ii. 926–34.
Germanos, Abp. Met. of Thyateira, ii. 1104.
Germany, efforts to promote Anglo-German friendship, i. 498, 590–3, 655–61; on outbreak of War, German theologians issue an 'Appeal to Evangelical Christians abroad', ii. 740; reply by Abp. Davidson and other Christian leaders in Eng., ii. 741–3; the Abp. of Upsala's peace appeal, ii. 743–4.
Germany, Emperor Wm. II of, i. 239–40; present at Q. Victoria's death, i. 353–7; receives at Potsdam leaders of Christian Churches in Eng. anxious to promote friendship with Germany, i. 592, is present at K. Edward's funeral, i. 610; Silver Jubilee of his own reign, i. 661.
Gibson, Edgar, vic. of Leeds, afterwards Bp. of Gloucester, i. 21, 22, 33, 378, 462; ii. 869, 1005
Gilmore, Mrs, Head Deaconess in Rochester Dio., i. 211.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J., M.P., Home Secy., i. 650.
Gladstone, Mary (Mrs. Drew), i. 62, 67.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E, Prime Minister—1880–5 (2nd time), 1885–6 (3rd time), 1892–4 (4th time)—i. 40, 52, 56, 57, 60, 61, 63, 74, 153, 161; Church patronage problems, i. 164–76, Abp. Benson's death at Hawarden, i. 281; ii. 1246*n*.
Gloucester, Duke of, attends on behalf of the King first part of funeral service of Abp. Davidson in Westr. Abbey, ii. 1380.
Glyn, Hon E Carr, successively vic. of Kensington and Bp. of Peterborough, i. 239, 285.
Gollancz, I., i. 1170.
Goodwin, Harvey, Bp. of Carlisle, i. 168.
Gordon, General, death of (1885), i. 112.
Gore, Charles, successively Canon of Westminster, Bp. of Worcester, Bp. of Birmingham, and Bp. of Oxford, i. 95, 109, 183, 279, 294, 297; apptmt. to Worcester, i. 362–3; correspce. with R. T. D. on obedience to Eccl. law, i. 362–5; confirmation of his election to Worcester opposed, i. 365–6; accuses doctors of issuing misleading bulletins about K. Edward's illness, i. 367–70; urges authoritative

declaration on the Creeds, i. 396; i. 403; i. 460; on Chinese Labour in the Transvaal, i. 474, supports People's Budget (1909), i. 596; his attitude towards the Welsh Ch. Disestabt. Bill (1914), i. 643; the Bishoprics Bill (1913), i. 645; his efforts to secure a declaration by the Bps. on clerical orthodoxy, i. 671–89; his view of the Kikuyu Conf', i. 694; i. 711; ii 744, 763; member of the Commee. apptd. to consider the holding of a National Mission (1916), ii. 767; difficulties about Reservation in Churches in the Oxford Dio, ii. 806 *et seq.*; ii. 816, leads attack in the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii 856; resigns the See of Oxford, ii. 970–3; Ld. Buckmaster's Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 997, Modernism in the Ch. of Eng., ii. 1004; ii 1028; ii. 1140; chairman of Eastern Churches Commee., ii. 1104; Letter about Abp Davidson, ii. 1157–60; takes part in the later Malines 'conversations', ii. 1276 *et seq.*

Gorell, Visct., presides over R. Commn. on Marriage Laws (1909), ii. 991, his Bill of 1921, ii. 1002.

Gorham, Rev. C T, i. 125 *and n.*

Goschen, Lord, i. 407.

Gosse, Mr. Edmund, i. 429–30; ii. 789–90.

Gould, Sir Alfred Pearce, ii. 943.

Gould, F. C., his cartoons—'The Aged Man', i. 325; 'A rejected overture', i. 439.

Greece, King George of, i. 119 *and n.*

Greek Church in Russia, i. 240.

Greek Orthodox Bp. of Beirut, i. 420.

Greek Patriarch in Jerusalem, i. 116.

Green, Peter, Canon of Manchester, ii. 767–8.

Green, Rev. S. F., vic. of Miles Platting, i. 44, 45.

Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople (1837), ii. 1087.

Gregory, Robt., Dean of St Paul's, arrangements in connexion with Q. Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, i. 308–10; opposes R. T. D.'s draft Bill to provide facilities for amendment of rubrics of Prayer Book (1896), i. 327.

Greig, J. R., Bp. of Gibraltar, afterwards Bp. of Guildford, ii. 1109–10.

Gretton, Rev. John, i. 110–12.

Grey, Earl, i. 576.

Grey, Sir Edward, afterwards Viscount Grey of Fallodon, i. 257, 548, 659, 710; the outbreak of War, ii. 734 *et seq.*; League of Nations, ii. 911.

Grillions Club, i. 710; ii. 1024.

Grimthorpe, Lord, i. 146.

Guildhall Banquet (1918), a memorable gathering at the time of the Armistice, Abp. Davidson's account of, ii. 915.

Gully, W. C., Speaker of the H. of Commons 1895–1905, afterwards Lord Selby, i. 407.

Gwynne, Llewellyn H., Bishop in Egypt and the Soudan, apptd. Deputy Chaplain-General for service with the troops in France, ii. 761; attends Abp. Davidson during visits to the troops in Belgium and France (1916), ii. 778–84; ii. 892, and (Jan. 1919), ii. 943; ii. 950; ii. 1225–6.

Hague Peace Conference (second, 1907) in Holland, i. 548–50.

Haig, Sir Douglas (afterwards Earl Haig), ii. 783, 950.

Haigh, Rev. M. G., Resident Chaplain to Abp., afterwards Bp. of Coventry, i. 46; ii. 1379.

Haldane, R. B., Minister for War (afterwards Visct. Haldane and twice Ld. Chancellor), i. 432; i. 660; unfair attacks upon him for his supposed pro-Germanism, ii. 789–90; ii. 904–5; ii 913; ii. 955; opposes the Enabling Bill (1919), ii. 973, 976–7; Abp. Davidson's appreciation of his mother and sister, ii. 1164–5, 1173

Halford, Sir Hy., physician to George IV, i. 98 *and n.*

Halifax, Visct., the Lincoln Trial, i. 133 *et seq.*; protests against *Pall Mall Gazette's* criticism of R. T. D.'s apptmt. to See of Rochester, i. 201; his eagerness for reunion with Rome, i. 229–37; ritual controversy, i. 342, 349; Education Bill (1902), i. 380; approves apptmt. of R. T. D. to Primacy, i. 388; sends a 76-page letter to the Abp.-designate on 'the whole present position of the Ch. of Eng.', i. 390; protests against Nonconformists being invited to take part in Communion Service in Hereford Cathedral, i. 634; the Irish crisis, i. 722, Liturgy of the First Prayer Book of Edw. VI (1549), ii. 800–1; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 870, 879; the relations of Ch. and State, ii. 956; Ld. Buckmaster's Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 1001; chief promoter of the 'conversations' with the Abp. of Malines on

reunion with Rome, ii. 1254 *et seq.*, ii. 1276 *et seq.*
Halsbury, Lord, Ld. Chancellor, i. 132, 223; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 620–33.
Hamilton, E. W., i. 166.
Hanley, Sir Maurice, ii. 1028.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm., M.P., praises R. T. D.'s Charge of 1899, i. 258, but demurs to his views on Eccl. Courts, i. 345; voluminous correspce. between him and R. T. D. on ritual practices, i. 329 *et seq.*, i. 400; i. 468.
Harnack, Prof. Adolf, of Berlin, his part in efforts for Anglo-German friendship, i. 655–60; ii. 740, 912, 919.
Harris, Lord, ii. 1365.
Harris, J. H. (afterwards Sir), ii. 787.
Harrow School, i. 14 *et seq.*; Debating Socy. (1886), i. 20*n.*
Harrow and Eton Cricket Match (1885), i. 113.
Hartington, Marquis of (afterwards Duke of Devonshire), i. 153.
Harvey, T. E., ii. 744.
Harwood, G., member of R. Commn on Eccl. Discipline, i 462.
Hassard, Sir John, Registrar of the Province of Canterbury, i. 133–4.
Hassé, Bishop (Moravian Church), ii. 743.
Hatcham, St. Catherine's, i. 219–20.
Hatherley, Lord, i. 40.
Hawarden Parish Church, sudden death of Abp. Benson in, i. 281.
Hay, Allen, vic. of South Mymms, ii. 1022–3.
Headlam, A. C., Bp. of Gloucester, ii. 1105, 1170.
Headlam, Rev. Stewart, i. 46, 47 *and n.*
Heazell, Rev. F. N., one of the Abp. of Canterbury's Missioners to the Assyrian Christians, ii. 1181–92.
Heberden, C. B., Fellow and Prin. of Brasenose Coll., Oxford, i. 20*n.*
Hemmer, Père Hippolyte, takes part on Roman side in the later Malines 'conversations', ii. 1280.
Henry VIII's tomb in royal vault at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, i. 98.
Henson, H. Hensley, successively Canon of Westminster and Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster, Dean of Durham, Bp. of Hereford, and Bp. of Durham, his views on Govt. Bill for relieving unemployment (1905), i. 491–2; his book *The Creed in the Pulpit*, i. 672; ii. 852; nomination to the See of Hereford, ii. 856–82, 899; his description of the Queen's Hall meeting inaugurating the Life and Liberty Movement, ii. 963–4; opposes the Enabling Bill (1919), ii. 968–80, 1024, 1316, 1364.
Herbert, Hon. Aubrey, ii. 1111–12.
Hereford Bpric., apptmt. of Dr. Percival to, i. 241; a ruling of the Queen's Bench on an objection to Dr. Hampden's confirmation to the Bpric. in 1848 recalled, i. 293; resignation of Dr. Percival, ii. 851; nomination of Dr. Hensley Henson, ii. 855 *et seq.*
Hertslet, Canon E. L. A., vic. of St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol (formerly res. Chap. to Abp. Davidson and vic. of Ramsgate), ii. 773–4.
Hervey, Ld. Arthur, Bp. of Bath and Wells, i. 239.
Herzog, Bishop (Old Catholic Bishop at Berne), i. 404–5.
Hicks, E. L., Bp. of Lincoln, i 643.
Hicks-Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir Michael, M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer (afterwards Ld. St. Aldwyn), Chairman of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462 *et seq.*; the People's Budget, i. 595
Higginson, Major, i. 448.
Higgs, Henry, private secy. to Sir Hy. Campbell-Bannerman, ii. 1240.
Hine, J. E., Bp. of Zanzibar, i. 563–6.
Hoare, Sir Samuel, member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462.
Hobhouse, Stephen, ii. 821.
Holden, Rev. Hyla, vicar of Folkestone, formerly res. Chap. to Abp. Davidson, accompanies him to America, i. 442 *et seq.*
Hole, S. Reynolds, Dean of Rochester, i. 214–18.
Holland, relations with, by members of Davidson family, i. 2.
Holland, R., Secy. of the National Society, ii. 900, 1126.
Holloway College, i. 200.
Hollwegg, Bethmann von, German Chancellor, i. 660.
Holmes, Ven. E. E., Archn. of London, ii. 870.
Holy Land, R. T. D.'s visits to, i. 32, 36, 37.
Hook, Dean, his *Lives of the Archbishops*, i. 161.
Hope, Beresford, i. 40, 110.
Horner, Rev. George, i 30.
Horsley, Rev. J W., i. 46.
Horton, Rev. Dr. R. F., i. 408–10; correspce. with the Abp. on question of Sunday tilling of the soil during the

War, ii. 825–7; opposes policy of reprisals, ii. 837.
Hoskyns, E., Bp. of Southwell, ii. 1042–3.
How, W. Walsham, successively Bp. Suffragan in London Dio. and Bp. of Wakefield, i. 167*n*, 179, 180.
Howe, Mrs. Sonia, ii. 746.
Howley, W., Abp. of Canterbury (1828), ii. 1087, 1246*n*.
Howson, J. S., Dean of Chester, i. 40.
Hughes, Rev. Hugh Price, i. 378.
Hulme, Rev. T. Ferrier, Pres. of Wesleyan Methodist Conf. at Bristol attended by Abp. Davidson (1923), ii. 1123.
Huxley, Prof. T. H, i. 152–4, 184.

