RANDALL DAVIDSON, LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

By G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester, 1935.

Oxford University Press. 2 volumes, Oct., 1428 pages. London: *Humphrey Milford.* Price, 36*s.*

A Review by the Right Rev. Bishop E. A. Knox, D.D.

The Biography.

BISHOP BELL has deserved well, not only of the Church of England, but also of that far wider circle, religious and secular, to which the memory of Archbishop Davidson is of profound interest. Of very few persons, not excepting even Sovereigns and Statesmen, could it be so truly said as of Randall Davidson, *humani nihil alienum a me puto.* (*Nihil*, with the exception, perhaps, of extreme Protestants.) Davidson loved men, and was never happier than when conversing with them. The course of his life was so ordered that for nearly sixty years he was in close touch with the leaders of the nation from the Sovereign downwards. He kept careful and well-ordered records of all his interviews and correspondence. The natural result was that his biographer had to work through, summarise, select, and present to the public, gleanings from an extraordinarily wide field of material, and so to present them as to make the result readily intelligible to ordinary readers, picturesque, truthful, and serviceable for future historians. How Bishop Bell achieved this task amid the incessant and exacting duties of an important episcopate, in the short space of five years, is difficult to understand. Perhaps the explanation is that he had been trained in diligence and method in the capacity of Chaplain to the late Archbishop. At all events he has produced what may fairly be called a monumental work, and produced it with the fairness, considerateness, and good taste which were characteristic of the subject of his biography. It is difficult to praise the book too highly. It is written in an easy fluent style. The necessary explanations are given clearly and concisely. The mass of material is so handled as to produce a vivid, life-like portraiture. Dates are abundantly supplied. No one can read the life without knowing the manner of man that Davidson was. Bishop Bell loved and honoured his chief, yet knew that mere hero-worship would do his memory more harm than good. He has not been afraid to criticise, though never satirically or maliciously. His book deserves, and we venture to add, is likely to take, a very high place among biographies. His subject was great, and he has done justice to it.

While thus whole-heartedly commending the book, we do not, of course, mean that we as unreservedly commend the policy pursued by Archbishop Davidson. Bishop Bell quotes an estimate contributed by Bishop Gore, which expresses our own attitude to

Randall Davidson's work: "Only the future can decide whether the almost absolute mastery which he won in the counsels of Bishops—both those of the Church of England, and those of other lands—was wholly good for the Anglican Communion" (II, 1159). Indeed we shall be obliged to express our conviction that, in some respects, the policy pursued in the twenty-five years of his Primacy was far from beneficial to the Church, though we can add quite honestly with Bishop Gore that the mastery "was gained and deepened to the end in the main by the grand and stainless character of the man." But our criticisms may be reserved to take their proper place in the review of his life.

Davidson up to His Ordination.

Starting then from the Scottish home, which was no mere shadowy memory to him, but, as it is with many Scotsmen, a dominating influence in the background of his whole life, we find the future author of Prayer Book Revision saying at the age of seven, "What do you think that those English have done?" His cousin replied that she could believe anything of them. Randall said: "They've altered the Bible!" He had just seen for the first time the Prayer Book version of the Psalter—the Scotch using the Old Testament version. Randall and Kate both vowed they'd "never use the Prayer Book version after that." It was no mere accident that the two Archbishops who promoted Prayer Book Revision in 1927, were both Scottish Presbyterians by birth. They never had the training in devout reverence for the Book of Common Prayer which was the heritage of Anglican Churchmen of all schools in the earlier part of the nineteenth century.

Though Davidson, true to his Scottish nature and upbringing, was a diligent sermon-taster, and in after life spoke of the sermons and lectures which he attended at Oxford as "touching the religious note" which was, after all, the deepest in his life, yet he passed both through Harrow and through Oxford, and through the terrible accident by which he nearly lost his life, without the profound religious experience which characterises the almost contemporary life of Bishop Gore. The Harrow of those days was the Harrow of Dr. Butler, of Westcott and of John Smith, a combination of religious influences almost, if not quite, unique in Public School experience, but, though Davidson engineered himself, with a diplomacy worthy of his later days, out of Watson's into Westcott's house, he passed through Harrow without being really scorched, as Gore was, by Westcott's prophetic fire. His academic career was marred by the effects of his accident, and it was a lifelong disappointment to him that he failed to obtain the First Class for which he had hoped, and for which he was qualified, in the Modern History School. That he sought, and that I declined to give him and Crawfurd Tait, the "coaching" at Addington which they desired of me, was one of the great blunders and lost opportunities of my life, all the more poignant since the biography reveals how eagerly Davidson was at that moment desir-