Illingworth, Percy H., M.P., i. 645; ii. 740.
Incense, Lambeth 'Hearing' on, i. 340.
Inchture, i. 3, 4.
India, German Missions in (*see* 'German Missions').
Influenza epidemic of 1892, i. 238.
Inge, Rev. Dr., Provost of Worcester (father of Dean Inge of St. Paul's), i. 177.
Inge, Prof. W. R. (afterwards Dean of St. Paul's), i. 556, 639, 683; ii. 743.
Ingram, A. F. Winnington, Suffragan Bp. of Stepney, succeeds Bp. Creighton in the See of London, i. 361; ritual troubles in London Dio., i. 362; his note to R. T. D. on the death of Abp. Temple, i. 383, ritual controversies, i. 459; Education Bills (1908), i. 532; Women's Suffrage, i. 670, Conv. debates on clerical orthodoxy, i. 674–89; ii. 743–4; the National Mission during the War, ii. 768; difficulties as to Reservation in the London Dio., ii. 806 *et seq.*; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 870; Railway Strike (1919), ii. 951.
Inskip, Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas, M.P., Attorney-General, opposes Prayer Book Measures in H. of Commons, ii. 1346, 1347–51.
Iremonger, Rev. F. A., Editor of *Guardian* (1923–7), later Religious Director of B.B.C., ii. 1170.
Irish Crisis (1914), i. 720–30; division in the Cabinet (1916), ii. 785; Sir Roger Casement executed for high treason, ii. 786–9; further crisis (1920–1), series of outrages on police and loyalists, and reprisals of the 'Black and Tans', ii. 1058–60; King's visit to Belfast, ii. 1061; appeal for conciliation and subsequent conf. between De Valera and Lloyd George, ii. 1062; settlement, ii. 1063–6.
Irvine, St. John (*see* 'Salvation Army').
Italy, R. T. D.'s visits to, i. 26, 205; ii. 1218–19.
Iveagh, The Countess, ii. 1350.

Jackson, Dr., Bp. of London, i. 47; death in 1885, i. 166; i. 172–3.
Jacob, Edgar, successively vic. of Portsea, Bp. of Newcastle, and Bp. of St. Albans, his part as Rural Dean, in the Dolling controversy, i. 265–80 (*see also* 'Dolling, Father'); on Foreign Missions at the Lambeth Conf. (1908), i. 572.
James, Henry, i. 244.
James, Dr. M. R., Provost of Eton, i. 639.
Jane Seymour, Queen, tomb in royal vault at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, i. 98.
Janic, Father, ii. 1036–7.
Jayne, F. J., Bp. of Chester, i. 180, 673.
Jebb, Sir Rich, Prof. of Greek and M.P. for the University of Cambridge, i. 407.
Jebb, Miss Eglantyne, founder of the Save the Children Fund, ii. 955.
Jelf., G. E., Canon of Rochester, i. 215–18.
Jenkins, Rev. Claude, successively Librarian of Lambeth Palace, Canon of Canterbury, and Regius Prof. of Eccl. History in the University of Oxford, ii 870, 979; ii. 1280.
Jerusalem, first visit of R. T. D. to, i. 32; second visit, *i.* 36, 37.
Jerusalem, Bpric, i. 116–18.
Jeune, Sir Francis H. (afterwards Ld. St. Helier), counsel for Bp. King in Lincoln Trial, i. 333; i. 425, member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462; death, i. 462.
Jones, Archn. Gresford (afterwards Bp. of Kampala), ii. 854.
Jowett, Rev. Dr. Benjamin, i. 68.
Joyce, G. C., Bp. of Monmouth, ii. 767.
Joynson-Hicks, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm., M.P. (afterwards Visct. Brentford), urges reprisals for German Zeppelin Raids, ii. 777; his criticism of the Malines 'conversations', ii. 1284; leads the opposition in H. of Commons to the Prayer Book Measure, ii. 1336–46, 1350, 1357.
Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, as the Final Court of Appeal in eccl. causes, i. 125 *et seq.*; i. 465 *et seq.*
Junior Clergy Society, i. 46 *and n.*

Keble, Rev. John, i. 338, 463–4; ii. 809.
Kelvin, Lord, ii. 1178.
Kempthorne, J. A., Bp. of Lichfield, ii. 1317–18.
Kennaway, Sir John, member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462.
Kenney, Annie, militant advocate of women's suffrage, i. 666, 668–9.
Kennington, Bishop's House, i. 206–7, 209–10.
Kennington, St. Mark's Ch., R. T. D. ordained deacon there, i. 34.
Kennion, G. W., successively Bp. of Adelaide and of Bath and Wells, i. 243*n*.
Kensit, John, i. 295, 328, 332, 467–8.
Kent, Duchess of, Q. Victoria's mother (died 1861), i. 78.
Kenya (East Africa), rights of the natives in, ii. 1229–35; the status of Indians in, ii. 1231.
Keyes, Admiral Sir Roger, ii. 897–8.
Kenyon, Sir F., Director of British Museum, ii. 867; ii. 900; ii. 1028; his account of Abp. Davidson's work as a Principal Trustee of the Museum, ii. 1195–9; pallbearer at the Abp.'s funeral, ii. 1380*n*.
Kidd, Rev. Dr. B. J, Warden of Keble Coll., Oxford, takes part in the later Malines 'conversations' on possible reunion of the Anglican Ch. with the Ch. of Rome, ii. 1278, 1303.
Kikuyu—conf. to consider a proposed Scheme of Federation of missionary bodies working in Brit. E. Africa, i. 690–708.
Kimmerghame (*see* 'Swinton Family')
Kindersley, Major, M.P., ii. 1312
King, Edward, Bp. of Lincoln, i. 164, 173–6, trial on charges of ritual irregularities, i 124 *et seq*.
King, G. L., Bp. of Madagascar, i. 716.
Kinnaird, Lord, i. 336, 631.
Kipling, Rudyard, i. 722.
Kitchener of Khartoum, Earl, i. 315; Minister for War, ii. 740; ii. 747–8; ii. 763; his view as to exemption of clergy from combatant service, ii. 888.
Kitto, Preb., vic. of St. Martin's, Trafalgar Sq., i. 151–2.
Knight, H. J. C., Bp. of Gibraltar, i. 716.
Knollys, Canon Erskine, chaplain at Nice, i. 311.
Knollys, Sir Francis (afterwards Ld. Knollys), private secy. to K. Edw. VII, i. 367, 369, 370, 395, 608, 626*n*.
Knox, E. A., Bp. of Manchester, opposes successive Education Bills (1906–8), i. 519, 532, 538; protests against prayers for the dead, ii. 830; opposes the Enabling Bill (1919), ii. 974; takes part in the Fisher Proposals (1919) on religious education in elementary schools, ii. 1126.
Knutsford, Viscount (formerly Sir Hy. Holland), i. 160, 407.
Knutsford Test School (*see* 'Ordination candidates').
Komnenos, Prof, ii. 1104, 1106.

Lacey, Rev. T. A., i. 328, 486.
Ladies' Bible Classes—Abp. Benson's, at Lambeth Palace, i. 96–7, Dean Davidson's, at the Deanery, Windsor, i. 72.
Lake, W. C., Dean of Durham, i. 40, 53, 55, 56.
Lambeth Conf. of Bps of the Anglican Communion (the second, 1878), i. 42; (the third, 1888), i. 120–1; (the fourth, 1897), i. 299–304; (the fifth, 1908), i. 559, 569–73; (the sixth, 1920), ii. 1003–15.
Lambeth Degrees, ii. 1030–4.
Lambeth Diploma for women teachers of theology, i. 499–501.
Lambeth Field, public use of, and transfer to, London County Council, i. 298–9.
Lambeth 'Hearings' on Incense and Reservation, i. 340, 467, ii. 804.
Lambeth Palace, R. T. D.'s Chaplaincy at, i. 37, 49, 61 *et seq*, marriage to Edith Tait in the Chapel of the Palace, i. 41, 44; their silver wedding celebrated there, i. 415, their golden wedding also celebrated there, ii. 1368–9; farewell service in the Chapel on the occasion of the Abp.'s resignation, ii. 1369.
Landport, St. Agatha (*see* 'Dolling, Father').
Lang, Andrew, author, i. 639.
Lang, Cosmo Gordon, successively vic. of Portsea, Bp. of Stepney, Abp. of York, and Abp. of Canterbury, i. 207, 209, 342–4, 423–4, 532; supports People's Budget (1909), i. 596; preaches sermon at Coronation of K. George and Q. Mary, i. 634; i. 712–13; i. 743, 744, 749, the National Mission (1916), ii. 770; his story about Prof Harnack, ii. 912; as Abp. of York attends enthronement of Dr. Edwards, Bp. of St. Asaph, as first Abp. of Wales, ii. 990; Report

(1912) of R. Commn. on Marriage Laws (1909), of which he was a member, ii. 991; opposes Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 992; chairman of the Reunion Commee. of the Lambeth Conf. (1920), ii. 1011–15; his presidency of subsequent Confs. with Free Ch. leaders, ii. 1116–17; his consistent and unselfish support of Abp Davidson, ii. 1156, his own view of his relationship to Davidson during the latter's Primacy, ii. 1156–7; is consulted by Abp. Davidson with regard to the Malines 'conversations' on possible reunion between the Anglican Ch. and the Ch. of Rome, ii. 1254 *et seq.*; is a member of the Commn. apptd. by the King to receive Abp. Davidson's resignation of the Primacy, ii. 1363; is chairman of the Davidson Tribute Commee., ii. 1365, is himself apptd. to succeed him as Abp. of Canterbury, ii. 1365; at his deathbed, 1376, officiates at his predecessor's funeral, ii. 1380–1.

Lang, Marshall, Moderator of the Ch of Scotland, i. 225.

Lansdowne, Marquess of, Foreign secy. in the Conservative Govt. (1902–5) —on Anglo-German friendship, i. 498; Education Bills (1906), i. 522–30; (1908), i. 533, the People's Budget (1909), i. 593–5; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 626–31; the Irish Crisis, i. 720–30; his Peace Letter of Nov. 29, 1917, statement by Abp. Davidson as to its origin, ii. 847–8, further step in peace movement, ii. 885, 901, 904; supports proposal for lottery in aid of Red Cross, ii. 901–3.

Laud, W., Abp. of Canterbury (1633), i. 228, 444.

Law, Rt. Hon. A. Bonar, M P., Prime Minister (1922–3), on the Irish Crisis, i. 722, 726–7; ii. 750; split in the Cabinet on the Irish question, ii. 785; ii. 822, 981, 1099–1100; death (1923), ii. 1176.

Lawrence, T. E., ii. 914.

Lawrence, Wm., Bp. of Massachusetts, U.S.A., conveys to Abp. Davidson invitation to attend General Convention of Protestant Episcopal Ch. in U.S.A. in 1904, i. 442, and becomes the Abp.'s principal host during the visit, i. 445–53.

League of Nations, proposed formation of, ii. 891, 910; principle supported by Abp. Davidson in a letter to *The Times* and at a public meeting, ii. 911; ii. 945–6; Third Assembly of the League and Abp. Davidson's sermon at Geneva, ii. 1207–9.

Lecky, W. E. H., historian, i. 244.

Lee, Rev. Godfrey B., Warden of Winchester College (*see* 'Dolling, Father').

Lee of Farnham, Visct., ii. 1172.

Lee, Sydney, ii. 1170.

Lees, Rev. Dr. Cameron, minister of St. Giles', Edinburgh, i. 92, 95.

Lefroy, G. A., successively Bp. of Lahore and Bp. of Calcutta (Met.), i. 636, 716, ii. 926–8.

Legge, Hon. Augustus, Bp. of Lichfield, i. 222.

Lenin, Pres. of the Soviet Govt., joint telegram to him from Christian Communions in Gt Britain protesting against attack on Russian Ch., ii. 1073, reply of Soviet Govt., and subsequent correspce., ii. 1074–7.

Leighton, Sir F. (subsequently Lord Leighton), i 110, 160.

Letters of Business issued to the Convocations of Canterbury and York after Report of R Commn. on Eccl. Discipline (1906), i. 647–54.

Leys, Dr. Norman, author of *Kenya*, ii. 904.

Licensing Laws, report (1899) of R. Commn. on, i. 322–6; Licensing Bills (1904), i. 438–9, (1908) i. 593–4.

Liddon, Canon H. P., i. 67, 116–17, 150, his relations with Abp. Tait, i. 170–2; i. 671; ii. 877; ii. 1143; ii. 1226.

Life and Labour in London, Charles Booth's volumes, i. 208.

Life and Liberty Movement, ii 961–7. *See* Enabling Act.

Lightfoot, Dr. J. B (afterwards Bp. of Durham), i. 33, 48, 103, 168–74; death (1889), i 179.

Lincoln, Bpric. of, i. 164, 166, 173–6. (*See also* 'Wordsworth, Christopher', 'King, Edward', and 'Lincoln Judgement.')

Lincoln Judgement, i. 124 *et seq.*; i. 466.

Lindsay, Rev. Dr. T. M., ii. 743.

Linguistic problem in E. Africa, i. 563–6.

'Liverpool Bill', advocating abolition of Bishops' Veto on eccl. prosecutions, i 398–400.

Liverpool, Lord, Prime Minister, i. 163.

Lloyd George, Rt. Hon. David, M.P., negotiations with Welsh Ch. about Disestabt., i. 504–5; supports the Bp. of St. Asaph's Education Bill

(1908), i. 531; the People's Budget (1909), i. 593–7; constitutional crisis (1910), i. 598–607; i. 617; Parliament Act (1911), i. 626; his anxiety to rouse public opinion in favour of total abstinence during the War, ii. 748–9; serves on commee. to consider the War problem of the 'unmarried mother', ii. 750; as negotiator, on behalf of the Govt., with Sinn Fein on the Irish question, ii. 785; his succession to the Premiership, ii. 792–4; ii. 816; decides against apptmt. of a Day of Humiliation and Prayer, as urged by Evangelical Alliance, ii. 827–8; his views on the Russian collapse, ii. 839; controversy raised by his nomination of Dr. Hensley Henson to the See of Hereford, ii. 851–82, ii. 900, 913; Abp. Davidson's correspce. with him as to proposed Peace terms in post-War treaty with Germany, ii. 947–9, his breakfast-table talk about Clemenceau and Pres. Wilson, ii. 951; railway strike (1919), ii. 951, post-War procedure on Welsh Ch Act, ii. 981; attends enthronement of Dr. Edwards, Bp. of St. Asaph, as first Abp. of Wales, ii 990, ii 1172, his episcopal apptmts., ii. 1242–50, approves Appeal from the Churches in General Strike (1926), ii. 1312.

Locker-Lampson, Commander O. S., ii. 781.

Lollards' Tower, Lambeth Palace, R. T. D.'s occupancy of rooms in, i. 287.

London, Bpric. of, i. 166–76; i. 359–61 (*see also* 'Blomfield, C. J.', 'Temple, F.', 'Creighton, Mandell', 'Ingram, A. F. Winnington-').

London, City of, confers Freedom of City on Abp. Davidson, ii 1366.

Long, Rt. Hon. W. H., Pres. of Local Govt. Bd., correspce. with Abp. Davidson on conscientious objectors, ii. 820–1.

Longley, C. T., Abp. of Canterbury (1862), i. 77.

Lord's Day Observance Socy., opposition to Sunday Opening of Museums, i. 110–12.

Lords, House of, position in, accorded to Abp of Canterbury's chaplain, i. 49; prayers in, i. 557–8; Abp. Davidson's justification of his constant attendance at, ii. 1024.

Loreburn, Ld., Lord Chancellor, i. 522; i. 609; i. 630; i. 637; i. 720; ii. 792.

Louis Napoleon, Prince (the Prince Imperial), ii. 1177.

Louise, Princess, i. 89.

Lubbock, Sir John (afterwards Ld. Avebury), i. 110, 244, 407.

Luckock, Canon (of Ely), i. 96.

Lucey v *Watson* case (1699), i. 132.

Lund, Sweden, i. 155.

Lux Mundi, i. 109, 183, 671, ii. 877, 1138–9

Lyall, Edna, novelist, i. 90–1.

Lyte, Sir H. Maxwell, i. 430.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred, M.P., Secy. of State for the Colonies, i. 477–9; i. 488; i. 539–40.

Lyttelton, Arthur, Bp. Suffragan of Southampton, i. 253, 255–6; death, i. 382.

Lytton, Earl, i. 630.

McArthur, Miss 'Etta', i. 153, 160.

McCarthy, Justin, M.P., i. 153.

McBee, Silas, ii. 1248*n*.

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. J. Ramsay, M.P., i. 322; becomes Prime Minister (1924), ii. 1175–6, Episcopal appointments, ii. 1251–3; General Strike (1926), ii. 1317, pallbearer at the Abp.'s funeral, ii. 1380*n*.

Macedonia, persecution of Christians in, by Turkish Army, i 421–4; Bulgarian atrocities in, i 548.

McInnes, R., Anglican Bp. in Jerusalem, i. 1107.

McKenna, Rt. Hon R., M.P., Pres. of Bd. of Education, his Education Bill (1908), i 530–2; ii. 750.

Mackonochie, Rev. A. H., of St. Alban's, Holborn, i. 45.

Maclagan, W., successively Bp of Lichfield and Abp of York, i. 229; joint author of the *Responsio* to the Papal Bull on Anglican Orders, i. 237, i. 283, i. 284; silver wedding, i. 415; resignation of Abpric. of York, i. 580–1.

Maclagan, Hon. Mrs, i 580–1.

Maclean, Rev. Norman, Presbyterian Minister, his report in *The Scotsman* of the Missionary gathering at Kikuyu, Brit. E. Africa, i. 690–2.

McLeod, Dr Norman, i. 88.

Macmillan, J. V., successively res. chap. to Abp. Davidson, vic. of Kew, C. F., Archn. of Maidstone, Bp. Suffragan of Dover, and Bp. of Guildford, i. 46; ii. 778–9; ii. 1380.

McNeile, E. G. H., of Manchester, i. 151.

Macqueen, Rev. Murdo, Moderator of the original Free Church of Scotland

(the 'Wee Frees') (*see* 'Scotland, United Free Church of').
Macready, Gen. Rt. Hon. Sir N., Adjutant-Gen. of British Forces in France, ii. 892–3.
Magee, W. C., Bp. of Peterborough, and later Abp. of York, i. 88, 557.
Major, Rev. Dr. H. D. A., ii. 1140.
Malines Conversations (*see* 'Mercier, Cardinal').
Manners-Sutton, C., Abp. of Canterbury (1805), i. 69, 163, 444.
Manning, Cardinal, i. 281.
Mar Benyamin, Patriarch of the Assyrian Ch., murdered, ii. 1180.
Marks, Harry, M.P., i. 439–40.
Marriage Laws, proposed R. Commn. on, i. 425–9; Report (1912) of R. Commn. on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes (1909), ii. 991; Ld. Buckmaster's Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 991–1002 (*see also* '*Banister* v. *Thompson*' marriage case).
Marriage questions, ii. 1201–6.
Mar Shimun, Patriarch of Assyrian Church, ii. 1113, 1179–80, 1186, 1188, 1192.
Mar Timotheus, Met. of Malabar, ii. 1185–8, 1192.
Martin, Sir George, organist of St. Paul's Cathedral, i. 308–10.
Mary, Queen, marriage to Prince George, afterwards K. George V, i. 238, 609–10, 720.
Masefield, John, ii. 1212–13.
Mason, Rev. Dr. A. J., i 103, 142, 230, 700; chairman of the Commee. of the Abp.'s Mission to the Assyrian Christians, ii. 1183.
Mathew, Bishop Arnold H. (alias Earl of Landaff and Count Povoleri), ii. 1016–23.
Matrimonial Causes—Report (1912) of R. Commn. on (1909), ii. 991; Ld Buckmaster's Bill (1920), ii. 991–1002.
Maurice, Gen. Sir Fredk., Director of Military Operations, ii. 899, 900.
Max von Baden, Prince, his appeal to Abp. Davidson on behalf of German prisoners in France, ii. 953–4.
Meiklejohn, Sir Roderick, ii. 1240.
Meletios Metaxakis, Abp., Met. of Athens; his visit to Eng. (1918), ii. 941; ii. 1088; further visit to Eng. (1922) to establish his position as the duly elected Patriarch of Constantinople, ii. 1092–6; his enthronement at Constantinople, ii. 1096–7; letter to Abp. of Canterbury on Anglican Orders, ii. 1106–7; abdication, ii. 1103 *and n.*
Memorial Hall Conf. on religious education in elementary schools (*see* 'Education, Religious').
Mercier, Cardinal, Abp. of Malines, his telegram to the Abp. of Canterbury on the arrest by the Soviet Govt. of Monsignor Cieplak, R. Cath. Met. of Petrograd, ii. 1078; his leading part in the 'conversations' at Malines on the possible Reunion of the Anglican Ch. and the Ch. of Rome, ii. 1254 *et seq.*; his death, ii. 1299; publication of Report of the 'conversations', ii. 1302.
Meredith, Geo., ii 1177.
Merriman, Sir Boyd, M.P., Solicitor-General, ii. 1350.
Meyer, Rev. F. B., ii. 951.
Military Service Act (1916), ii. 775–6; the Act of 1918, ii 888–90.
Mills, Miss Mary, ii. 1213, ii 1218; ii. 1375 *et seq.*
Milman, Dean, i. 163.
Milner, Visct., Governor-General of S. Africa; Chinese Labour in Transvaal, i. 474, 477; the Irish Crisis, i. 722; conscientious objectors, ii. 821–2; compulsory labour in E. Africa, ii. 1230, memorial in Canterbury Cathedral, ii. 1367.
Missionary and Race Problems, Abp. Davidson's interest in, ii. 1222–35.
Mitchell, Rosslyn, M.P., ii. 1346.
Molony, H. J., Anglican Bp. in Chekiang, China, ii. 1227–8.
Monkswell, Ld., strong attack on Belgian administration of Congo Free State, i. 547.
Montgomery, H H., successively Bp. of Tasmania, Secy. to S.P.G., and Prelate of the Order of St Michael and St. George, i. 201*n*; i. 499, 565–6, originates Pan-Anglican Congress (1908), i. 569; (1910), i. 573; *also* i. 715; ii. 1377.
Moore, J., Abp. of Canterbury (1783), i. 163; ii. 962.
Moorhouse, J., Bp. of Manchester, i. 112, 283.
Morant, Sir Robert, permanent secy. of the Bd. of Education, the Education Act (1902), i. 373–81; Education Bill (1906), i. 517.
More, Sir Thomas, i. 259.
Morel, E. D., i. 547.
Morgan, J. Pierpont, i. 442–53.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John, Ld. Pres. of the Council (afterwards Viscount Mor-