ing such tuition. His training for Holy Orders under Dean Vaughan at the Temple, was for him, as a *Public School boy*, the normal Ordination training of those days. But there can have been few of Vaughan's Ordinands to whom Vaughan wrote at parting in the terms in which he wrote to Davidson: "I had got to think of you as one who could feel as I felt, and who *anticipated* half of my thoughts ere they were uttered." It would probably have been of value to Davidson in after life if his first curacy had not been prematurely terminated by his being summoned to take the place of Archbishop Tait's Chaplain: the post which practically determined the rest of his career.

Davidson at Lambeth and Windsor.

A singular and interesting comparison and contrast might be drawn between the influence exercised by Archbishop Tait in the seventies, and his Chaplain Davidson in the same office in later years. Archbishop Tait was certainly the more dominating influence of the two: he counted for more in the national life. The Church of England was immensely stronger in his day than in our own. Statesmen consulted Davidson, but they were swayed by Tait, who was naturally more conspicuous when Bishops were far fewer, and counted for more in public estimation. A slight, but significant, instance from my own experience confirms this opinion. Having occasion to call on Archbishop Tait, I was asked by Davidson as Chaplain, to fill in the time of waiting for my appointment by going through a big scrap-book of cartoons of Tait from old numbers of *Punch*. Tait was constantly appearing in *Punch*, far oftener in his few years than Davidson in the twenty-five years of his primacy. Tait was, even as Primate, the awe-inspiring Headmaster, whose dignity dominated Church and State. His ecclesiastical policy was almost the reverse of Davidson's. It was as Tait's Chaplain that Davidson wrote to the notable ritualist, S. F. Green of Miles Platting, the letter which Bishop Bell describes as "prophetic of the issues which it was Davidson's task to try and get the Church to face for many years to come." "My dear Sir," wrote Davidson to S. F. Green, "your letter just received makes it clear, if I understand you rightly, that no authority, ecclesiastical or civil, exists, to which you would feel yourself at liberty to defer with respect to the practical action which you found upon your own interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric." This letter written in 1882 may be set by the side of one written in 1927 by Sir W. Joynson-Hicks to Archbishop Davidson: "I should have gone a long way in the cause of peace if you had been able to say to me—'Of course this is a concordat which will be carried out in the letter and in the spirit on both sides. . . . 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.'" It is the fashion to speak of the failure of Archbishop Tait's policy.

But after it had been reversed for forty-five years, the reversal left the old difficulty precisely where it had been in Davidson's youth, or even in a worse position. Davidson could not guarantee that even the revised Prayer Book would bring the contumacious to order.

On December 3, 1882, Archbishop Tait died, and Davidson, after a short continuance in office as Chaplain to Archbishop Benson, was carried off by the Queen to be Dean of Windsor and Domestic Chaplain. "The Dean was an irresistible Dean; not because he fought (he never fought), still less because there was anything dramatic about him (he was never dramatic), but because he was so cool, and Scotch and right, and always to the point." It hardly requires to be said "that the charm of his wife (Edith, daughter of Archbishop Tait), made him doubly irresistible." Into his ministrations in the Castle we need not here enter, except to note the courage with which, for her own good, he withstood the Queen on the question of her publishing memoranda in continuance of *Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands* (I, 92 etc.). That incident was the more noteworthy on account of Davidson's careful avoidance of all unnecessary friction, and should be classed with other occasions of his facing unpopularity (I, 490 and 550)—a side of his character seldom recognised. Yet it was there, and peacemaker as he was, he was no coward. The true importance of the Dean's new position lay in his influence on ecclesiastical appointments, and still more in the degree in which he became the trusted counsellor of Tait's successor, Archbishop Benson. Under Benson the policy of opposition to Ritualism was changed for a policy of toleration, notably of course, in the matter of the trial of Bishop King of Lincoln, who might not unfairly be described as the first Ritualistic Bishop. A series of judgments, chiefly by the Privy Council, had declared the Ritualists to be wrong in their contention that they were true law-observers, and Protestants the real law-breakers in the Church. It would have taxed the ingenuity even of Archbishop Benson, lover as he was of pageantry, of study of archæology and obscure chronicles, to have judged that all churches *must* use lighted candles by daylight for Holy Communion, all clergy use the mixed chalice, and the Eastward position. Even he could not maintain the position for which the Ritualists contended, yet he found it possible, with the help of his coadjutors, to decide that the ritualistic practices examined were not necessarily *illegal*, and that they could be tolerated though certainly not enforced. This was a turning-point in English Church History. It was the abandonment of the principle of Uniformity, and of "the intent that every person in this realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship."[1] This principle was abandoned in favour of elasticity of worship. What was Davidson's share in the formulation of this judgment? The biography does not enable us to answer this question precisely. But it reveals (1) hat Davidson

[1] Act of Uniformity of 1662.