ley), i. 307, 336, 407, 497, 523–4, 631, 637, 720–30; ii. 1176.
Mott, Dr. John R., Secy. of World's Student Federation, i. 499, 573, 711, 716; ii. 917–19, 934, 1153.
Moule, Handley C., Bp. of Durham, i. 508–9.
Moule, Ven. W. S., Archn. of Chekiang, China (1911–25), i. 717.
Moulton, Rev. Dr. J. Hope, i. 743.
Muir, Rev. Dr., Minister of St. Stephen's Ch., Edinburgh, i. 1, 5, 8.
Muirhouse and Hatton, estates of (bequeathed to Thomas Randall, the younger, by his uncle, Wm. Davidson), i. 2, 3; home of R. T. D.'s boyhood, i. 9, 10; scene of serious accidents to him in early life, i. 12, 13; i. 18, 19; R. T. D.'s subsequent visits to, i. 50, 157–8, 193; ii. 1174.
Munitions factories, religious and social work among women and girls in, ii. 816, 884.
Murray, Sir Geo., ii. 1028.
Murray, Prof. Gilbert, ii. 1315.
Museums, Sunday opening, R. T. D.'s advocacy of, i. 109–12, 155, 221–2.
Mynors, Rev. A. B., i. 569.

Nall, Sir Joseph, M P., ii. 1312.
Nansen, Dr., ii. 1070
Nash, Vaughan, i. 579–80.
National Assembly of the Ch. of Eng. (*see* 'Church Assembly').
National Church Council (*see* 'Representative Ch. Council').
National Mission, ii. 767–74.
National Registration Act, ii. 761.
National Society (*see* 'Education, Religious').
Native Education in British Tropical African Dependencies, Advisory Commee. on, ii. 1234.
Natural History Museum, Kensington, experimental Sunday opening of, i. 109–12.
Nevill, S. T., Bp. of Dunedin and Primate of New Zealand, i 562–3.
Newbolt, Sir Hy., ii. 1028.
Newman, Cardinal, i. 464
Newton, Lord, ii. 900, 1172.
Nicaea, Council of, celebration at Westr. Abbey of 1600th anniversary, ii. 1112–14.
Nickson, G., Bp. of Bristol, ii. 1329.
Nicholai, Velimirovic, Father, afterwards Bp. of Ochrida, suggests plan for helping Serbian theological students to complete their training in Eng., ii. 844–6; ii. 1053.
'Nobody's Club', i. 150.
Norfolk, Duke of, his arrangements as E. Marshal for Q. Victoria's funeral, i. 355; Education Bill (1906), i. 528.
Norris, F. L., Bp. of North China, ii. 1227.
Northampton, Marquess of, member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462, 470.
Northumberland, Duke of, opposes Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 992.
Norway, Queen of, at K. Edward's funeral, i. 610.
Norwood, Dr. Cyril, Headmaster of Harrow, ii. 1365.
Nutt, A. Y., i. 99.

O'Connor, T. P., M.P., ii. 750.
Ogilby, Rev. Dr., ii. 1369.
O'Halloran, Father, i 404–6.
Old Age Pensions, i. 545–6, 593.
Oldham, J. H., secy. of the Conf. of Missionary Societies of Gt. Britain and Ireland, i. 573–4; ii. 917, 926, 931, 933, 944, 1230
Oliphant, Mrs., i. 200–1.
Olney, R., a Secy. of State in U.S.A., i. 449.
Opium Traffic, correspce about, i. 436–8.
Ordination candidates from the Navy and Army, ii 884.
Ornaments Rubric, i. 651.
Orthodox Church, Relations with, ii. 1104 *seq.*
Ouless, W. W., portrait painter, i 160.
Osborne Cottage, i. 206, 214.
Osborne House, i. 75; P. Consort's room in, i. 84, 85; R. T. D.'s visits to Q. Victoria at, i. 82, 179–80, 202, 238, 249, 335; death of the Queen at, i. 351–7.
Owen, John, Bp. of S. David's, i. 630–4; ii. 981–90.
Oxford, Earl of (*see* 'Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.').
Oxford Movement, i. 124.
Oxford, Trinity College, i. 21–5
Oxford University, suggested candidature of Abp. Davidson for the Chancellorship, ii. 1217–18.

Paget, Francis, Bp. of Oxford, member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 454–73; i. 570; i. 582–3; death (1911), i. 672; *also* i. 712–14.
Pagonis, Archimandrite of Greek Church, i. 548.
Palestine, R. T. D.'s visits to, i. 32, 36, 37.

Pall Mall Gazette 'Revelations', i. 112–15.
Palmer, E. J., Bp. of Bombay, i. 570; at the Lambeth Conf. (1920), ii. 1012–15.
Pan-Anglican Congress (1908), i. 568–9.
Pankhurst, Mrs., i. 667–8.
Pares, John (*see* 'Dolling, Father').
Parker, John, porter and custodian at Lambeth Palace for thirty-two years; ii. 754–5.
Parker-Deane, Sir Joseph, Vicar-General at the time of the Lincoln Trial, i. 133 *et seq.*, death, i. 365.
Parmoor, Lord (*see* 'Cripps, C. A.').
Parratt, Sir Walter, Organist of St. George's, Windsor, and Master of the King's Music, i. 310, 356; ii 914.
Parry, Edward, Bp. of Dover, i. 34, 53.
Parry, Sir Hubert, ii. 913–14.
Parry, Sir Sydney, i. 347–50, 380
Partridge, Canon Frank (afterwards Archn. of Oakham), ii. 944.
Paschitch, M., Prime Minister of Serbia (*see* 'Serbia').
Paterson, Rev. Dr. W. P., i. 743.
Paton, Rev. Dr., of Nottingham, i. 378.
Payne Smith, R., Dean of Canterbury, i. 146–8.
Peace—2nd Hague Conf., i. 548–50, anxiety as to proposed terms of the Treaty with Germany; Abp Davidson's letter to the Prime Minister, ii. 946–9.
Pearce, Canon E. H. (afterwards Bp. of Worcester), apptd. Assistant Chaplain-General at the War Office, ii. 848; ii. 1242, 1329, 1339.
Peel, Visct. (late Speaker of H. of Commons), i. 324*n*.
Peel, W. G., Bp. of Mombasa, i. 690–708; ii. 1230–5.
Pember, F. W., Pres. of All Souls Coll., Oxford, ii. 1028.
Penzance, Lord, Dean of Arches (1876), i. 130.
People's Budget (1909), introduced into Parl. by Mr. Lloyd George and defeated in the H. of Lords, i. 593.
Percival, John, successively Headmaster of Rugby and Bp. of Hereford, i. 241, 382, 452–3, 634–6, 640–4, 687; resigns See of Hereford, ii. 851.
Pereira, Hy. H., first Suffragan of Croydon, i. 415; ii. 770.
Perrin, W. W. (afterwards Bp. of Columbia, and, later, Bp. Suffragan of Willesden), i. 22.
Petra country, R. T. D.'s travels in the, i. 31, 32.
Phillimore, Sir Walter (afterwards Ld. Phillimore), counsel for Bp. King in the Lincoln Trial, i. 135; opposes Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 992.
Philpotts, Eden, ii. 832.
Photios, Patr. of Alexandria, present at celebration in Westr. Abbey of 1600th anniversary of Council of Nicaea, ii. 1113.
Pillans, Prof. of English Literature in the University of Edinburgh, i. 5.
Pitman, Mr. and Mrs., relatives of R T. D., i. 195.
Pitt, Wm., the younger, Prime Minister, i. 163.
Platon, Met. of Odessa, reports to Lambeth cruelties of Russian Revolutionary Govt., ii. 1067–8.
Plumer, Visct., F. M., General in command of Second Army in European War, ii. 780.
Plummer, Rev. A., Dean of Trin. Coll., Oxford, i. 21.
Plunket, Lord, Abp. of Dublin, consecrates Señor Cabrera a Bp. of the Reformed Ch. of Spain, i. 230.
Pollock, B., Bp. of Norwich, ii. 1329, 1339 *et seq.*
Ponsonby, Rt. Hon Arthur (afterwards Ld. Ponsonby), ii. 1210, 1240.
Ponsonby, Sir F., assistant priv. secy. to Q. Victoria and K. Edward and Treasurer to K. George, i. 311.
Ponsonby, Sir Hy, Q. Victoria's priv. secy., i 56, 61, 79, 80, 88, 96, 97, 113, 164–70, 174–7, 180–92, 199, 240.
Ponsonby, T. H. (afterwards Ponsonby-Fane), i. 20*n*.
Poor Law, Royal Commn. on (1909), i. 594.
Popes:
Pius IX, i. 27.
Clement VI, i. 162.
Leo XIII, the author of the encyclicals *Ad Anglos* and *Satis cognitum*, i. 231–7.
Pius X, the author of an encyclical *Pascendi* and a decree *Lamentabili* (condemning Modernism), i. 671.
Pius XI, approves the Malines 'conversations' on possible reunion of Anglican Ch. with the Ch. of Rome, ii. 1258.
Popescu, M., Rumanian priest, ii. 1108–10.
Porcelli, Col., i. 349.
Porritt, Arthur, editor of the *Christian World*, ii. 1124.
Portal, Abbé, i. 229–37; takes a leading part with Ld. Halifax in the 'Malines

conversations' on reunion with Rome, ii. 1254 *et seq.*; death, ii. 1300.
Portland, Duke of, i. 160.
Portsmouth, Lord, i. 346, 474.
Potter, H. C., Bp. of N. York, i. 445, 451.
Powell, Prof., i. 244.
Powell, Sir Francis, i. 351–4.
Poynter, Sir Edw., Pres. of R. Academy, i. 407.
Prayer Book Revision, its various stages before the War, i. 647–54; during the War, ii. 799–815, 912; after the War, ii. 1325–40; the first Prayer Book Measure in Parl. carried in the H. of Lords, ii. 1342–4, rejected in the H. of Commons, ii. 1344–6; Abp. Davidson's published pamphlet, *The Prayer Book: our Hope and Meaning*, ii. 1350; second Measure rejected in the H. of Commons, ii. 1351; reflections as to the reasons for the failure of the Measures, ii. 1354–8, apptmt. by the Abps. of Canterbury and York of a Commn. on the relations between Ch. and State, ii. 1360.
Prayers for the Departed, i. 440–1; ii. 828–30.
Premium Bonds, proposals to issue, opposed by Abp. Davidson, ii. 952.
Presbyterian Ch. of Eng., Abp. Davidson's visit to its General Assembly (1928), ii. 1124.
Pretyman, Bp. of Lincoln, i. 163.
Price, F., Bp. of Fuhkien, China, i. 716.
Prince Consort, i. 75, 76, 78, 82, 83, 84, 86.
Prince Imperial (Prince Louis Napoleon), ii. 1177.
Prisoners of War, Abp. Davidson's appeals on behalf of, ii. 899.
Probyn, Sir Dighton, Comptroller to Q. Alexandra, i. 160.
Prothero, Geo., member of R. Commn., of Eccl. Discipline, i 462.
Prothero, Rt. Hon. R., M.P., Minister of Agriculture, ii. 823, 1028.
Public Worship Regulation Act (1874), and the Bps.' Veto, i. 39, 128, 465–6.
Purchas Judgement (1871), i. 126.
Pusey, Rev. Dr., i. 463–4; ii. 803, 881.

Quick, Oliver, res. Chaplain to Abp. Davidson, successively Canon of Newcastle, Carlisle, St. Paul's, and Durham, ii. 1280.
Quicunque Vult (*see* 'Prayer Book Revision').

Railway Strike (1912), i. 662.
Rainy, Rev. Dr. Robert, Moderator of the United Free Ch. of Scotland (*see* 'Scotland, United Free Church of').
Raleigh, Sir Walter, i. 639.
Rampolla, Cardinal, i. 229–37.
Ramsay, Sir Wm., i. 743.
Randall, David, i. 3.
Randall, Rev. Thomas (the elder), great-grandfather of Abp. Davidson and successively minister of Inchture and Stirling, i. 2, 3.
Randall, Rev. Thomas (the younger), married (1) Elisabeth Rutherford, (2) Elisabeth Cockburn · successively minister of Inchture and of the Tolbooth Ch., Edinburgh; succeeds to uncle's estates of Muirhouse and Hatton on condition of changing name to Davidson; grandfather of Abp. Davidson, i. 4.
Randolph, Rev. C., i. 134.
Raper, R. W., Fellow of Trin. Coll., Oxford, i. 22, 67; his view as to the form which War prayers should take, i. 737–8.
Rashdall, Rev. Dr. H., subsequently Dean of Carlisle, i. 396; ii. 853, 1140.
Reading, Marquess of, Lord Chief Justice, Viceroy of India, &c., ii. 792.
Reay, Lord, i. 546.
Red Cross, proposed lottery in aid of, ii. 901–3.
Reichel, Archn., i. 40.
Reid, Sir James, physician to Q. Victoria, i. 311; at the Queen's death, i. 353.
Reith, J. C. W. (afterwards Sir John Reith), General Manager of the B.B.C., ii. 1210–11, 1308–11.
Religious Education in Elementary Schools (*see* 'Education, Religious').
Religious Novels, R. T. D. writes article for *The Contemporary Review* on, i. 122.
Religious Plays, ii. 1044–5, 1212–15.
Representative Church Council, preliminary stages in its formation, i. 402–3; its initial action leading to the passing of the Enabling Bill (1919), ii. 956–60, 967–80.
Reprisals on Germany for air-raids and gas attacks, conflicting views on, ii. 756–60, 777–8, 831–8.
Rescue and preventive work, i. 35, 212; ii. 1162.
Reservation, Lambeth 'Hearing' on (*see also* 'Prayer Book Revision'), i. 340, 346; ii. 802–15.
Reunion, Christian, desires and suggestions for (with Rome), i. 229–37, (with Greek Ch.), i. 240, (in mis-

sionary work overseas), i. 572–4; the 'Appeal to all Christian People' (1920), ii. 1007–15; first conf. of Ch. of Eng. and nonconformist representatives, following the issue of the Appeal, ii. 1039; further confs., ii. 1115–24 (*See also* 'Orthodox Church'; 'Mercier, Cardinal').
'Revolt from Rome' movement, i. 404–6.
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, his portrait of Wm. Davidson, i. 2.
Rhinelander, P. M., Bp. of Pennsylvania (1920), ii. 1012.
Ridding, G., Bp. of Southwell, i. 173, 175, 180–1, 202, 222.
Ridding, Lady Laura, i. 557.
Ridge, Rev. E. L., res. chap. at Lambeth Palace to Abps. Benson and Temple, i. 287–9.
Ridley, Mr. Justice, i. 366.
Riley, Athelstan: on Jerusalem Bpric., i. 117; his part in Education controversy (1906–8), i. 532; member of the council of the National Mission (1916), ii. 769–70; entertains Abp. Meletios, Met. of Athens, when (in Nov. 1918) the latter visits Eng., ii. 941; opposition (afterwards withdrawn) to the initial scheme for a National Assembly of the Ch. of Eng., ii. 968; takes part in conf. on Fisher Proposals (1919) on religious education in elementary schools, ii. 1126; his part in the debates on the Prayer Book Measure in the Church Assembly, ii. 1329.
Ripon, Marquess of, i. 474.
'Ritualists and the Law', R. T. D.'s letters to *The Times*, i. 136–9.
Robberds, W. J. F., Bp. of Brechin and Primus of the Scotch Episcopal Church, ii. 743, 990.
Roberts, Earl, i. 315, 351, 407, 722.
Robertson, Sir Benjamin, sent to Russia by the Russian Famine Relief Fund to report, ii. 1070.
Robertson, Lord (Lord of Appeal), i. 407.
Robinson, Rev. Dr. A. W., ii. 767.
Robinson, Rev. C. L., i. 490–1.
Robinson, J. Armitage, successively Canon of Westminster, Dean of Westminster, and Dean of Wells, i. 370, 397*n*, 407, 610; helps in preparing special prayers at the outbreak of War, ii. 736; ii. 741, 743, 866, 1170, 1177; takes part in the 'conversations' at Malines on the question of reunion with Rome, ii. 1255 *et seq.*
Rochester, Bpric., R. T. D.'s apptmt. to, i. 194 *et seq.*; administration of, i. 208 *et seq.*; extent and character of the Dio., i. 208; R. T. D.'s Primary Charge, i. 226; alteration of boundaries, i. 492–4.
Rogers, J. Guinness, i. 213, 378, 388.
Rome, Church of, i. 228–37; revolt of discontented clergy, i. 404–6 (*see* Mercier, Cardinal).
Roosevelt, Theodore, Pres. of U.S.A., Abp. Davidson's visit to him at White House, i. 445; attends K. Edward's funeral, i. 610.
Rosebery, Earl of, Prime Minister (1894–5), i. 9, 110, 165, 225; Q. Victoria's remonstrance as to his political partisanship in eccl. apptmts., i. 242–3; i. 244, 254–5, 306–7, 325, 376, 393; debates on reform and reconstitution of H. of Lords, i. 604; i. 607, 609; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 630; i. 710, 720; his appreciation of Asquith as a great parliamentarian, ii. 868; Abp. Davidson's comment on Rosebery himself, ii. 868–9; ii. 1026–8, 1028*n*, 1173–4, 1216.
Rouen, Frederic, Abp. of (Monseigneur Fuzet), ii. 744–5.
Rowntree, Arnold, ii. 744.
Royal Academy Dinner (1890), i. 160.
Royden, Miss Maude, ii. 769, 964.
Royle-Shore, S., i. 717.
Runciman, Rt. Hon. W., Pres. Bd. of Education, his Education Bill (1908), i. 530–40; ii. 1123.
Russell, Canon Lord Wriothesley, i. 68, 69, 71.
Russell, G. W. E., Under Secy. of State for India, i. 225; ii. 770.
Russia—The Tsarevich, i. 240; the Czar of, i. 306; the Revolution (1917) and the Russian Ch., ii. 839–44; the Bolshevik domination of the whole Russian nation, and the suppression and terrible persecution of the Russian Ch., ii. 1067–86; the great famine and the Russian Famine Relief Fund, ii. 1069–70; protests by leaders of Christian communions in Gt. Brit., to Soviet Govt., and to the world against the ruthless war on religion, ii. 1073, 1079–81.
Russia, Greek Church in, i. 240.
Russo-Greek Synod at Kieff, i. 106–7.
Russo-Japanese War (1905), i. 481–2.
Rutherford, Elisabeth, first wife of Thomas Randall (the younger), i. 4*n*
Ryle, Herbert, successively Bp. of Exeter, Bp. of Winchester, and Dean

of Westminster, i. 355, 610; ii. 966, 1170.
Ryle, J. C., Bp. of Liverpool, i. 121.