" was the constant correspondent and friend of Archbishop Benson, who was at that time engaged in the Lincoln case " (I, 139), and (2) that Davidson was " intensely and whole-heartedly in favour of the *toleration* line and determined to use every possible opportunity in favour of it " (I, 131). It seems to be a fair historical inference that as far back as 1888, Davidson had completely abandoned the position of Archbishop Tait, and thrown the whole of his already potent influence on the side of *toleration* of some ritualistic innovations. It is fair, however, to Davidson to add that the Episcopal veto on prosecutions to which Tait clung with much tenacity did, in fact, make room for a pernicious diversity of use in different Dioceses, and had the effect of making the Bishop prosecutor, Judge, and Father in God of his own clergy—an intolerable combination of functions. Tait must not be absolved from his share of blame.

It is interesting to note that Bishop King's appointment was largely due to Davidson's influence, who pleaded that out of five simultaneous appointments, it was only fair that " the High Church party should have one representative " (I, 175) and balance Bishop Bickersteth's appointment to Exeter, the latter being all the better fitted because " the narrow Evangelicals regard him as too lax and wide in his sympathies." It would be difficult to find in the whole biography a single evidence of any sincere attempt on Davidson's part to appreciate the position of Protestant Churchmen. They were always to him, as they were to the Queen, objects of something like aversion. It was an error for which in the end he paid dearly.

Davidson as Bishop. His Views on Episcopacy.

During Benson's primacy, which lasted from 1883 to 1896, Davidson was promoted in 1891 to the Bishopric of Rochester, and in 1895 to the Bishopric of Winchester. His last speech in the Lower House of Convocation as Dean of Windsor was a successful protest against the appointment of a Committee of the House to examine the teaching of the volume of Essays called *Lux Mundi*. The appearance of that volume was another milestone in English Church History. It divided the High Church party into two sections, and in one of these placed it under the dominating influence of Hegelian Philosophy. It was, of course, consistent with Davidson's principle of toleration to make room for this new departure from the lines of old-fashioned orthodoxy. But he can hardly have foreseen the troubles which it was to cost him in less than a quarter of a century. It would be absurd to blame him for this lack of foresight. On the other hand it was another warning, and an unheeded warning, that the Church of England needed nothing so much as the establishment of legal authority that could command public confidence in its wisdom and its fairness. The ordinary layman was once more scandalised by the helplessness with which the ark of the Church drifted in the troubled seas through which it was passing. The officers

seemed to have little control of mutinies in the crew, and no charts to guide their course. To the officers the ordinary layman appeared to be no more than an ignorant landlubber. "The ship was caught, and could not bear up into the wind; so we let her drive" (Acts xxvii. 15).

Passing by Davidson's Rochester Episcopate (1891–5) which was sorely troubled by illness, we come towards the end of his Winchester Episcopate (1895–1903) to the violent attack of Sir William Harcourt upon the Bishops for neglect of their duty to the Church. We pause here in our review of Davidson's ecclesiastical policy because we are conscious that in our concentration on this side of his activities we are giving a very inadequate idea of his conception of episcopal duty, and of his attempt to carry out his ideal, expressed in his own words (I, 317 ff.):

"Besides a Bishop's duties to the parishes in his Diocese, a Bishop is, and not less rightly, expected to be giving time and thought to a whole multitude of central things in the life of the nation or the Church, things quite other than Diocesan. . . . He is set in this peculiar office, which has its duly assigned niche in our national history past and present, to be in some sense your representative and mouthpiece for dealing with moral as well as with religious questions in the public life of England. To give practical examples of what I mean. When questions directly affecting the affairs of the clergy or the system of our Church Schools, or the observance of Sunday, and so forth, are under discussion, it is expected as a matter of course that the Bishops should take an active part. But in my judgment they are not less truly called upon—especially while they have a place in the National Legislature—to accept and use their responsibility in other matters which concern the social and moral health of our citizens and their children, say the protection of infant life from cruelty and wrong—or such amendment of our prison laws as shall make them remedial as well as punitive, or provision for the cases of workmen who are injured in the discharge of duty—or enactments for checking commercial immorality—or arrangements for promoting the health of shop assistants. Bishops, in short, are entrusted, as I believe, with a place in the Legislature, not only for what are technically called Ecclesiastical questions, but for whatever things directly concern the moral life and the social well-being of the English people."