Sadler, Sir Michael, i. 257, 510–11, 532–40; ii. 714, 763.
St. Aldwyn, Lord (*see* 'Hicks-Beach').
St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, Bpric. of, story of the parliamentary proceedings attending the creation of the See, i. 644–6.
St. Katharine's Hospital, Regent's Park, i. 717.
St. Matthew, Guild of, i. 46.
Salisbury, 3rd Marquess of, Prime Minister (1885–6, 1886–92, 1895–1902), i. 113, 160, 165; Church patronage problems, i. 176–81, 184–200; Welsh Disestablishment, i. 224; accused of partisanship in eccl. apptmts., i. 242–3; his nomination of Bp. Temple of London to the Primacy, and his wish that R. T. D. should succeed Temple in the See of London, i. 283–7; opposes R. T. D.'s Bill to provide seats for shop assistants, i. 322; his attitude towards recommendations of R. Commn. on Liquor Licensing Laws (1896–9), i. 322–6; urges R. T. D. to succeed Bp. Creighton in the See of London, but again defers to medical advice to the contrary, i. 359–61; death, i. 414.
Salisbury, 4th Marquess of—R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline (1904–6), i. 457, 459; education controversy (1906–8), i. 527, 532, 534, 602; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 620–33; presides over advisory commee. for supply of chaplains to the Army, ii. 848; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 871; his opposition to post-war procedure on Welsh Disestabt., ii. 984–6; his remonstrance with Abp. Davidson for the line he had taken in the Irish crisis (1920–1), ii. 1066.
Salter, Dr. Alfred, of Bermondsey, interview with Abp. Davidson on harsh treatment of conscientious objectors, ii. 819–20.
Salvation Army, Randall Davidson's interest in, i. 47, 48, 106–7, 202.
Samuel, Rt. Hon. Sir Herbert, M.P., Home Secy., ii. 786–9, 1304, 1314.
Sandars, J. J., priv. secy. to Mr. Balfour when Prime Minister, i. 379, 384–5, 400, 427–9, 462, 595.
Sanday, Prof. W., i. 486, 677–89, 692; ii. 743, 863–4.
Sanderson, Sir Thomas (afterwards Ld. Sanderson), Permanent Secy. at the Foreign Office, ii. 900.
Sandford, Archn., i. 388.
Sandhurst, Visct., Lord Chamberlain, ii. 1044–5.
Sandringham House, i. 119.
Satis cognitum, Papal encyclical (*see* 'Anglican Orders').
Saumarez-Smith, W., Abp. of Sydney, i. 560–2.
Save the Children Fund, ii. 955.
Schuster, Sir Claude, ii. 741.
Scotland, Church of, General Assembly, i. 1, 3, 4, 7; i. 471; Abp. Davidson's visit to expound the Lambeth Appeal, ii. 1051; further visit to take part in the final act of the Union of the Ch. of Scotland and the United Free Ch. of Scotland, ii. 1374.
Scotland, English Episcopalians in, i. 8.
Scotland, United Free Church of, decision of H. of Lords against their claim to the property of the original Free Ch., i. 430; R. T. D.'s offer of help, i. 430–4 (*see also* 'Scotland, Ch. of').
Scott-Holland, H., Canon of S. Paul's, i. 22, 67, 225, 305–7, 406–7; ii. 743.
Scottish Episcopal Church, i. 8; ii. 1375.
Scott-Lidgett, Rev. Dr. J., Warden of Bermondsey Settlement and Free Church leader, friendly letter to R. T. D. on apptmt. to See of Rochester, i. 212; co-operates with Anglican and R.C. leaders on Sunday observances, i. 506–7; correspce. with R. T. D. on the attitude of Free Churchmen in the constitutional crisis of 1910, i. 598–602; ii. 741, 743, 744; opposes policy of reprisals in the War, ii. 832; signs appeal to nation on occasion of railway strike (1919), ii. 951; views favourably the Enabling Bill (1919), ii. 974; his part in confs. at Lambeth on Christian reunion, ii. 1117; the Fisher Proposals (1919) on religious education in elementary schools, ii. 1125–33, ii. 1365; pall-bearer at the Abp.'s funeral, ii. 1380*n*.
Scott, Sir Walter, i. 1, 4, 5, 20, 30, 124, 464; ii. 1374, 1377.
Scott, Mrs. (mother of Sir Walter Scott), i. 1.
Seaton, J. B, Prin. of Cuddesdon Coll. (afterwards Bp. of Wakefield), ii. 1158*n*.
Seeley, Major J. E. B. (afterwards Ld. Mottistone), i. 474.
Selbie, Rev. Dr. W. B., Prin. of Mansfield Coll., Oxford, ii. 974, 1126.

Selborne, 1st Earl of, Ld. Chancellor, i. 103, 161.
Selborne, 2nd Earl of, High Com. S. Africa—Chinese Labour in Transvaal, i. 477; the Parliament Act (1911), i. 620–33; preliminaries to R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 457–9; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 871; chairman of the Abps.' commee. on Ch. and State (1913), ii. 957, and main sponsor and author of its Report, ii. 957, 967; the Enabling Bill (1919) in Parl., ii. 973–80; opposes Matrimonial Causes Bill (1920), ii. 992; pallbearer at Abp. Davidson's funeral, ii. 1380*n*.
Selwyn, G. A., Bp. of N. Zealand (afterwards Bp. of Lichfield), i. 442.
Serbia, appeal to Abp. of Canterbury to intervene in political affairs of, i. 588–9; plan for helping Serbian theological students to complete their training in Eng., ii. 844–6; a Serbian Order conferred on Abp. Davidson, ii. 912.
Seymour, Ld. Victor, ii. 770.
Shaftesbury, Earl of, i. 465, 468; ii. 881.
Shakespeare, Dr., Secy. of the Baptist Union and Pres. of the Free Ch. Council, ii. 744, 822.
Shaw, Bernard, his *St. Joan*, ii. 1212, 1213.
Shaw, Rev. C. J. M., i. 439–40.
Shaw, Norman, architect, i. 210.
Sheffield Bpric.—curious facts about the passage through Parl. of the Bill creating the See, i. 644–6.
Sheppard, Arthur, priv. secy. to R. T. D. (1889–1923), i. 714; ii. 818, 1200–1, 1365.
Sheppard, Edgar, successively Sub-Dean of Chapel Royal, St. James's Palace, and Canon of Windsor, i. 239; death (1921), ii. 1053.
Sheppard, H. R. L. (afterwards Dean of Canterbury; later Canon of St. Paul's), ii. 961–80, 1379.
Shortt, Rt. Hon. Edw., Home Secy., ii. 1328.
Sidmouth, Lord, i. 163.
Siegmund-Schultze, Dr., religious leader in Germany, ii. 919, 925.
Simon, Rt. Hon. Sir John, M.P., Foreign Secy., i. 710; ii. 1314, 1346.
Simpkinson, C. H., Rev., i. 211.
Simpson, Rev. Dr. P. Carnegie—his part in confs. at Lambeth on Christian Reunion, ii. 1117; his view, in Prayer Book controversy, of the action which the Bps. should take, ii. 1357.
Sinai Peninsula, R. T. D.'s visit to the, i. 31.
Sing, T. S., first native-born Bp. in China, ii. 1227.
Sitwell, Miss Blanche, Abp. Davidson's letters to, about the Revolution in Russia and other matters, ii. 846–1.
Smith, Rev. Clement, Rect. of Whippingham, i. 351–7.
Smith, Rev. Dr. G. Adam (afterwards Sir George Adam Smith), ii. 743.
Smith, Rev. John, asst.-master at Harrow, i. 17.
Smith, R. Bosworth, i. 105.
Smith, Rt. Hon. W. H., M.P., Leader of the H. of Commons, i. 153, 347.
Smuts, General, ii. 891, 901, 914.
Smyth, Dr. Ethel, i. 153; correspce. with Abp. Davidson on Women's Suffrage, i. 663–6.
Soderblom, Dr. Nathan, Abp. of Upsala, i. 155–6; his appeal, in the early part of the War, for peace, ii. 743–4; convenes (Dec. 1917) at Upsala conf. of neutral churchmen on questions of practical Christian unity and international peace, ii. 884; further simular conf. in 1918, ii. 885; his intervention on behalf of German and Swedish missionaries to India, ii. 928–31; acts as intermediary in presenting to Abp. of Canterbury Dr. Deissman's German view of the situation immediately after the War, ii. 928–39; his proposed International Ch. Conf., ii. 940–1; visit to Lambeth (1921), conversation with Abp. Davidson, ii. 1048–51; present at celebration in Westr. Abbey of 1600th anniversary of Council of Nicaea, ii. 1113; ii. 1172.
South African War, i. 312–16, 351.
Southcott, Joanna—variously described as prophetess, fanatic, and (by herself) 'the Lamb's wife'—her remarkable career and mysterious box of writings, ii. 1199–1201.
Southwark Bpric., constitution of, i. 492.
Southwark, St. Saviour's, the future Cathedral for S. London, i. 210–11.
Spalato, Abp. of (Marcus Antonius De Dominis, Dean of Windsor, 1618–22), i. 69.
Spencer, Herbert, ii. 1177–8.
Spencer, Earl, i. 244.
Spender, J. A., biographer of Ld. Oxford and Asquith, i. 624*n*, 625, 626*n*.
Spens, Will, Fellow (and later Master) of Corpus Christi Coll., Cambridge, ii. 1136 *et seq*.

Spiecker, Dr., of Germany, his part in efforts for Anglo-German friendship, i. 655–61; ii. 740, 918–19, 1036.
Spurgeon, Rev. Chas. Haddon, the famous Baptist preacher, i. 113–14; his death (1892), i. 218; R. T. D. attends funeral and pronounces Benediction, i. 219.
Spurgeon, Rev. James, i. 218–19.
Stamfordham, Lord (formerly Sir Arthur Bigge), priv. secy. to Q. Victoria, K. Edward VII, and K. George V, i. 80, 164, 167, 186, 188, 199, 241, 242, 245, 312–14, 351–7, 636, 713; ii. 900, 913, 950, 1028, 1365, 1380n.
Stanhope, Earl, i. 63.
Stanley, A. P., Dean of Westminster, i. 39, 40, 43, 61, 88, 202, 226, 464; ii. 1177.
Stanley, Sir H. M., at Windsor Castle, i. 160–1.
Stark, Pastor, director of the German Evangelical Mission in the Cameroons, ii. 920–1.
Stead, W. T., *Pall Mall Gazette* 'Revelations', i. 112–15; peace propaganda, i. 548–50.
Stephens, W. Reynolds (afterwards Sir W. Reynolds Stephens), sculptor, ii. 1365.
Stephens, W. R. W., Dean of Winchester, i. 244, 256; death, i. 382.
Stirling, ministry there of Thomas Randall (the elder), i. 2, 3, 4.
Stock, Dr. Eugene, ii. 743.
Stone, Rev. Dr. Darwell, Prin. of Pusey House, Oxford, ii. 862–3, 878, 1025–6
Stone, St. Mary's Home for rescue and preventive work, i. 35.
Stopford, Miss, Lady-in-waiting to Q. Victoria, i. 79, 81, 82, 86.
Storr, Vernon F., Archdeacon of Westminster, ii. 767, 1280, obtains, on behalf of Liberal Evangelicals, from Abp. Davidson, an assurance that if the Prayer Book Measure receives Royal Assent, the rules of the new Book will be faithfully administered by the Bishops, ii. 1341–2.
Strachey, Lytton, his *Life of Queen Victoria*, ii. 1045.
Strachey, St. Loe, editor of *The Spectator*, advocates referendum in constitutional crisis (1910), i. 607, 624; champions Ld. Haldane, ii. 789–90.
Stratford, Abp. John de, restoration of his tomb in Canterbury Cathedral, i. 495.
Streeter, Canon B. H., editor of *Foundations*, i. 672, 677.
Strikes—in cotton and coal industries (1892–3), i. 225; in coal, transport, and railway industries (1912), i. 661–2; General Strike, ii. 1304–18.
Stringer, Isaac O., Bp. of Yukon, i. 720.
Strong, Dr. S. A., Librarian of H. of Lords, i. 429.
Strong, T. B., successively Dean of Ch. Ch. Oxford, Bp. of Ripon, Bp. of Oxford, i. 677.
Stubbs, W., Bp. of Oxford, i. 133n, 135, 162n, 297, 357.
Student Christian Movement, i. 499; inter-communion proposals from Swanwick, ii. 1042–3.
Sturdee, Admiral, ii. 1028.
Sullivan, Sir Arthur, at Cimiez, i 311.
Sumner, C. R. (afterwards Bp. of Winchester), George IV's nominee for a Windsor Canonry, i. 163.
Sumner, George, Suffragan Bp. of Guildford, i. 255.
Sumner, J. B., Abp. of Canterbury (1848–62), i. 442.
Sumner, Lord, ii. 1028.
Sunday Observance, i. 506–7; a War problem connected with the food-supply of the country, ii 822–7.
Sunday Opening of Museums, i 109–12, 155, 221–2.
Surma (Lady) d'Mar Shimun, sister of the Assyrian Patriarch, visits Eng. as official representative of her nation to urge the settlement of the Assyrian people, ii. 1182–92.
Swabey, Ven. Mark, Chap to the Crimean Memorial Ch., i. 418.
Swayne, Preb. W. S. (afterwards Bp. of Lincoln), ii. 854.
Sweden, Crown Prince of, marriage, ii. 1174.
Sweden, visit of R. T. D. to, i. 154–6; the Swedish Ch., i. 155–6.
Swete, Rev. Dr. H. B., ii. 743.
Swinton Family, of Kimmerghame, i. 1, 5, 7, 8, 193.
Swinton, Archibald, Abp. Davidson's uncle, i. 7, 158.
Swinton, Kate, Abp Davidson's cousin, i. 8, 24; (death 1921), i. 1053.
Sydenham, Lord, ii. 896.
Sydney, Abp. of (*see* 'Saumarez Smith, W.').

Tait, Archibald Campbell, successively headmaster of Rugby, Dean of Carlisle, Bp. of London, and Abp. of Canterbury—confirms R. T. D., i. 14;

ordains him priest, i. 34; appts. him res. chap. at Lambeth Palace, i. 37, 38; engagement and marriage of his daughter Edith to R. T. D., i. 41–4; 'the sacred principle of delegation', i. 44; Tait's estimate of the comparative unimportance of ritual details, i. 45; his presidency of Lambeth Conf. (1878), i. 42; i. 120; death (1882), i. 50–5; personal relations with his chaplain, i. 49, 50; *Life*, i. 44, 45, 122, 158–9, 206, 715; Tait and Benson contrasted, i. 101, 120; i. 107, 109, 112, 124, 128, 152, 163, 168; Tait's relations with Canon Liddon, i. 170–2; his censure of *Essays and Reviews* recalled, i. 289; Athanasian Creed debates in Conv. (1872) recalled, i. 434; Tait's move to secure a reform of Eccl. Courts recalled, i. 466.

Tait, Rev. Craufurd, son of Abp. Tait, i. 29, 33, 34, 37, 39, 41; death, i. 42, 43; i. 46, 442, 447.

Tait, Mrs., wife of Abp. Tait, i. 40, 41, 42; death, i. 44, 53.

Tait, Agnes, eighth daughter of Abp. Tait (afterwards Mrs. J. H. J. Ellison), i. 41, 70, 82, 119, 122–3.

Tait, Edith Murdoch (*see* 'Davidson, Mrs.').

Tait, Lucy, sixth daughter of Abp. Tait, i. 41, 118, 120, 122, 134, 154, 281; ii. 883.

Talbot, Edward Stuart, successively Warden of Keble, vic. of Leeds, Bp. of Rochester, Bp. of Southwark, and Bp. of Winchester, i. 22, 252, 33, 118; correspce. with R. T. D. on the Lincoln Trial, i. 127–31; declines See of St. Alban's, i. 186, is suggested for See of Rochester, i. 245; i. 256, 283, 378, 382–4, 390, 458–60; Education Bill (1908), i. 532, 534, 535, 582; the Sovereign's Declaration required by Act of Settlement, i. 615; i. 634; withdraws licence of J. M. Thompson, Dean of Divinity at Magdalen Coll. Oxford, i. 672, and takes part in Conv. debates on clerical orthodoxy, i. 672–89; i. 712–13; ii. 743–4; the Henson-Hereford controversy, ii. 879; the Abp.'s letter to Bp. Talbot about the varied duties devolving upon a modern Primate, ii. 906–9; ii. 953.

Talbot House, Poperinghe, ii. 780.

Talbot, Miss L. C., reminiscences of R. T. D., i. 584–6.

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G., M.P., member of R. Commn. on Eccl. Discipline, i. 462; Education Bill (1908), i. 534 *et seq.*

Talbot, Neville, asst. Chap.-General in France, afterwards Bp. of Pretoria, ii. 780, 1012.

Tate, Sir Hy., donor of the Tate Collection and Picture Gallery at Westr., i. 160.

Tatlow, Rev. Tissington, leader in the Student Christian Movement, i. 499; i. 573.

Tatton, R. G., i. 20*n.*

Taylor-Smith, John (formerly Bp. of Sierra Leone), Chap. General during the War, ii. 739.

Temple, The, R. T. D.'s preparation for Orders, i. 27 *et seq.*

Temple, Fredk., successively headmaster of Rugby, Bp. of Exeter, Bp. of London, and Abp. of Canterbury—takes part in Lambeth Conf. (1867), i. 121; assessor in Lincoln Trial (1889), i. 133, 135; joint author, with Abp. Maclagan of York, of the *Responsio* to the Papal Bull on Anglican Orders, i. 237; Sunday opening of Museums, i. 222; his apptmt. to the Bpric. of London, i. 167 *et seq.*; takes part in marriage of Prince George and Princess May, i. 239; accepts Primacy when 75 years old, i. 284; R. T. D.'s appreciation of Temple's powers, i. 283, 286–7; strange delusions, for a time, that R. T. D., while professing to welcome the apptmt., had really wished to obtain the Primacy himself, i. 288–9; 'The isolation of a powerful mind', i. 290; other characteristics and methods of work, i. 290–2; i. 391; opposition to confirmation of his election (*a*) to the Bpric. of Exeter, (*b*) to the Primacy, i. 292–3; his determination to substitute Old Palace, Canterbury, for Addington Park, Croydon, as the country house of the Abps., i. 297–8; succeeds in transferring Lambeth Field to London C.C., i. 298; his presidency of the Lambeth Conf. (1897), i. 299, 302–4; the ritual controversy of 1898–9, i. 329*n.*, 340, 342, 346–50; strongly urges that R. T. D. should succeed Bp. Creighton in the See of London, i. 360; his gratitude to R. T. D. for help in arrangements for Coronation of K. Edward, i. 371–2; is awarded Gold Chain of Royal Victorian Order, i. 371; his last speech, i. 380; his death (Dec. 23, 1902), i. 381; prayers in H. of Lords, i. 557.

Temple, Wm., son of Fredk. Temple, successively Bp. of Manchester and

Abp. of York, ii. 767; a leader in the Life and Liberty Movement (1917), ii. 961–80; Chairman of the Doctrinal Comman., ii. 1150, 1209.
Tennyson, Lord, sometime Governor-General of Australia, i. 488.
Thicknesse, Preb. F. N., ii. 1133.
Thirlwall, C., Bp. of St. David's, i. 464; ii. 803–4.
Thomas, Rt. Hon. J. H., M.P. (afterwards Secy. of State for the Dominions), ii. 951.
Thompson, H. M., Bp. of Mississippi, i. 122.
Thompson, Rev. J. M., Fellow and Dean of Divinity at Magdalen Coll. Oxford, his book *The Miracles of the New Testament*, i. 672; ii. 852, 856.
Thomson, W., Abp. of York, i. 75, 104, 117*n*, 145–6; death, i. 202.
Thorndike, Dame Sybil, ii. 1212.
Thornton, Rev. Douglas, missionary in Egypt, i. 567.
Thorold, A. W., successively Bp. of Rochester and Bp. of Winchester, i. 133*n*, 135; i. 187–192, 202, 244; death, i. 244; i. 252 (*see also* 'Dolling, Father').
Tikhon, Patriarch of All Russia, greeting sent to him by Abp. Davidson on his election to the Patriarchate, ii. 843–4; appeals through Abp. of Canterbury to English people to help in the great Russian famine, ii. 1069; his conflict with the Soviet Govt. on their confiscation of all eccl. treasure, ii. 1071; his arrest and imprisonment by the Soviet Govt., ii. 1072; his strange recantation and release, ii. 1084; his gift of an Ikon to the Abp. of Canterbury, ii. 1085; death, ii. 1086.
Toledo, Rom. Cath. Abp. of, i. 230, 237.
Tosti, Signor, at Cimiez, i. 311.
Tracey, Rev. A. Hanbury, ii. 815.
Trade Union Movement, i. 46.
Trades Union Congress, orders General Strike (1926), ii. 1305; termination of Strike, ii. 1314.
Transport Trade, strike in (1912), i. 662.
Transvaal, Chinese Labour in, i. 474–80.
Tribute to Abp. Davidson on his resignation of the Primacy, ii. 1365.
Truscott, Rev. H. J. H., minister of St. Catherine's, Hatcham, i. 219–20.
Tucker, A. R., Bp. of Uganda, i. 563–6.
Tulloch, Rev. Principal, Dean of the Order of the Thistle, i. 86*n*.
Tupper, C. L., i. 15, 20*n*.
Tweedmouth, Lord, i. 552.
Twiss, Sir Travers, Vicar-General in 1869, i. 295.
Tyndall, Prof., i. 154.
Uganda, Bp. of (*see* 'Tucker, A. R.' and 'Willis, J. J.').
Unemployed, March from Leicester to London, i. 488–92.
Union, Act of (1707), i. 1.
'Unmarried mother' problem, during the War, ii. 749–50.
Upsala (Sweden), Abp. of (*see* 'Söderblom, Dr. Nathan').
Van Roey, Mgr. (afterwards Cardinal Abp. of Malines), a representative of the Roman side in the Malines 'conversations' on the reunion of Christendom, ii. 1256 *et seq.*
Vaughan, Cardinal, i. 225, 228, 229, 230, 237, 404.
Vaughan, C. J., Master of the Temple, and Dean of Llandaff, i. 27 *et seq.*, 43, 76, 88, 151, 187, 189, 190.
Venizelos, M., ii. 1097–9, 1103.
Victoria, Princess of Schleswig-Holstein (Princess 'Tora'), grand-daughter of Q. Victoria, i. 353.
Victoria, Queen—correspce. and interviews with R. T. D., i. 53–6, 58–61, 74, 75, 89–97, 99, 188, 195–200, 203–4, 238–43, 248–9, 305–16, 335–6, 351; H.M.'s *Journal*, i. 55, 56, 91; correspce. with Mr. Gladstone, i. 57, 58, 60; correspce. with Abp. Benson, i. 63–5; R. T. D.'s description of the Queen and H.M.'s entourage, i. 77 *et seq.*; H.M.'s interest in ritual controversy (1899), i. 335–6; H.M.'s trust in Dean Wellesley as confidential adviser, i. 77; the like trust in R. T. D., i. 77 *et seq.*; birth of a great-granddaughter, i. 90, reads one of Edna Lyall's novels, i. 90, 91; denies a story about H.M.'s accession, i. 91; *Leaves from a Journal of a Life in the Highlands*, i. 92–5; sometimes employs R. T. D. as ambassador between the Sovereign and the Abp. of Canterbury, i. 96–7; support of Deceased Wife's Sister Bill (1883), i. 96; H.M.'s anxiety about Abp. Benson's Bible Class for society ladies, i. 96–7; H.M.'s Jubilee (1887), i. 118; interest in the Lincoln prosecution, i. 151; visit to Biarritz, i. 153; action and practice in eccl. apptmts., and dependence upon R. T. D.'s advice, 163 *et seq.*; is reluctant to sanction