Davidson—the Statesman Primate.

Such being Davidson's view of the duties of the Episcopate it is needless to say that, especially after his promotion to the Primacy, social questions occupied a very large share of his time and attention—and not only social questions but purely political as well. He loved the House of Lords: he loved the Athenæum Club, where he held long conversations with men of eminence in the political, literary, and artistic world. The simplest proof of the extraordinary width of his interests may be gained by Bishop Bell's account of a *sample* day (II, 867 etc.). We begin with a wedding, of course after dealing with the day's correspondence. From the wedding we pass to the Cabinet meeting, where the Archbishop dissuades the Government from using the British Museum to house the Air Force during the War. The Cabinet meeting is followed by a visit to Lord Rosebery in distress over

the death of Neil Primrose. The conversation is religious and afterwards political. At three o'clock Davidson is at Lambeth (presumably to sign letters). At half-past three he is in the House of Lords. Behind all this is a background of conversations with Dr. Henson, whose promotion to the Bishopric of Hereford is being severely contested. Long, long into the night did such conversations last. It was extraordinary that Davidson's health stood the strain of the work. Nor was he a mere busybody in other men's matters. His marvellous memory, his shrewdness, his versatility of intellect made him an adviser of more than ordinary value. Perhaps the supreme test of his political influence is to be found in the debate on the Parliament Bill in the House of Lords in 1911. Of that debate Lord Morley has left the following record:

"The speeches that followed (Morley's), though some were made by leading men, were in the strain of altercation, hot or cold, rather than serious contribution. The one most reassuring for the Ministers of them all, took no more than three or four minutes. It fell from the Primate—the head of the hierarchy, who have their seats not by descent or birth, nor by election from Scotland and Ireland, nor by political or secular service—a man of broad mind, sagacious temper, steady and careful judgment, good knowledge of the workable strength of rival sections." He goes on to say how the Archbishop in a few words, impressed the House with the real gravity of the situation, and practically, on Lord Lansdowne's admission, decided the issue.

It has seemed to be bare justice to Davidson's memory to interrupt our story of ecclesiastical strife with mention of the far wider activities that engaged his attention. It was, perhaps, during the War that his political experience and influence were of greatest value to the nation.

"His refusal to be carried away, whether in ultra-nationalism or ultra-pacifism, begat confidence in his judgment. There was something massive about him, massive and true. And throughout four and a half years on the repeated and solemn occasions on which he had to address the whole people at, or through, special services, he spoke the brave, strong, 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 protest against actions and speeches, which seemed to him unworthy of the traditions of his country. . . . Certainly he was far better known and more fully respected when the Armistice was signed than he had ever been before" (II, 1152).

Davidson's Church Policy.

While trying to do justice to Davidson's lofty conceptions of the duties of the Episcopate, and to the respect which he won by his endeavour to discharge the social and political responsibilities which he believed to be incumbent on him, we cannot help wondering whether he fully realised that the ecclesiastical difficulties which were his first care were not easily compatible, as a mere question of time, with the secular causes into which he

threw himself so heartily. He was conscious that his training and experience, his marvellous memory and his diplomatic ability enabled him to deal swiftly and successfully with emergencies, as they presented themselves. But was he fully conscious that he had ascended the throne of Augustine in a moment of spiritual and theological difficulty such as none of his predecessors had faced, a time when these problems were sufficient to tax the whole energy of a trained philosopher or theologian? The problems dividing the Church at the beginning of the twentieth century were not superficial but fundamental. They were such as these: the relation of the Church of England to the Church Universal: the relations between Church and State in questions spiritual as well as temporal: the authority of Scripture, and specially of the Old Testament as compared with the New. To such problems as these Davidson brought no special theological training, no first-hand study of philosophical or juristic education: no more than bare outlines of historical and liturgical tradition. He brought invaluable common sense, and skill in picking the brains of men more learned than himself. But it may be questioned whether he ever realised to the full the seriousness of the controversy into which he was drawn. He was apt to regard ritualism as the fruit of romanticism, an outgrowth of Sir Walter Scott's novels, his favourite literature to the end; but while romanticism popularised ritualism, the roots of ritualism were deeper far. Davidson despised Puritanism as an outworn creed, exploding occasionally in anti-Roman demonstrations, but of the deep roots of the anti-clerical spirit in English History and of their meaning he had little conception. The Church of England, when he became Archbishop, was called to a decision whether it would or would not renounce Protestantism, and turn its back on the Reformation. The effect of Prayer Book Revision as Davidson presented it to the nation, was to remit this problem to a majority of the Parish Council in each parish, with such assistance as the Bishop of the Diocese chose to give it.

Two biographies appearing contemporaneously with Archbishop Davidson's bring into strong contrast his attitude to the problem with that of the two Anglo-Catholic leaders, Bishop Gore and Lord Halifax. Gore was the philosopher, prophet and theologian, Halifax the statesman, of the Anglo-Catholics. The lives of both were practically contemporaneous with Davidson's. Both were in antagonism with him, Gore more especially. Yet both seemed to Davidson indispensable, men who must be retained at any cost. Gore and Halifax display, in a striking manner, their wholehearted devotion to their cause, as against Davidson's, to some extent necessary, dissipation of his energies. The study of the three lives together throws a flood of light on the secret of the success of Anglo-Catholicism, and enables us to form a clearer estimate of Archbishop Davidson's career than we can gather even from Bishop Bell's excellent biography. Of Lord Halifax's life, we have only the first volume, carrying us down to 1885. But it goes far enough

to illuminate the difficulties of ritual with which Davidson was called to deal. Gore's life helps us to understand the difficulties of Davidson's long Archiepiscopate, and that from more than one point of view.

The first and sharpest contrast between the two men is presented by the conditions under which Halifax became President of the English Church Union in 1868, while Davidson was still Dean of Windsor. The nobleman, who had been chosen playmate! (if the Prince of Wales could be said to have had any playmates) of the future King Edward, his close friend and his Groom of the Bedchamber, by accepting that Presidency renounced the brilliant Parliamentary career that was almost his right, to become the leader of a little Society which then could not count more than 2,300 members. It was a great renunciation inspired in him by the belief that "the Body and Blood of Christ were present under the Sacramental veils by virtue of Consecration," there to be worshipped and adored, and that it was his duty to do all in his power to support the clergy, who seemed to him to be persecuted for trying to express the same faith by liturgical symbolism, such as lighted candles, vestments, incense, and reservation of the Sacrament. This love of symbolism had proved to be no mere love of display or expression of eccentricity. There had been a time when the Tractarian leaders, and notably Pusey, had strongly disapproved of ritualism as mere indulgence in finery: and not without reason. We read of clergy got up in cassocks and tall hats at Wantage, or of Hawker of Morwenstowe "stalking about his parish in a claret-coloured suit, a blue jersey, and a brimless pink hat," or of the aping of Roman priests in Mass which amused Newman when he had joined the Church of Rome. But the day of these frivolities was passed. Ritual, auricular confession, fastings, scourgings, monastic vows, profession of nuns, worship of the Reserved Sacrament, invocations of the Virgin Mary and of Saints, were found to hang together and to be parts of a "way of salvation." The result on the whole was a defiance, or even a detestation, of Protestantism and of the Church order of England. It was a repudiation of the authority of the State in things spiritual, and from this point of view provoked the hostility of Bishops, of statesmen such as Sir William Harcourt, and of devout church-goers, who saw their churches turned into "Mass-houses" and profaned by intrusion of "idolatrous images." The forces arrayed against the Ritualists, even at the time of Davidson's appointment to Canterbury, seemed to be overwhelming, and he had not been in office a month when a deputation of a hundred M.P.s waited on him to insist on the suppression of Ritual. To this deputation he made his answer concerning some of the more extreme churches: "I say to you deliberately in my view of such cases tolerance has reached, and even passed, its limits. The sands have run out. Stern and drastic action is, in my judgment quite essential" (I, 399). Yet at the end of Davidson's term of office no stern and drastic action had been taken. Some, nay, almost

all of the practices which he definitely forbade in his last year at Winchester (I, 338) would have been tolerated under the Revised Prayer Book. Whence this victory of the cause which seemed at his accession to be threatened with extinction?

While it would be grossly unfair and contrary to fact to lay the whole blame for the success of Anglo-Catholicism upon Archbishop Davidson, yet he was mainly responsible for the policy adopted during his Primacy. That was his fate as Archbishop. From his life, especially as read with the others that we have mentioned, it is evident that his mistakes lay in supposing (1) that a spiritual court commanding the obedience of Anglo-Catholics could be devised without surrendering the connection of Church and State, and (2) that the Anglo-Catholics could be bought off by acceptance of a portion of their demands. For the first of these errors there was hardly any excuse. Twice already Davidson had seen refusal of obedience to courts which were wholly spiritual, if, as in common parlance, "spiritual" and "clerical" are identical. Archbishop Benson's decisions on the Lambeth Judgment had been disobeyed, and so had the opinions of Archbishops Temple and Maclagan on Reservation and Incense. Yet in his last Charge as Bishop of Winchester, Davidson expressed his approval of Archbishop Benson's scheme for reform of Ecclesiastical Courts, which included the reference of all points of doctrine or ritual to the decision of the whole English Episcopate specially summoned for the purpose.

The Anglo-Catholics were certain to refuse obedience even to the unanimous Episcopate on the ground that the Bishops were of State-appointment, and if one Bishop dissented and took their side, to exploit this one Bishop's action to the utmost. This is precisely what they did in the matters of incense and reservation. The liberty accorded in the London Diocese was claimed by extremists in all other dioceses as the rightful heritage of the Church. The consensus of the Episcopate was not to be had without a Pope to shape and to enforce it. Unfortunately Davidson was not really disposed to correct even excesses of ritual. In spite of what he had said in April, 1903, to the Parliamentary deputation of the necessity for "stern and drastic" action, we find him writing in February, 1904, to Bishop Gore (I, 455): "I regard the growth of a loyal spirit as far more valuable than the mere pruning of eccentric men." There is a distinct change of tone here, and the whole purpose of the letter is to glean proofs of loyalty wherewith to repel the threatened Parliamentary inquiry. In his evidence before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Irregularities he went further, even so far as to say that "a Court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must, above others, rest on moral authority if its judgments are to be effective. As thousands of clergy with lay support refuse to recognise the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee, its judgments cannot be practically enforced." On Davidson, as Archbishop, must rest no small share of the responsibility for discrediting the authority of Ecclesiastical

Courts. He intended, no doubt, to devise some form of Ecclesiastical Court which could be represented as wholly spiritual, and yet have behind it the power of the State to enforce its decrees. But no self-respecting State would have consented to enforce judgments of the Church in blind obedience to its commands. The only alternative was to place the Church on a purely consensual basis, and to get rid of the State connection altogether. Davidson had really no well-thought-out policy of Ecclesiastical Courts. Thirty years have passed since the Royal Commission recommended that they should be reformed. They are unreformed still. Davidson's other great error, shared by most of his episcopal brethren, was that of regarding what were called extreme practices as a bundle of disconnected items, of more or less serious gravity, some of which could be allowed, while others were refused. It seemed possible by diplomatic bargaining to compound with the bulk of the clergy to reject certain practices on condition that others were allowed. They might have the Eastward position and vestments, if they would give up incense and reservation.

The same policy was followed by the Royal Commission which drew its celebrated line of deep cleavage between the churches of England and Rome, and placed some practices on one side of the line and some on the other. No doubt there were clergy open to this form of liturgical chaffering. Others there were like Bishop Gore, who were prepared to obey, or even enforce, episcopal regulations with full purpose of "squeezing" the Bishops to obtain further concessions. But always behind these was the determined body of extremists, who found in the complete Catholic system the true way of holiness, the only way of sanctification to which the Church had lent its authority. It did not trouble them that this way was almost identical with the Roman way. Some believed Rome to be in error and prayed for her repentance. Others waited only in the Church of England till by a corporate act she should return to the Roman obedience. But all of them agreed that they must insist on all that the Church—as they interpreted it—required, vestments, incense, adoration of the consecrated elements, masses for the living and the dead, auricular confession, penance, and vocations to the monastic or conventual life. There was no bargaining with these men, no Church of England Court that they would obey. Davidson left them, not merely unshaken, but far stronger than at the time of his accession to the Primacy. His friendship with some of them was so close that he could hardly be unaware of their aims. But he was very careful to abstain from the kind of step which would have alienated them. His Kikuyu decision was not very different from that of the consultative Lambeth Committee, of which it was said that "they came to the conclusion that the service at Kikuyu was eminently pleasing to God, but must on no account be repeated" (I, 708, note).

Prayer Book Revision.

So we pass to the great design with which the name of Davidson will always be associated, his effort to secure for the Church an alternative Prayer Book embodying his ideal of "elasticity of worship"—the very negation of the Reformation attempt to secure Uniformity in all public services of the Church of England. On the whole Dr. Bell gives us the story fairly, but not quite as fully as we could have wished. We seem to miss clear apprehension of errors in the earlier stages of the adventure. The summary of reasons for its failure is very straightforward. But we could have desired a more detailed account of the preparatory steps, which exhibit in a remarkable degree both Davidson's determination to secure his end and the adverse forces which he overlooked. We start from the intention to substitute a new Rubric for the Ornaments Rubric—an intention never fulfilled. The Anglo-Catholics saw to that. Then came the long, long, "wanderings" of revision of the Prayer Book in the four houses of Convocation of Canterbury and York, and the unsuccessful attempt to bring the Houses into agreement. The hope of getting a new Prayer Book in response to Royal Letters of Business addressed to the Convocations failed. But the great transformation of the voluntary Representative Assemblies of the Church into the statutory Church Assembly was really the greatest and most lasting of all Davidson's achievements. It was a measure quite remarkable enough to secure his memory as a Church Reformer for all time. Then followed the steady pressure of the alternative Prayer Book through the Church Assembly and through the Diocesan Conferences, partly by insisting that there was no other means of restoring order in the Church, and partly by explanations that unpopular expressions were patient of some other interpretation. In the latter of these two devices Davidson was badly "let down" by the Evangelical Bishops, who were quite out of touch with the strong Protestantism of which they ought to have been exponents. Their responsibility for the final fiasco was very great. They paid far too dear a price for an illusory peace. However, they *seemed* to remove the most formidable of all obstacles, and that obstacle was discounted. Even Nonconformist opposition was discounted by securing public support from some eminent Nonconformist leaders. It only remained to enlist the aid of "a good Press" for the new venture, and a better Press few proposals of the Church have ever had. Victory seemed to be absolutely assured.

What then had Davidson overlooked? Where did his well-laid plans go astray? He overlooked the smouldering discontent in hundreds of parishes into which Anglo-Catholic incumbents had ruthlessly forced their ritual, remorselessly turning a deaf ear to all protests, and not caring if they emptied their churches. He overlooked the unpopularity incurred by the Episcopate for its failure to repress these innovations. He rated far too low the numerical strength of devout Protestants, of whose existence he

seemed hardly aware. He overlooked the extraordinary conservatism of "the Churchman who never goes to Church," but firmly declares that "he will not have the Prayer Book changed to please the Papists." Davidson never understood the Englishman's love for the Prayer Book. The public never heard the carping criticisms to which the Book was subjected in the Convocations; they were not interested in the "Grey" and "Green" and other productions of fanciful liturgiologists, but they were strong in their belief that their Prayer Book was being altered with the deliberate intention of undoing the work of the Reformation. Presently it transpired also that a Bishop (Weston of Zanzibar) had telegraphed to the Pope from a meeting of 16,000 Anglo-Catholics in the Albert Hall "humbly praying—that the day of peace with Rome might quickly dawn," and that neither the Archbishop nor the Convocations had publicly rebuked this publicly expressed desire for reunion with Rome. Nay, it was first whispered, and presently admitted, that conversations with a view to ultimate reunion were being conducted at Malines with the sanction of both the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury. All these were public facts which could not fail to influence the House of Commons when its consent was demanded to the Revised Prayer Book. The final stage was reached when it was found that the innovations proposed included provisions for "reserving" the consecrated elements "perpetually," under conditions it is true, but already more than 1,000 clergy had publicly announced their determination of disregarding these conditions. The book, in fact, comprised all that Lord Halifax and his friends regarded as the very core of all their faith and practice, though fenced with futile and irritating precautions and restrictions. Bishop Bell (II, 1354) suggests some reasons why the Book failed to pass the House of Commons. The real reason was that which he places first—national antagonism to Popery. Reactions in favour of Rome had, in effect, captured the Councils of the Church. They failed to capture the great Council of the Nation.

It is the acid test of Davidson's archiepiscopal policy that he bequeathed to the Church in the last meeting that he attended of the Church Assembly a Commission "to inquire into the present relations of Church and State." His great object had been by diplomatic manœuvres to prevent any secession of the Anglo-Catholics from the Church. He was successful, but at the cost of imperilling the bond which in fact holds the various sections of the Church together. What schisms and ruptures threaten the disestablished Church, it passes the wit of man to foretell. They cannot fail to be manifold and far-reaching in their consequences to the Empire as well as the Nation.

Modernism.

We must perforce deal much more briefly with the other great trouble of Davidson's primacy, the trouble of Modernism. It occupies a considerable space in Bishop Bell's records, and centres chiefly round the name of Bishop Gore. In his Essay in *Lux*

Mundi Gore had not hesitated to question the historic value of the Old Testament, especially in the matter of miracles. Our Lord's references to those miracles he explained by regarding the references to them as expressions of His Manhood, so humbled that He spoke to men of His time as a man of His time, veiling for this purpose His Divine Omniscience. But when sundry clergy, and notably Dr. Rashdall, Canon Sanday and others, expressed disbelief in such miracles of the New Testament as our Lord's Virgin Birth, His Resurrection and Ascension, Gore was profoundly disturbed.

Davidson had scarcely been enthroned, when he received a letter from Gore, asking for something to be done in Convocation by way of a declaration or otherwise to make it very clear that the Bishops did not connive at the practices of the clergy, who openly recited the Creeds in Church, while in their publications they questioned or even denied the facts asserted in the Creeds. Davidson, who had not forgotten the Convocation declarations concerning *Essays* and *Reviews*, and concerning Bishop Colenso, advised caution, and for a while staved off the project, but only for a while. Gore returned to the attack more insistently in 1914, on the publication of a book by J. M. Thompson, Fellow and Dean of Divinity at Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1914. Gore was so troubled that he wished to resign if some decisive action were not taken at once. He went to see Davidson, and found him equally opposed to making any declaration, and even ready to resign his Archbishopric, if Gore's motions were passed. Davidson was obdurate against petitions signed by Churchmen of all shades of opinion including 45,000 Evangelicals. Those were the days of Dean Wace's prominence in Convocation. Of course Gore had to give way to Davidson's threat of resignation and to modify the resolutions for which he had clamoured. A compromise was reached by substituting a declaration affirming that " denial of the historical facts contained in the Creeds went beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation," and " gravely imperilled the sincerity of profession which is plainly incumbent on the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments." But a clause was added declaring that the " Convocation was anxious not to limit the freedom of thought and inquiry whether among the clergy or laity." As the declaration was eventually accepted by both parties to the dispute it is hardly necessary to inquire which of the two was the gainer. At all events both resignations were averted, and the War turned all thoughts for a while into other directions. Before the War was over, however, the appointment of Hensley Henson to the Bishopric of Hereford in 1918 threatened another crisis. Gore was once more upon the war-path. But on this occasion Davidson obtained from Henson, by prolonged conversations, a definite statement that those who supposed that he disbelieved in the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection were misinformed, and once more Gore's threats of resignation were withdrawn. In view of Dr. Henson's strenuous advocacy of Disestablishment to-day, it is interesting to note that but for

the protection afforded by the Establishment he would not have had the remotest chance of being made a Bishop. In a self-governing Church he would have been fortunate to escape being unfrocked for heresy.

Education.

We have not space for recounting the story of the Education Problem, of Birrell's Bill, of Runciman's compromise, of Fisher's strenuous endeavour to bring about agreement. Briefly it may be said that Davidson was more anxious to secure some sort of religious instruction in all schools, than to maintain the retention of Church Schools. He had never been an incumbent, and only for a few months a curate. He seemed quite unable to realise how dearly Churchmen, especially in Lancashire, prized their Church Schools. This story ends with a resolution passed by the Committee of the National Society in Davidson's presence, and to his keen disappointment "requesting the authorities of the Church to abandon the policy of negotiation for the surrender of Church Schools."

The Conclusion.

Here we must close our review. If we have ventured to criticise frankly Davidson's Ecclesiastical policy, we have done so with a consciousness that he was called to face problems such as no other Archbishop had to encounter, and not without profound admiration for his personal character. He gave himself wholeheartedly to his overwhelming task with sincere conscientiousness and earnest endeavour to win the blessing that belongs to peacemakers. Unsparing in his labours, unfailing in courtesy, unbounded in sympathy, guided by genuine unaffected piety, consistent in aiming at, and maintaining, the highest ideals, "a wholesome example to Church and nation in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in chastity and in purity"; making his home to be, to all guests from all parts of the world, the perfection of a beautiful and godly home, he fully deserved the admiration and affection that he won, and passed from this world full of days, honours, and overflowing love and devotion. No Archbishop before him did more honour to the throne of Augustine, or raised it to higher esteem in the National and Imperial life by his personal character. What we have written in criticism of his policy, in no way detracts from our profound respect for that character or from our high esteem of the great gifts which he brought to the service of our Church, and used with unstinting self-devotion.