R. T. D.'s apptmt. to a bpric., i. 184, but presses him upon Ld. Salisbury for the See of Winchester, i. 187, and on Ld. S. refusing to nominate him thereto, ultimately agrees that R. T. D. should be offered the choice of the Sees of Rochester and Worcester, i. 191; but is anxious about his health, i. 197; H.M.'s partial blindness, i. 244; on death of Bp. Thorold (1895), H.M. again asks Ld. Salisbury to consider R. T. D. for the See of Winchester and is gratified by his acquiescence and by the apptmt. being made, i. 245–6; a year later, on death of Abp. Benson, presses for the apptmt. of R. T. D. to the Primacy, but is overruled by Ld. Salisbury, and by R. T. D.'s strong advice that Bp. Temple of London should be apptd., i. 285; objects, on grounds of health, to R. T. D.'s being nominated as Temple's successor in the See of London, i. 285; H.M.'s Diamond Jubilee (1897) and the service outside St. Paul's, i. 308–10; R. T. D accompanies H.M., as Chaplain to Cimiez, and describes the place and the life there, i. 311; H.M. officially issues a 'Queen's Letter' to the Abp. of Canterbury 'for a general collection in the Churches of Eng. and Wales on behalf of sufferers in the S. African War', i. 312; but is opposed to the suggestion that a special day for intercession should be apptd., urging that the necessity for special prayer and praise—not humiliation—should be inculcated generally 'not on one day, but throughout these times of national anxiety', i. 313–14; expresses to Lady Audrey Buller her sympathy and her faith in Sir Redvers Buller, despite the reverses he had met with in the S. African War, i. 315–16; H.M.'s last effort—an hour's talk with Ld. Roberts—before her death (on Jan. 22, 1901), i. 351; R. T. D.'s account of her illness, death, and funeral, i. 351–7; *Letters of Q. Victoria* (frequently quoted and referred to in this biography), i. 412; her wish that the Prince Imperial should be buried in Westr. Abbey recalled, ii. 1177; Abp. Davidson writes for *The Times* a short article on the Queen on the eve of the publication of the Second Series of H.M.'s *Letters* (postscript by Ld. Rosebery), ii. 1215–17.

Villiers, Henry, i. 74–5.

Wace, Dr. Henry (afterwards Dean of Canterbury), i. 150, 153, 395, 486, 534 *et seq.*, 722; ii. 863–5, 1040.

Wake, W., Abp. of Canterbury (1716), i. 444.

Wakefield, H. Russell (afterwards Bp. of Birmingham), i. 402.

Wales, Abp. of (*see* 'Edwards, A. G.').

Walpole, Sir Spencer, Secy. to the Post Office, i. 244.

Walsh, W., successively Bp. of Mauritius and Bp. Suffragan of Dover, i. 415; death, ii. 914.

Walton, Rev. J. L., ii. 1032.

Ward, Mrs. Humphry, her novel *Robert Elsmere*, i. 122.

Warre, Rev. Dr., headmaster of Eton, i. 205.

Warrington of Clyffe, Lord, as junior trustee of the Athenaeum Club, presides at banquet given by the Club in honour of Ld. Davidson after his resignation of the Primacy, ii. 1371.

Washington, Booker, negro leader, i. 446.

Waterpark, Lady, i. 79.

Watkins, H. W., Archn. of Durham, i. 169.

Watson, Arthur, asst.-master at Harrow, i. 14, 15, 17.

Watts-Ditchfield, J. E, Bp. of Chelmsford, ii. 1040.

Wayte, Dr. Samuel, Pres. of Trin. Coll., Oxford, i. 21.

Webster, Sir Richard, Attorney-General, i. 103, 135.

Wellesley, Dean of Windsor, i. 50, 61, 69, 76, 77, 82, 163, 202.

Wellwood, Sir Hy. Moncrieff, i. 3.

Welsh Bprics., correspce. about apptmts. to, i. 178–9.

Welsh Church Disestablishment, i. 224–5, 504–5, 640–4; ii 981–90.

Wesley, John, said to have visited Thomas Randall (the elder) at Inchture in 1768, i. 3.

West, Sir Algernon, as vice-chairman of the R. Commn. on the Liquor Licensing Laws, i. 324*n*.

Westcott, Dr. Foss, Bp. of Chota Nagpur, the problem of German Missions in his Dio. during and after the War, ii. 926–8.

Westcott, B. F., asst.-master at Harrow (afterwards Bp. of Durham), i. 14–17, 19, 68, 103; apptd. to the Bpric. of Durham, i. 179–81, 187, 227, 250, 325*n*, 662.

Westminster Abbey, Abp. Davidson's views on questions of burial in, ii. 1178.

Weston, Frank, Bp. of Zanzibar, his letter to the Bp. of St. Albans raising the whole question of the Faith and Order of the Ch., i. 674; his indictment for heresy and schism of the two Bps. (Uganda and Mombasa) who had taken a leading part in the missionary confs. at Kikuyu, i. 690–708; his proposal to take over German Missions in E. Africa during the War, ii. 816; at the Lambeth Conf. (1920), ii. 1010–11–12; at the Anglo-Catholic Congress (1923), ii. 1154; the rights of natives in E. Africa, ii. 1229–35; as Pres. of Anglo-Catholic Congress in Eng., telegraphs to the Pope 'the respectful greetings of 16,000 Catholics', ii. 1276; Abp. Davidson's comments (in a letter to Ld. Halifax) on 'the unguarded way in which he writes and speaks', ii. 1277.
Whippingham, Parish Church, i. 85, 352.
Whipple, H. B., Bp. of Minnesota, i. 122, 447.
White, Rev. Dr. John, Moderator at the first reunited General Assembly of the Ch. of Scotland and the United Free Ch. of Scotland, ii. 1374.
Whitehead, H., Bp. of Madras, i. 716.
White-Ridley, Sir Mathew (afterwards Visct. Ridley), i. 244.
White Slave Traffic (*see* 'Criminal Law Amendment Bill').
Whitgift Hospital, Croydon, ii. 1193.
Whittaker, Sir Thomas, M.P., member of the Speaker's Conf. on Reform of Second Chamber, ii. 883.
Wigram, Rev. Dr. W. A., one of the Abp. of Canterbury's Missioners to the Assyrian Christians, ii. 1181–92.
Wilberforce, Samuel, Bp. of Oxford, i. 75, 163*n*.
Wilkinson, G. H., Bp. of Truro, i. 62, 74.
William II, Emperor of Germany (*see* 'Germany').
Williams, Watkin H., Bp. of Bangor, ii. 990.
Willis, J. J., Bp. of Uganda, presides at the missionary gathering in Brit. E. Africa, which led to the Kikuyu controversy, i. 690–708; the rights of natives in E. Africa, ii. 1230.
Wilson, Archn., i. 152.
Wilson, Rev. H. B., contributor to *Essays and Reviews* (1860), i. 338.
Wilson, Sir Hy., Field Marshal, ii. 781; outspoken criticism of Pres. Woodrow Wilson's peace proposals, ii. 913.
Wilson, Woodrow, Pres. of U.S.A., his support of the principle of a League of Nations, ii. 891, 910–11; 913.
Winchester, Bpric. of, i. 187–92; R. T. D.'s apptmt. to, i. 245, and work in, i. 247 *et seq.*; division of the Dio., ii. 1170–2, 1195.
Winchester College, i. 248; the Coll. Mission, i. 263 (*see also* 'Dolling, Father').
Windsor Castle, i. 74 *et seq.*; P. Consort's room in, i. 84; private chapel, services in, i. 85; hymn books in use at, i. 85; Mausoleum, i. 86; Ascot Cup Day, i. 113; calendar of Ch. of Eng. papers in Royal Archives at, i. 165.
Windsor, Deanery of, i. 63 *et seq.*; R. T. D.'s apptmt. to, i. 97, R. T. D.'s varied work during his tenure of, i. 182–3; his Ladies' Bible Class, i. 71–3, his farewell to the Deanery, i. 182 *et seq.*; Canon P. S. Eliot apptd. to succeed him, i. 199*n*.
Windsor, St. George's Chapel, i. 68, 70, 71; replacement in Royal vault of Charles I, i. 98–100.
Winnington-Ingram, Bp. A. F. (*see* 'Ingram').
Wiseman, Rev. Dr. F. L., ii. 743.
Wolmer, Visct., M.P., his part in securing the passage of the Bishopric Bill (1913) through Parl., i. 645–6; his active participation in the movement culminating in the passage of the Enabling Bill through Parl., ii. 956–7, 969; his pilotage of the Bill through the H. of Commons, ii. 979–80.
Women's Suffrage, i. 669–70.
Wood, Major Hon. Edw. (afterwards Visct. Irwin and Visct. Halifax), opposes initial scheme for a National Assembly of the Ch. of Eng., ii. 968.
Woods, F. Theodore, successively Bp. of Peterborough and Bp. of Winchester, ii. 871, 1008, 1364.
Worcester, Bpric., i. 187–95.
Wordsworth, Christopher, Bp. of Lincoln, i. 173.
Wordsworth, John (Bp. of Salisbury), i. 133*n*, 177, 389, 402, 404–5, 416, 570; presents to the Upper H. of Conv. of Canterbury a report of a sub-commee. containing evidence in favour of the legality of vestments, i. 652; i. 712–13; his protest to the Old Catholic Bps. of Holland against their consecration of Arnold H. Mathew (q.v.), ii. 1018; his part in development of relations between the Ch. of Eng. and the Orthodox Ch.,

ii. 1105 (*see also* 'Prayer Book Revision').
Worksop, Mr. Bury's School at, i. 10–12.
World Alliance for promoting International Friendship through the Churches, founded on the eve of the War, ii. 733; Abp. Davidson elected Pres. of international commee., ii. 1036–7.
World's Evangelical Alliance, ii. 827.
World Missionary Conf. at Edinburgh (1910), i. 572–5.
World's Student Federation, i. 499.
Wright, Mr. Justice, i. 366.
Yeatman (afterwards Yeatman-Biggs), H. W., successively Bp. Suffragan of Southwark, Bp. of Worcester, and Bp. of Coventry, i. 207, 211, 717.
York, Abpric. of, i. 202.
York, Duke of, marriage (1923), ii. 1169, 1172; his presence, as Ld. High Commissioner, at the first reunited General Assembly of the Ch. of Scotland and the United Free Ch., when Abp. Davidson addresses the Assembly, ii. 1374.
Zanzibar, Bp. of (*see* 'Hine, J. E.' and 'Weston, F.').

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
JOHN JOHNSON
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY