

Durham E-Theses

The prayer book controversy 1927-28

J. D. Martell

How to cite:

Martell, J. D. (1974) *The prayer book controversy 1927-28*. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/9913/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

J. D. MARTELL

THE PRAYER BOOK CONTROVERSY 1927-28

Thesis presented for the
degree of Master of Arts
in the University of Durham

1974

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

J.D. MARTELL: THE PRAYER BOOK CONTROVERSY, 1927-28

M.A. THESIS, UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM, 1974

ABSTRACT

This historical study focuses upon the sixteen months between February 1927, when the revised Prayer Book was presented to the Convocations, and June 1928, when for a second time it was rejected by the House of Commons. The emphasis throughout is upon the narrative of events and upon the societies and persons most closely concerned in those events. Consideration is given to both the ecclesiastical and the secular aspects of the controversy.

The study is based upon the papers of Archbishop Randall Davidson, made available at Lambeth Palace Library in the late 1960s, under the Library's forty-year rule for Archbishops' papers. The papers relating to the Prayer Book controversy are as yet unsorted and unindexed and consist of a wide variety of documentary material: significant manuscript material as well as printed material of lesser importance. Further private papers of Davidson, made available in 1974, have tended to confirm and illustrate opinions already formed. Manuscript material in the possession of the Church Society and the General Synod of the Church of England has also been examined. The official reports of debates in Convocation, the National Assembly of the Church of England and Parliament, the reports and opinions in the ecclesiastical and secular press and contemporary literature - in both book and pamphlet form -

have helped towards a clarification of the main issues in the controversy.

The revision was handicapped by the brief that it was expected to fulfil: the restoration of discipline within the Church of England. Strongly held views were evoked from many different protagonists and the issue became one of the most intense with which the Church has been confronted in the twentieth century. The Book's rejection by parliament enabled the controversy in the Church to subside. But it emphasised the underlying dependence of the Church of England upon the State and the difficulty of seeking satisfactory solution at that time to the problems which were implicit in such dependence.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	2
Note on references and abbreviations	5
1. The progress of Prayer Book revision to 1927	6
2. The Prayer Book Measure 192- and the Book, presented to the Convocations, February 1927	41
3. Anglo-Catholic opinion of the 1927 Book	61
4. Protestant opinion of the 1927 Book	80
5. The Laity and the 1927 Book	131
6. Roman Catholic and Nonconformist opinion of the 1927 Book	148
7. Opposition in the scholarly press, in parliament and in the courts	167
8. Anglican attempts to secure parliamentary approval	179
9. The parliamentary debates, December 1927	200
10. The amended Measure and Book, January 1928	239
11. The controversy in the early months of 1928	261
12. The parliamentary debates, June 1928	285
Appendices	
I Diocesan Archbishops and bishops most closely concerned with Prayer Book revision, 1927-28	311
II The Memorandum of Bishop Strong	312
III Archive material, relevant to this study; but to which scholars are at present denied access	314
IV A Song of the Deposited Book	316
Bibliography	318

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Though it is difficult to conceive that the issues involved in the Prayer Book controversy could today engender the intensity of feeling that was displayed in 1927/28, there exists in the subject strong interest and desire to understand better both the controversy and the place that it occupies in history. My researches have been considerably assisted by generous help from many people interested in the subject. Though it is not possible to mention all who have helped me in different ways, it would be inappropriate and discourteous not to mention those whose assistance has been particularly valuable.

I have throughout benefitted by the encouragement and insight of my supervisor, Professor W. R. Ward, Professor of Modern History in the University of Durham. The bulk of the research has been undertaken in Lambeth Palace Library. Mr. E. G. W. Bill and his staff were always most helpful to me; Miss Melanie Barber gave me particularly valuable assistance in making known to me material that related to the controversy and in answering many of my enquiries.

Others made freely available to me valuable archive material that is in their possession and I thank especially for so doing Mr. K. M. L. Benson (Secretary, Church Society), Mr. A. L. Kensit (Secretary, Protestant Truth Society), Miss K. Lewis (Administrative Assistant, General Synod of the Church of England), the Reverend Canon A. S. Neech (General Secretary, Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society),

the Reverend Dr. K. W. Noakes (Custodian of the Library, Pusey House, Oxford), Mr. B. H. M. Palmer (Editor, The Church Times), Mrs. Bertram Pollock (widow of the late Bishop Pollock of Norwich). The value of membership of the London Library has once more been fully demonstrated; access to the secondary sources - and to some primary sources - would otherwise have lacked the immediacy that is thereby provided. Where it failed, the British Museum filled the gap.

New material and different approaches have been suggested to me by conversation or correspondence with the following people, whose help has been considerable: the Reverend R. T. Beckwith (Librarian, Latimer House, Oxford), the Viscount Brentford, the Reverend Father F. D. G. Campbell, S.S.J.E. (Prior, St Edward's House, Westminster), the Reverend Canon A. H. Couratin, Professor H. Martyn Cundy (Professor of Mathematics, University of Malawi), the Reverend D. B. Harris (Vicar, St Paul's, Knightsbridge), the Reverend D. R. Hill (Headmaster, The Preparatory School, Twickenham), the Reverend Canon R. C. D. Jasper, the Reverend Canon T. L. Livermore (President, Church Society), the Reverend Father T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E., the Reverend Canon T. G. Mohan, the Most Reverend and Right Honourable A. M. Ramsey (Archbishop of Canterbury), the Venerable P. D. Robb (Archdeacon of Kingston-upon-Thames), the Right Reverend E. J. K. Roberts (Bishop of Ely), the Reverend A. J. M. Saint (Vicar, St Philip and St James, Oxford), the Reverend

W. J. Waker (Secretary and Treasurer of the Fellowship of Catholic Priests), the Right Reverend K. J. Woolcombe (Bishop of Oxford), the Very Reverend J. H. S. Wild (sometime Dean of Durham).

The structure and content of the narrative and such conclusions as are reached in this study are my responsibility alone. To none of those who have assisted me in different ways are to be attributed any misconceptions which may be observed hereon.

June 1974.

J. D. Martell

NOTE ON REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Unless stated otherwise, all documentary sources are located at Lambeth Palace Library.

The following abbreviations are used in footnotes:

CSA	Church Society Archives
FCTF	File of letters and papers relating to the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith
GSA	General Synod Archives
LPL	Lambeth Palace Library
PHL	Pusey House Library

CHAPTER 1.

THE PROGRESS OF PRAYER BOOK REVISION TO 1927

The early twentieth-century controversy surrounding Prayer Book revision, which had its most acute expression in the double rejection of the proposed Book by the House of Commons in December 1927 and June 1928, is traceable to the long-term effects of the Oxford Movement upon the Church of England. The early Tractarians laid stress upon their loyalty to the 1662 Book. Many of the Tracts for the Times were concerned with the view that the Prayer Book provided for the expression of the Catholic traditions of the Church of England; the Book was the very bed-rock on which their claims were founded.¹ But a later generation of Tractarians viewed the Book in a different light and contended that the 1662 Book was too narrow for the expression of their faith. Demand was made for revision along lines that would incorporate liturgical practices on which the Tractarians were increasingly laying value, and manuals of devotion were produced in the seventies and eighties that catered for these demands; the most significant of a number of publications of this type was Catholic Prayers for Church of England People compiled by the Reverend A. H. Stanton in 1880² and which contained features from current Roman Catholic liturgical and extra-liturgical

1. R.C.D. Jasper: Prayer Book Revision in England, 1800-1900, London, 1954, Chapter 3, passim.

2. Ibid., p. 76.

practice. Demand for revision of the Prayer Book in these directions was strongly resisted by the episcopate, but the spread of ritualism in the Church of England was a cause of acute concern for many individual bishops and statesmen, and led to the appointment of a Royal Commission on Ritual in 1867, from which resulted the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874. Provision was thereby made for improved administration of Church Courts and the curtailment of ritualistic practices. So far as the Prayer Book was concerned, the third report of the Commission recommended changes in the form of the Lectionary, a comparatively uncontroversial matter, that was accepted by the convocations and parliament and which received the Royal Assent in 1870.¹

A second major controversy over the increased raising of ritual in Anglican churches was initiated in May 1898 when Bishop Creighton of London presented to the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation a petition compiled by Mr. John Kensit, alleging a marked increase of Roman forms in Anglican churches. Kensit brought to his cause a Protestant militancy that led to interruptions of church services - mainly in London in 1897 and 1898 - and a notoreity that fostered a devoted following. But the most able exponent of the Protestant cause in the ritualistic controversies of 1898 and 1899 was Sir William Harcourt, who cherished the Protestant principles he conceived to be enshrined in the formularies of the Church

1. Ibid., pp. 97-100.

of England and who embarked upon a voluminous correspondence, both public and private, in which not only were those principles given expression, but also his conviction that parliament must assert its authority to deal with the 'Mutiny of the Priests', as one of his letters was entitled. '.....he was an Erastian who looked on the Church as a creation of Parliament and the Book of Common Prayer as "the Schedule of the Statute"'.¹

The High Church element responded vigorously to these varying onslaughts and the lead on their side was largely taken by the English Church Union and Lord Halifax. In the course of the dispute the view was expressed that High Churchmen might go so far as to decline to accept instructions from bishops if such instructions were by their own definition 'uncatholic' and by so asserting kindled further the charge of the 'disloyalty' of the High Church element. The basis of the controversy was certainly magnified by this outpouring of rhetoric and enthusiasm, as the problem of lawless ritualism was comparatively slight.² Further, the Protestant element disliked and campaigned against confession, yet provision was made for confession in the 1662 Book and as Archbishop Temple made clear in a charge in 1898, confession, prayers for the dead and the doctrine of the real presence were lawful within the Church of England.³

1. G.K.A. Bell: Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, O.U.P., 1935, vol.i, p.329.

2. Owen Chadwick: The Victorian Church, London, 1970, part ii, p. 357.

3. Ibid., p. 356.

Harcourt pressed for legal prosecution of the ritualists. Though the bishops would not take this course, from meetings of the two Archbishops at Lambeth in 1899-1900 there came a statement that incense and reservation of the Sacrament - for neither of which was any provision made in the 1662 Book - were forbidden in the Church of England. This pronouncement caused these practices to cease in some but not all churches and it proved an inadequate response to Harcourt's campaign, as the bishops still refused to apply the test of submission to a court of law.

The unwillingness of the bishops to employ legal sanctions was based upon the fact that the ultimate court of appeal, the Privy Council, was composed of persons who might not be Anglican. The experience of the ritualistic cases of the late nineteenth century had shown a widespread distaste within the Church of England towards the acceptance of pronouncements on ecclesiastical matters from what was in reality a secular tribunal, and the fear of the episcopate was that any legal pronouncement given in this way would lack moral force among the clergy; there had been in fact numerous instances of clerical disobedience to the judgments of the Privy Council on these very grounds and a widespread sympathy shown by clergy who were not themselves involved in ritualism.

The campaign in 1899 was concentrated within parliament and a Church Discipline Bill of that year proved remarkably popular in the House of Commons, receiving 156 affirmative

votes.¹ The controversy subsided somewhat in the last years of Archbishop Frederick Temple, who himself had only slight interest in the matter.

In February 1903 Randall Thomas Davidson began his long tenure of the See of Canterbury, having earlier held in succession the positions of Dean of Windsor and Bishop of Winchester, in which latter position he had become involved in ritualistic controversies, in his action against the Reverend R. P. Dolling of Portsmouth in 1895, and in spirited correspondence with Harcourt, whose seat at Malwood, near Lyndhurst, was in his diocese. His first public function at Lambeth Palace was on March 11, 1903, when he received a public deputation of over a hundred members of parliament, who represented a renewed parliamentary interest in the ritualistic controversies and who pressed for the 'further legislation' which the House of Commons had declared to be necessary if episcopal action failed to curb ritualism. Davidson received the deputation sympathetically and made clear in his statement that he intended to curb lawlessness, while leaving uncertain the precise way in which this was to be done. '.....The sands have run out. Stern and drastic action is in my judgement quite essential I assure you, using my words with a full sense of responsibility, I desire and intend that we should now act, and act sternly.'² His words were solemn

1. Ibid., p. 357, footnote.

2. Quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. i, p. 399.

and were taken by many to place a stamp upon his Primacy. In March 1904, after further pressure from the House of Commons and the strong prospect of the appointment of a Commons Select Committee to enquire into ritual, the Prime Minister, A. J. Balfour, announced the appointment of a Royal Commission with the following terms of reference:

'To inquire into the alleged prevalence of breaches or neglect of the Law relating to the conduct of Divine Service in the Church of England and to the ornaments and fittings of Churches; and to consider the existing powers and procedure applicable to such irregularities and to make such recommendations as may be deemed requisite for dealing with the aforesaid matters.'¹

The Commission was under the chairmanship of Sir Michael Hicks Beach and was predominantly lay in composition, the only clerical members being Davidson and the Bishop of Oxford, Francis Paget, on whose advice on this matter in the early stages of his Primacy, Davidson greatly relied.² Between May 4, 1904, and June 21, 1906, the Commission held 118 meetings and examined 164 witnesses, including 16 diocesan bishops. The report was a lengthy document, largely composed by Sir Lewis Dibdin, Dean of Arches, and published with the unanimous agreement of all members of the Commission. It outlined in detail widespread omissions from

1. Quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. i, p. 462.

2. Ibid., p. 454.

and additions to the practice of the 1662 Book, giving extensive detail ~~of~~ these in a supplementary report; it outlined the historical process by which this situation had resulted and it dealt sympathetically with the unwillingness of the bishops to employ the Privy Council as a means of compelling obedience to the strict letter of the 1662 Book: 'A Court dealing with matters of conscience and religion must, above all others, rest on moral authority if its judgements are to be effective'.¹ The report reached two main conclusions: 'First, the law of public worship is too narrow for the religious life of the present generation. It needlessly condemns much which a great section of Church people, including many of her most devoted members, value; and modern thought and feeling are characterised by a care for ceremonial, a sense of dignity in worship, and an appreciation of the continuity of the Church, which were not similarly felt at the time when the law took its present shape.....Secondly, the machinery for discipline has broken down. The means of enforcing the law in the Ecclesiastical Courts, even in matters which touch the Church's faith and teaching, are defective and in some respects unsuitable'.² The report ended with a list of ten recommendations, largely composed by Davidson and for the implementation of which he therefore took a large share

1. Quoted ibid., p. 471.

2. Quoted ibid., p. 471.

of responsibility. The cessation of extreme practices, the repeal of the Public Worship Regulation Act and various administrative measures were among the recommendations, but the principal ones were closely linked with the two main conclusions of the Report.

'2. Letters of Business should be issued to the Convocations with instructions: (a) to consider the preparation of a new rubric regulating the ornaments (that is to say, the vesture) of the ministers of the Church, at the times of their ministrations, with a view to its enactment by Parliament; and (b) to frame, with a view to their enactment by Parliament, such modifications in the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and to the ornaments and fittings of Churches as may tend to secure the greater elasticity which a reasonable recognition of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England and of its present needs seems to demand.

'5.....Where, in an appeal before the Final Court which involves charges of heresy or breach of ritual, any question touching the doctrine or use of the Church of England shall be in controversy, which question is not in the opinion of the Court governed by the plain language of documents having the force of Acts of Parliament, and involves the doctrine and use of the Church of England proper to be applied to the facts found by the Court, such questions shall be referred to an Assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, who shall be entitled to

call in such advice as they may think fit; and the opinion of the majority of such assembly of the Archbishops and Bishops with regard to any question so submitted to them shall be binding on the Court for the purposes of the said appeal.¹

The Commission regarded these two recommendations, for both the revision of the Prayer Book and the reform of Church Courts, both of which would require legislation, as being 'mutually dependent', a point that was later seized upon by opponents of Prayer Book revision, who alleged - rightly - that the reform of the Church Courts failed to keep pace with the revision of the Prayer Book.

The immediate result of the Report was application by Davidson and the Most Reverend W. D. Maclagan, the elderly Archbishop of York to the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman for the issue of letters of business. On November 10, 1906, letters of business to the Convocation of Canterbury were issued by the Home Office. Convocation was thereby required to consider 'the desirability and the form and contents of a new Rubric regulating the ornaments (that is to say the vesture) of the Ministers of the Church at the time of their ministrations, and also of any modifications of the existing law relating to the conduct of Divine Service and to the ornaments and fittings of Churches; and, after mature debate, consideration,

1. Quoted ibid., pp. 472-473.

consultations and agreement that you do present to Us a Report or Reports thereon in writing.'¹

Thus commenced the long history of the Church's own consultations on the question of Prayer Book revision and though in 1906 there was little likelihood of a speedy result to these consultations, few foresaw that the Church's own discussions would last for almost twenty-one years and not be completed until July 1927, when the National Assembly gave its final approval to the new Book. This long period in which the Church considered revision can be considered in three sections, 1906-14, 1914-19 and 1919-27, each of which contains a fair measure of unity and in each of which the motive for revision, the points of importance in discussion and the constitutional method by which the Church's approval was to be obtained were different.

In the first of these periods, 1906-14, the scope that Convocation set itself was comparatively limited. The immediate problem that was tackled was the Ornaments Rubric and a Committee of five bishops under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Salisbury, the Right Reverend John Wordsworth, worked on this problem. They were assisted by the Reverend W. H. Frere, of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield, one of the few liturgical experts of that time, whose influence upon revision during the next twenty years was to be crucial. When the official report,

1. Quoted ibid., p. 650.

The Ornaments of the Church and its Ministers was published on January 23, 1908, it bore clearly the scholarly marks of Frere's influence.¹ But its suggestion of the legality of vestments brought forth protests and the Resolution on the subject eventually passed by the Upper House on July 7, 1911, toned down considerably the Committee's views.²

A second stage was reached on May 5, 1911, when Davidson announced to Convocation that an Advisory Committee on liturgical questions was to be formed, a course advocated by Frere in Some Principles of Liturgical Reform, first published in 1911. Davidson took pains in the appointment of this committee to ensure that there was a fair balance between the different schools of thought, but he found it difficult to include men who were also liturgical experts in the full sense of the word. He took advice at the end of November 1911 on its composition from the Bishop of Sodor and Man, the Right Reverend T. W. Drury, from the Reverend Canon A. J. Mason and from Frere. He invited all of them to join the committee and he presented to them the other names he had in mind for the committee and invited their comments. Particular reliance was placed on the opinions of Drury: 'There is no one on whose advice in this matter I should place more confidence,' Davidson wrote, and approached

-
1. R.C.D. Jasper: Walter Howard Frere, Correspondence on Liturgical Revision and Construction, London, 1954, p. 23.
 2. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 653.

him as representative of and knowledgeable about the Evangelical school of thought. 'It is vitally important that those who belong to the Evangelical School and have real knowledge of liturgical matters should be members of such a committee can you advise me as to one or two names of Evangelicals, or at all events non-High Churchmen, who would be strong on these matters?'¹ To Mason also he stressed the difficulty of finding Evangelicals with liturgical interests, 'unless they are cranks like Tomlinson or fighting enthusiasts like Wace'.² He asked Frere also for suggestions. Davidson's most helpful response came from Mason, who agreed that the finding of liturgical experts among Evangelicals was a problem and that it was none too easy to find them even among other schools of thought at that time. 'Frere and Brightman are the most fully acknowledged of experts - and Frere at least has a large practical outlook' but as far as Evangelicals are concerned all that he could suggest was that 'Drury and Gee would admirably represent the Evangelicals who know something of these questions' and his letter concluded with the statement that 'Wace and Tomlinson would be worse than useless'.³ A few days later Davidson wrote for further advice from the bishops of Worcester, Ely and

1. Davidson Papers, Box 2, Davidson to Drury, November 30, 1911.

2. Ibid., Davidson to Mason, November 30, 1911.

3. Ibid., Mason to Davidson, December 1, 1911.

Gloucester. Letters of invitation were then sent to those whom Davidson decided to invite and the final list was made public at the meeting of Convocation on February 15, 1912.

Some slight problem was caused by the omission of the name of the Reverend Dr. Percy Dearmer, Vicar of St. Mary's, Primrose Hill. Davidson had certainly contemplated Dearmer as a possible member of the committee, but advice had been strongly offered against him. Mason acknowledged 'Dearmer knows a good deal, I believe; but I should think he is not a sufficiently important person to select for such a work,'¹ and the Bishop of Ely, the Right Reverend F. H. Chase, contended that 'Dr. Dearmer and Canon Beeching are rather popular writers than students, and on such a body we only want those who have some title to be called experts'.² But Dearmer had a stout advocate in the ^{future} Bishop of Oxford, the Right Reverend Charles Gore, a personal friend of Dearmer and who, in a letter to Davidson only four days after the publication of the list of committee members, confessed that he had not at first noticed the omission of Dearmer's name and said of him that 'He has done more in High Church circles to restore Prayer Book reverence and order than any other man. He is a real ritualist in the old sense'.³ Davidson referred the matter to Robertson, the

1. Ibid.

2. Ibid., Chase to Davidson, undated letter.

3. Ibid., Gore to Davidson, February 19, 1911.

Chairman, who felt that Dearmer could be added, though not as a solitary addition; he suggested also Prebendary Percival Jackson. He did not fully approve of Dearmer who, he thought, had popularised 'some absurd ideas', but he nevertheless had taste and 'might be less troublesome within the Committee than outside it'.¹ Dearmer's name was thus among those of four names added to the committee in November 1912.

Meanwhile much effort was expended by the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation in examining the complex matter of the Ornaments Rubric, and their liberal interpretation of the rubric caused further storms of protest, which found an episcopal leader in the Bishop of Manchester, the Right Reverend E. A. Knox. Knox's opposition is a factor of continuing importance throughout the controversy and after his retirement from Manchester in 1921 he continued a lively and popular campaign of opposition from suburban Bromley, though his role as episcopal leader of opposition had by then passed to others. On February 13, 1913, Knox protested to Davidson at what he alleged was a new interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. Davidson's reply is of interest in revealing a sense of irrelevance in the debate about the Ornaments Rubric and of desire to move forward to a more positive position: '.....the question is in my judgment of archaeological rather than cogent practical importance. We ought surely to be able to say in the twentieth century what

1. Ibid., Robertson to Davidson, undated letter.

we do want and not merely to find some explanation of what other people said or wanted 250 or 350 years ago'.¹ This reply was strongly criticised in the ecclesiastical and the secular press. The Record, The English Churchman and The Times all criticised Davidson's attitude.

In February 1914 a Report of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation was published, embodying comparatively modest recommendations. In the Summer of 1914 Davidson attempted, by means of the creation of committees, to bring some coordination to the work of the two houses of Canterbury Convocation and to the work of the Canterbury and York Convocations. The War prevented further progress in the matter, but the question of the ultimate authorisation of changes was already exercising episcopal minds. In the Summer of 1914 a committee of the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation was set up to consider procedure by Canon, 'The necessary Parliamentary sanction being subsequently sought'.² The view seems generally to have been held at that stage that discussion of the revision within the House of Commons would be unsuitable. Davidson's own attitude within those years is revealed in correspondence in 1910 with the Reverend Dr. H. H. B. Ayles, of Barrow Rectory, Bury St Edmunds. Ayles wrote to Davidson explaining that he was writing a pamphlet on Prayer Book revision and that some people were objecting

1. Ibid., Davidson to Knox, March 6, 1913.

2. Quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol.ii, p. 654.

to revision because of their dislike of the matter being raised in the Commons. 'The prospect is rather used as a bogey but it is very effective nevertheless Could you authorise me to state that it is probably baseless and that some means may be taken for obviating it?'¹ In a reply marked 'Private' Davidson could give no guarantee that the matter would not ultimately reach parliament, 'But if you ask for my private opinion, I tell you without reserve that I should never be party to an arrangement which involved the submitting of the details of directions for Divine Service to unfettered discussion in e.g. the present House of Commons. I do not myself see insuperable difficulty in our recommending certain changes and coupling such recommendations with a proposal that they shall be brought about either by the enactment of a Canon to sanction what Convocation has recommended, or in some other similar fashion'.² Such a course was ultimately to prove quite impossible. The impact of the War, the extension of the scope of revision and the passage of the Enabling Act, 1919, all made for a changed view, which enhanced the role that parliament was to play in the controversy.

The War did not put the question of revision into the background of affairs to the extent that Davidson would have preferred. Bell records a conversation in February 1917

-
1. Davidson Papers, Box 2, Ayles to Davidson, April 7, 1910.
 2. Ibid., Davidson to Ayles, April 8, 1910.

when Davidson stated strongly that 'he could not bring himself to stress the points of liturgical reform as comparable with the fight against evil'.¹ Whilst it was agreed that revision by the Convocations should continue, no final decision would be taken until the House of Laymen was reassembled and that would only take place when the War was ended. Two issues in particular arose during these years: the matter of the re-arranged form of the Holy Communion and the matter of Reservation. The re-arranged form of the Holy Communion was proposed in the report of the Joint Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1915 and included the proposal for the Prayer of Oblation to follow immediately upon the Prayer of Consecration and to be linked to it. Evangelical opinion became alarmed and lead was given to it in this instance by Sir Edward Clarke, a member of the Royal Commission of 1904-06. The proposed re-arrangement in fact originated in the Lower House and was defeated in the Upper House on April 28, 1915. In 1916 another proposal on the same subject alike came to nought. Lord Halifax visited Davidson in April 1916 and urged upon him the claims of the 1549 Holy Communion, which was used, with archepiscopal permission, in his private chapel. Halifax suggested that this would receive much support from Anglo-Catholics who were in the practice of interpolating secretly parts of the Roman Mass into the 1662 service. Davidson was alive to the

1. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 815.

dangers of precedent that his approval of the 1549 rite might create, and the matter got no further then, though at a later stage Halifax's own Archbishop was to press the same course, with similar failure.

But of greater importance in these years was the question of Reservation of the Sacrament. Reservation had been used in very few churches in the previous century and where it had been practised it was in nearly all cases practised in order to ensure that the Sacrament could be taken to sick persons. In 1885 the bishops unanimously forbade Reservation, though the prospect of Reservation for the sick was held as a possible exception, and in the pronouncements of Temple and Maclagan in 1899-1900 a more explicit prohibition of Reservation was given. The Royal Commission of 1904-06 discovered that Reservation was nevertheless practised in some churches - especially in the London diocese - and in a few of these the reserved Sacrament was the focus of devotion, expressed in ceremonies such as Benediction and Processions of the Sacrament.¹ It was this secondary use of the reserved Sacrament that caused concern.

The matter was considered by Convocation and the 1911 Report made provision for Reservation of a non-permanent kind, solely for the purposes of communion of the sick and solely with the permission of the diocesan bishop. This recommendation was in practice adopted as a rule of thumb

1. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 804.

by the bishops in dealing with the problem as it then existed. The pressures of the War brought demand for more frequent communion and for access to chapels where Reservation was practised in order that prayer - private at least - might be offered before the reserved Sacrament. The demand appears to have been keener in London than elsewhere, and the Bishop of London, the Right Reverend A. F. Winnington-Ingram, felt justified in abandoning strict adherence to the 1911 recommendations and in allowing access to the reserved Sacrament for the purposes of prayer, and in allowing permanent Reservation.¹ The bishops held a number of meetings at which the subject was discussed and in July 1917 composed a confidential memorandum on the subject in which the main lines of the 1911 statement were adhered to, though allowance was made for a bishop to make provision for Reservation and his action would be considered 'individual and exceptional, and will lie outside what the episcopate has assented to'.² One major effect of the War had been to increase the frequency with which church people received Holy Communion and this seen together with the unsatisfactory nature of the compromise settlement that the bishops had worked out, suggested that the future course of revision was likely to concentrate on matters connected with the Holy Communion and Reservation. Indeed, in the decade after

1. S.C. Carpenter: Winnington-Ingram, The Biography of Arthur Foley Winnington-Ingram, London, 1949, p. 201.

2. G. K. N. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 814.

the War it was on these two questions, rather than on any others, that discussion concentrated.

The course of Prayer Book revision was substantially altered after the War by the passage through Parliament of the Enabling Act, which received the Royal Assent on December 23, 1919. The comparative swiftness with which this Act was passed is attributable to Parliament's desire to rid itself of Church issues, to the skill of Davidson and to the enthusiasm of the Life and Liberty movement between 1917 and 1918 and the influence of the Reverend William Temple, son of Archbishop Frederick Temple, and at that time Rector of St James's, Piccadilly. The Act established the National Assembly of the Church of England, which was to be a tri-partite organisation consisting of the House of Bishops (the Upper Houses of the two Convocations), the House of Clergy (the Lower Houses of the two Convocations) and the House of Laity (the former 'House of Laymen' of the Representative Church Council). The whole structure was in fact based upon the Representative Church Council, which had existed since 1903. Measures for parliamentary legislation were to pass through the National Assembly and were then to be considered by the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament, consisting of fifteen representatives of each of the two Houses, which would report to parliament as to whether the Measure should proceed. If need be, the Ecclesiastical Committee of parliament could have the assistance of the Legislative Committee of the National Assembly. The debates in the House of Lords made

clear the fact that any revision of the Prayer Book would pass through these various stages and would ultimately come before Parliament. Davidson and the ecclesiastical lawyer, Lord Parmoor, emphasised this in the debates in the House of Lords.¹ Thus Davidson acknowledged the parliamentary right to consider and reject legislation that had passed the National Assembly, though it seems he did not fully anticipate the use to which parliament would put that right.

The National Assembly held its first meeting in the Summer of 1920; in the Autumn a committee, known as the Prayer Book Revision Committee, was appointed to consider the earlier decisions of the Convocations. In June 1922 this committee produced its report, known for convenience as N.A. 60. In October 1922 the House of Bishops introduced these recommendations unaltered as the better known N.A. 84, The Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure. General approval was given to this Measure in January and April 1923 by the three houses sitting separately and it then became necessary for the House of Laity and the House of Clergy to revise the Measure thoroughly and to send recommendations (known as C.A. 158 for the House of Clergy and C.A. 169 for the House of Laity) to the House of Bishops, who began their own final revision in October 1925 and completed it in February 1927; the National Assembly gave final approval to this Measure and the accompanying Book in July 1927. The

1. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 978.

passage of the Book through the National Assembly thus took rather more than seven years.

This lengthy process was necessary by reason of the provisions of the Enabling Act, 1919, and Davidson explained the application of the Act to measures concerning doctrine or ritual on a number of occasions; the Davidson papers reveal that the main adviser on these complicated matters was Lord Hugh Cecil, M.P. for Oxford University, with whom Davidson was in frequent communication. In his speech to the National Assembly in April 1923, when N.A. 84 received 'General Approval', Davidson likened that particular stage to a second reading in parliament and it was essential that all three houses should show general approval if the matter was to proceed any further. Thereafter the houses took on different functions. 'When the three houses have thus given General Approval the House of Clergy and Laity sitting separately are to revise the Measure in detail, a procedure corresponding roughly to the stage of Committee and Report in Parliament. The House of Bishops does not "revise" the Measure until the result is before it of what has been done in the other two houses When the Houses of Clergy and Laity have completed their revision, with or without such conference, the Measure, whether amended or not, is laid by each of the two Houses before the House of Bishops. The House of Bishops thereupon takes up the consideration of the Measure, having at an earlier stage given its General Approval, and considers it for revision, dealing seriatim

with any amendments introduced by either Clergy or Laity....' It would then be laid before the whole Assembly, could not at that stage be altered, and '.....if it be accepted the Measure goes before the Legislative Committee [i.e. of the National Assembly] for submission to Parliament'.¹

N.A. 84 was a slim volume of 118 pages, the vast bulk of which consisted of a 'Schedule' of thirty-four areas of alteration to the Book of 1662, incorporating therein matter that had been discussed in the previous seventeen years. The Measure itself covered only two-and-a-half pages and six paragraphs, and made specific provision for an 'alternative' Book which would be the 1662 Book incorporating the amendments outlined in the Schedule which, among other things, made provision for Reservation and for an Alternative Order of Holy Communion.

At that stage the process of revision became further complicated by the appearance of a number of Prayer Books that put forward the particular views of different schools of thought within the Church. The most important of these books were the Green Book of the English Church Union, reflecting Anglo-Catholic views; the Grey Book, reflecting liberal views and much encouraged by Temple, then Bishop of Manchester; and the Orange Book of the Alcuin Club, reflecting the moderate Catholic school of thought.

1. Davidson Papers, Box 14, Copy of speech of Davidson to National Assembly, April 1923.

The English Church Union appointed a Prayer Book Revision Committee in July 1922, after the publication of N.A. 60. Minutes of that committee show that the English Church Union was concerned at the prospect of being compelled to use a Book based on N.A. 60 and which they might find unacceptable. The committee was especially concerned at proposals that would mutilate the Psalter, diminish the significance of the Quicumque Vult and they disliked a number of features in the new Baptismal and Eucharistic services.¹ The E.C.U. revision was largely undertaken by the Reverend Canon N. P. Williams, Christ Church, and the Reverend Canon Darwell Stone, Principal of Pusey House. The proposals were published in October 1922 and by decision in March 1923 were to be incorporated in a complete Prayer Book, the publication of which in April 1923 was fraught with financial difficulties, necessitating recourse to the Reserve Fund of the E.C.U. 'as the occasion was one of exceptional importance'.² The intention of the E.C.U. was stated in the Preface to the Book: 'the President and Council have decided to print a model Prayer Book in extenso, in order to exhibit, in a popular and easily intelligible form, the exact effect which their proposals, if sanctioned by authority,

1. E.C.U. Papers, Minutes of the Prayer Book Revision Committee of the E.C.U., July 25, 1922.

2. Ibid., September 12, 1922.

would have,' and it was published 'merely as an essay in liturgy-making'.¹ The proposals went further in a Catholic direction than did the proposals of N.A. 60, but they represented by no means an extremist position.

Criticism was made at the time and subsequently about the publication of this and the other books. Bell later considered that 'Had the members of the Assembly been left to deliberate on the proposals of Convocation by themselves, their task would have been comparatively simple'.² Some High Churchmen also were unhappy about the composition of the Green Book and light is shed on another reason for its origin in later correspondence between Lang and the Reverend Charles Harris, in October 1925. 'I believe the E.C.U. made a tactical mistake in putting forward the Green Book Measure: and I want you to understand why they did so. Two years ago "advanced" opinion was implacably opposed to the 1549 Mass. This opposition was based, not on the merits of the service itself, but on hostility to a single rubric, which forbids the elevation of the host. It was chiefly to get rid of this rubric that an alternative service (as much like 1549 as possible) was devised by the E.C.U.'³ However this may be,

-
1. A Suggested Prayer Book, Being the text of the English Rite altered and enlarged in accordance with the Prayer Book Revision proposals made by the English Church Union, O.U.P., 1923, p. iii.
 2. G.K.A. Bell, Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1329.
 3. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Harris to Lang, October 12, 1925.

it should be noted that Harris was at that time endeavouring - successfully - to persuade Lang of the need to encourage the 1549 Book.

But the presence of the Green Book continued to be felt throughout the 1920s. Even in February 1927, Darwell Stone wrote an article critical of the recently published proposals in The Guardian, as part of a series, and he entitled his article 'A "Green Book" View',¹ thus showing the importance of the Green Book proposals as a focus of Anglo-Catholic opposition.

The Grey Book was published in April 1923 at virtually the same time and it also displayed no spirit of real extremism; the fact that Temple was associated with it gave ample evidence of this fact. In the Foreword, Temple commended the Book 'to the consideration of all members of the Church of England, as that of men drawn from all "parties" in the Church, well versed in liturgiology, experienced in the spiritual work of parishes, and eager to help in making our worship the worthiest that can be offered to God as well as the most strengthening for the life of Christian discipleship'.² The Book made provision for Reservation and for confession, but its greater liberality of approach was shown

1. The Guardian, February 25, 1927, p. 153.

2. A New Prayer Book, Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer and for Additional Services and Prayers, drawn up by a Group of Clergy, Together with a Foreword by William Temple, D.Litt., Bishop of Manchester, London, 1923, p. iii.

particularly in its removal of the Catechism 'because it is more fitting that it should be revised, or alternatively, that a short and simple statement of doctrine illustrated from the New Testament, for the guidance of teachers, should be drawn up'.¹ The Communion service was also removed, greater freedom was permitted after the third collect and in the Occasional Offices there was introduced a 'more human note where it was felt to be needed'.² The Grey Book continued as a focus of opinion among many centrally-minded church people and the Book was by no means dead in 1927. The Reverend E. S. Woods, Vicar of Croydon, wrote to Bell in February 1927 that many of those who supported the Grey Book - who happened in many cases to be those who had supported the Life and Liberty Movement earlier - were anxious to assist the passage of the proposals of February 1927, even though they did not entirely reflect Grey Book opinion.³ The Grey Book was also the subject of an article in The Guardian in February 1927 by the Bishop of Middleton, the Right Reverend R. G. Parsons, which showed a firm appreciation of the 1927 proposals from Grey Book people. 'The result is something ever so much more alive and beautiful than N.A. 84, though this provided the necessary anvil on which the form which is

1. Ibid., p. v.

2. Ibid., p. iv.

3. Bell Papers, Buff File, Prayer Book Revision, 1925-27, Woods to Bell, February 25, 1927.

now receiving our admiration was beaten out.'¹ The Grey Book people had apparently been won over to the bishops' proposals; many of the Green Book people had not.

The Orange 'Book' in fact consisted of three books, the result of the work of the Alcuin Club. It appeared after the other two and it possessed less significance as a focus of opinion. It was the only one to advocate experimentation: 'many of those who desire changes would wish to make trial of them experimentally, before any of them are treated as final or imposed'.²

Thus when the House of Clergy and Laity resumed their discussions there was a wealth of opinion on which they could and did draw. Progress was so slow that in the Autumn of 1923, when the Eucharist was under discussion, unofficial conferences were held each evening in the Jerusalem Chamber in order to consider matters informally before they were debated in the Assembly,³ and in February 1925 Davidson himself appealed to the clergy to conclude their deliberations.⁴ Dutifully they complied, and incorporated their proposals in C.A. 158 and sent it to the House of Bishops. The House of Laity sent their proposals as C.A. 169 also.

1. The Guardian, February 18, 1927, p. 129.

2. Alcuin Club Prayer Book Revision Pamphlet, xii, A Survey of the proposals for the Alternative Prayer Book, 1. The Order of Holy Communion, London, 1923, p. 2.

3. F.L. Cross: Darwell Stone, Churchman and Counsellor, London, 1943, p. 175.

4. Ibid., p. 176.

One matter that had come to attract increasing attention in these years was Reservation, the practice of which had increased markedly since the War. It played a prominent part in many of the early debates in the National Assembly. The subject was one that lent itself to over-ready accusation by one group against another and a bold decision was taken by the Bishop of Winchester, the Right Reverend F. T. Woods, to call a conference of those who were well versed in the matter and who approached it differently. There gathered at Farnham Castle on October 24-27, 1925, a distinguished group of eighteen churchmen, under Woods' chairmanship and including Headlam, Temple, Strong, Frere, Gore, Talbot, Parsons, Guy Rogers and Darwell Stone. A Report of the proceedings was subsequently published.¹ The purpose of the conference was stated by Woods to be 'to clear our minds in regard to the theological implications of the use of the Reserved Sacrament as a focus of "devotions" in the hope of stimulating students in the Church of England to unprejudiced inquiry'.² It was a valiant and a scholarly attempt to do just that, and the 162 page report of the papers and discussion conveys the impression of the cooperative work that many wished to see in greater evidence in the course of Prayer Book revision. But the Farnham Conference seems to have had only slight success in achieving its purpose, as controversy of an inflammatory

1. Reservation, Report of a Conference Held at Farnham Castle on October 24-27, 1925, London, 1926.

2. Ibid., p. iii.

kind continued to rage on this issue and was a key factor in parliament's eventual rejection of the Book. The Farnham Conference never struck firm roots.

The consideration that the bishops gave to the proposals of the clergy and laity in their meetings between October 1925 and February 1927 was thorough; so much so that the 1927 Book was after dubbed 'the Bishops' Book'. With the exception of their first meeting on October 20, 1925, their meetings were in private and were on most occasions not meetings of the House of Bishops as such, but rather bishops' meetings, which were conducted in a more informal atmosphere. The meetings also possessed a greater degree of confidentiality and the minutes of the proceedings are still not available for use by historians. It is therefore impossible to chart with complete accuracy the course that the discussions took, though a number of impressions have been left by those who took part and by that time the views of the bishops towards revision were well known. The Right Reverend T. B. Strong, Bishop of Oxford, wrote an account of the meetings, which is apparently now lost.¹ It would probably shed much interesting light on the discussions and possibly rather colourful light, as it has been described as 'not without passages of the naughty wit of which that shy prelate was capable'.²

1. See Appendix II.

2. C.S. Phillips (editor): Walter Howard Frere, A Memoir, London, 1947, p. 136.

Bell estimated that between forty and fifty full days were spent by the bishops on revision and most of their meetings were held, evidently at Mrs. Davidson's suggestion, in the drawing room of Lambeth Palace.¹ Davidson commented in a private memorandum on the general cordiality of the meetings, and on the value of holding them at Lambeth: 'It not only softens asperities, but it gives opportunity for consultation and practical talk which though only side dishes, contribute a great deal to the central fare'.² He later felt that Henson, in particular, had been favourably influenced by the atmosphere of the Lambeth meetings.

In connection with Henson's speech at the Convocations in March 1927, Davidson commented: 'I think, though he did not suggest or perhaps imagine it, that the change in him is really ascribable to the friendliness at Lambeth during the successive sessions'.³

The bishops were provided with impressive, so-called 'quarto' books: large, black-covered volumes in which the text of the N.A. 84 proposals was printed down the centre and the proposals of the clergy and laity at either side. In the first instance, Davidson had disliked the suggested lay-out when it was put to him by the Bishop of Chichester,

1. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1330.

2. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, volume xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-1930, Memorandum of February 13, 1927, p. 2. Also quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1330.

3. Ibid., Memorandum of April 23, 1927, p. 9.

the Right Reverend W. O. Burrows, who was chairman of the committee that made preparations for the bishops' meetings. 'I do not want the Bishops to have before them a set of papers which will make them think that the work they have to do has been already done, and that they have little to read or study and only to say Yea or Nay.'¹ But nevertheless the columns were printed as Burrows intended and he wrote to Davidson to that effect a month later.² Copies of the 'quarto' book are in the Library at Lambeth Palace and one of them has in it notes in the hand of Dr. Brightman, though apparently little attention was paid to what he wrote.³ It may be that the quarto book was not cast in the most suitable form. At least, that was the opinion of the Reverend Mervyn Haigh, Senior Chaplain to Davidson and secretary at the bishops' meetings: 'there was no column reminding the bishops of the text of the Book of Common Prayer. It was a great mental strain to have three sets of suggestions in front of one and to be also constantly referring to the Prayer Book as it still was.....Few took much, if any, notice of the Green, Grey and Orange Books with which they were also supplied; and few indeed seemed to have any vision

-
1. Davidson Papers, Box 13, Davidson to Burrows, July 24, 1925.
 2. Ibid., Burrows to Davidson, August 25, 1925.
 3. Professor Claude Jenkins has certified in the volume that the gloss is in Brightman's hand.

of the Book of Common Prayer'.¹

In addition to the various proposals from the Assembly and elsewhere, the bishops felt some obligation to consider the large number of memorials and petitions that they had received. Davidson was at a loss as to what to do with these. A letter to Burrows in July 1925 shows his concern: 'I do not think it is possible for your committee to grapple with the consideration of the Memorials or Protests which have poured in at Lambeth. Some of these are of vast weight both mentally and avoirdupois, e.g. Bishop Knox's Memorial. I fancy I shall somehow or other have to try to make a full statement myself with regard to these outside Recommendations or Protests'.² Later Davidson did make reference to them, but how much importance was attached to these petitions in the course of the bishops' discussions is obscure, and as most of the memorials expressed opposition to many features of the revision which the bishops eventually incorporated in the Book, it is reasonable to conclude that the petitions were in large measure ignored. Protestant opponents, such as Lord Carson, certainly held this to have been the case;³ and they were probably right.

Davidson was a poor chairman in these discussions. The records of the meetings of the House of Bishops show only

-
1. Quoted in F.R. Barry: Mervyn Haigh, London, 1964, pp.86-87.
 2. Davidson Papers, Box 13, Davidson to Burrows, July 24, 1925.
 3. Parliamentary Debates (Official Record), 69 H.L. Deb., 5s column 872.

slight initiative on his part in the discussions; he quite candidly left Lang to deal with difficult points. If this is so in the House of Bishops, there is no reason to believe his performance at bishops' meetings to be any different. Haigh made this point strongly: 'however much I dislike having to say it, my Archbishop, the Chairman at all these debates, who could have done much to awaken the bishops to a worthy and constructive vision of their task and opportunity, had always been, and remained, so lukewarm about the whole project as not only to discourage ardour in carrying it out but even to allow of his tolerating proposals, not because he approved them, but because they were so far beyond his own range of interest that he could hardly appreciate what they really involved'.¹ A similar view was advanced by Bell: Davidson 'was not really sufficiently interested; he took a lay point of view'.² In a private memorandum, Davidson revealed his own dislike of discussions of this kind, a factor which was probably the main cause of his weak chairmanship. '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

1. Quoted in F.R. Barry: Haigh, p. 87.

2. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1331.

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.'¹

Throughout their meetings at Lambeth, the bishops continued to receive comment on the best means of effecting Prayer Book revision, though Davidson had in fact asked that comment should cease while the bishops met. There was much speculation in the press about the decisions that were being reached and there was criticism of the 'secret' nature of the discussions. The League of Loyal Churchmen, in one of its many tracts, wrote that 'Your Lordships are meeting in private to revise the Book of Common Prayer, or "open" or public Prayer. This secrecy is abhorrent to the English nature. The Truth loves the light and cannot be sold or bartered or whittled down'.² Some decisions of the bishops were in fact made known in the course of their work, most notably that Continuous Reservation was approved by them in June 1926.

-
1. Private papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, vol. xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-30, Memorandum of February 13, 1927, p. 4.
 2. Davidson Papers, Box 5, A Further Appeal to the Bishops with reference to revision of the Prayer Book, third in a series of four published by the League of Loyal Churchmen.

CHAPTER 2.

THE PRAYER BOOK MEASURE 192- AND THE BOOK,
PRESENTED TO THE CONVOCATIONS, FEBRUARY 1927

The results of the lengthy discussions of the bishops at Lambeth Palace were first made known at the sitting together of the two Houses of Convocation of Canterbury and York on February 7, 1927. The session opened with major speeches by Davidson and Lang - speeches that were available separately in pamphlet form - after which copies of the Book and the speeches of the two Archbishops were distributed to the members. The purpose of this 'sitting together' of the two Convocations was to allow the Lower Houses the opportunity of considering the bishops' proposals and of submitting any final points that might occur to them in such consideration. Six weeks thereafter, commencing on March 29, 1927, there would take place the formal sanctioning of the Book by the Convocations and its submission to the National Assembly would follow.

The Archbishops spoke impressively in thus commending the Book to the Convocations. Davidson concentrated upon the historical circumstances which had seen the origin of the present revision, casting back into the late nineteenth century in so doing and drawing much on his own intimate experience of ecclesiastical affairs for more than half a century. He concluded on a personal note, reminding his listeners that he was beginning his twenty-fifth year as Archbishop of Canterbury and that this matter ought now to

be accepted so that 'we as men of one heart and one soul, and with this work to aid us, be now set free, to discharge aright, at a great time in the world's history, the larger tasks which await us on every side, in promoting the Spirit of the Lord Christ, and the progress of His Kingdom among men'.¹ This theme was often forwarded by both Archbishops and to an extent reflected a contemporary feeling that the Church ought to be concerned with matters of greater significance than liturgical revision, which was seen as an irritating necessity that was eliciting undue attention and importance. Lang's speech complemented that of Davidson, and concentrated upon the Book itself and upon the way in which the bishops had worked over the earlier suggestions of the clergy and laity and upon the fact that the present Book was a composite Book, containing new material as well as material from the 1662 Book.²

The session concluded with a speech from the Bishop of Chelmsford, the Right Reverend F. S. Guy Warman, who spoke on behalf of the episcopal 'members in charge' of the Measure, who had worked under the chairmanship of Burrows, (who was ill and unable to be present on February 7) and who also included Strong, Frere and Carr of Coventry. Warman explained the major changes that the Book contained.³

1. Chronicle of Convocation, February 7, 1927, p. 20.

2. Ibid., pp. 21-31.

3. Ibid., pp. 34-38.

The Book that was then so eagerly scanned by the members of Convocation had an identical title to the 1662 Book and the sub-title 'The Book of 1662 with permissive additions and deviations approved in 1927'. There were only minor textual changes to the parts taken from the 1662 Book and these aroused virtually no controversy at all. In many cases there was an 'alternative order' for parts of the 1662 Book: for Morning and Evening Prayer, the Holy Communion, Public Baptism, Confirmation, Matrimony and the Communion of the Sick. There was a revised form of the Quicumque Vult; its recitation was optional and provision was made for the omission of the damnatory clauses. All new material, whether in the form of an entire 'alternative order' or in the form of material interposed within the 1662 Book was denoted by a heavy marginal line. An Appendix was added containing material that had no place in the 1662 Book: an Order for Prime and Compline, a preparatory Devotion for the Holy Communion, provision for special collects, epistles and gospels on lesser feast days and fast days, forms of prayer commemorative of the accession of the Sovereign and a form for the ordering of deaconesses. The Alternative Order for Morning and Evening Prayer was briefer than in the 1662 Book: the earlier material could be omitted and a greater element of freedom was given to the minister in his use of prayers after the third collect.

Though many of the points other than those connected with the Holy Communion caused some controversy, it was the

innovations that were specifically provided for in the Alternative Order for Holy Communion and the Alternative Order for the Communion of the Sick that elicited the most acute forms of controversy.

In the Alternative Order for Holy Communion provision was specifically made for the wearing of the Eucharistic vestments, for the use of an Epiclesis in the Canon, for the use of additional proper prefaces and the anthem 'Blessed is He that cometh...' before the consecration, as well as other minor changes that tended to reflect custom found in a number of Anglican churches of the time. The Alternative Order for the Communion of the Sick made express provision for Reservation of the Sacrament under episcopal permission and for the purposes only of sick communion. Any devotions outside such need were clearly and unequivocally forbidden: 'The Sacrament so reserved shall not be brought into connexion with any service or ceremony, nor shall it be exposed or removed except in order to be received in Communion'.¹ If there was one point above any other that aroused controversy it was this matter of Reservation.

On February 22, 1927, the Convocations again met, this time separately, and importance attached at this stage to the discussions in the Lower House. The Prolocutor, the Venerable K. F. Gibbs, explained the scope of their work and that the House of Bishops of the National Assembly had suspended its

1. National Assembly of the Church of England: Book Proposed to be Annexed to the Prayer Book Measure 192-, London, 1927, p. 302.

work 'in order to consult the Convocations of Canterbury and York before the Book is put into its final form' and that 'We have no power to amend the Book but we have power to petition for amendment'.¹ Gibbs warmly commended the Book and recommended that the Lower House sit as a committee of the whole House to consider it, as such an arrangement would afford them greater freedom of debate and they would be without the press and the public. This motion of Gibbs was carried, but not without opposition from leading opponents of the Book.

Darwell Stone, who by this time was the acknowledged leader of Anglo-Catholic opposition, was concerned that detail should be recorded of what was proposed and lost in committee as well as of what was agreed to. The suggestion has been made that Stone's opposition to the idea of committee discussion was in order to make clear that opposition to the Book did exist within the ranks of the clergy and that the bishops' contention that the Book would be a means of restoring discipline among the Anglo-Catholic clergy was over-optimistic.² The Reverend Guy Rogers, for the Evangelicals, was also opposed to the idea of committee discussion as there was abroad a general feeling that too many discussions were taking place behind closed doors, that a recent letter of the Bishop of Worcester to The Times had

1. Chronicle of Convocation, Lower House, February 22, 1927, p. 44.

2. F.L. Cross: Stone, p. 179.

suggested that episcopal unanimity was not as great as had been earlier suggested and that 'the very people whom we want to persuade in favour of a settlement will become more restive'.¹ Printed record of the committee discussions is therefore non-existent, but 67 amendments were proposed and carried in the discussions, mostly on fairly technical points.²

The suggestions that were put forward by the Lower Houses of Canterbury and York were considered by the bishops over the following few weeks and on March 29, 1927, there was a joint meeting of the Houses of Canterbury and York Convocations at Church House. Davidson then formally introduced the Book that bore slight changes, consequent upon the consideration by the House of Bishops of the suggestions made by the Lower Houses of Convocation after the first appearance of the Book. Davidson explained that the meeting together in this way was purely for the purposes of debate and that the voting would be separate, in accordance with usual practice. His speech on this occasion concentrated upon the manner in which the Book was one 'adapted to the needs of contemporary life with its new conditions and sympathies, its new aspirations and endeavours' rather than upon the circumstances of the Book's origin.³

-
1. Chronicle of Convocation, February 22, 1927, pp. 48-49.
 2. Ibid., pp. 53-65.
 3. Chronicle of Convocation, March 29, 1927, p. 75.

In the course of his speech he made much of the continuing Catholic tradition within the Church of England, represented not only by the men of the Oxford Movement, but by earlier divines such as Andrewes, Ken and Thomas Wilson and he wondered 'what pages of our proposed Book would, if the general standard, say, of Bishop Andrewes were applied, fall under the condemnation as un-Anglican'¹ thereby meeting in advance objections that he anticipated on that ground.

The debate thus initiated by Davidson developed as one of the most important and the most distinguished that occurred in the course of the controversy, in which virtually all the episcopal and clerical protagonists voiced their opinions, in many cases with skilful rhetoric.

Davidson was followed by the Bishop of Norwich, the Right Reverend Bertram Pollock, the acknowledged leader of the four episcopal opponents. In addition to Pollock, they consisted of the Bishop of Birmingham, the Right Reverend E. W. Barnes, the Bishop of Exeter, the Right Reverend Lord William Cecil (the brother of Lord Hugh Cecil) and the Bishop of Worcester, the Right Reverend E. H. Pearce. Davidson, in his comments on the last of the bishops' meetings, early in 1927, presents an interesting picture of the four dissident bishops. 'Birmingham, Worcester and Norwich, sitting together at the end of the table, were quite obviously out of sympathy with what we were doing. Birmingham adopted a kind of

1. Ibid., p. 77.

supercilious aloofness, like a wise man sitting among foolish people. Worcester was quite good-tempered, but emphatically Protestant in the large sense of the word, or at least anti-High Church. Norwich had intimated to me that he would not be able to throw in his lot with us on the general question in the end.¹

Pollock's opposition to the Book had been firm and consistent throughout the discussions of the bishops at Lambeth in the previous two years and, indeed, since before that. Pollock was not as positively Evangelical as were other opponents, nor as was Bishop Drury in the earlier controversies. He came from a family that had a traditional interest in the law; his brother, Lord Hanworth, was a leading high court judge, who espoused similar sympathies, and it was with him later in the year that Davidson experienced one of his most traumatic interviews on the subject. 'I had a really furious bombardment this afternoon from Lord Hanworth (Norwich's brother) denouncing the Book and the Bishops and all who are on their side.....Altogether his utterances about it were the most vehement I have ever heard from anyone'.² Bertram Pollock's own inclinations had led

-
1. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, vol. xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-30, Memorandum of February 13, 1927, pp. 3-4.
 2. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Davidson to Hugh Cecil, July 28, 1927.

him to a career as a schoolmaster, and he was Headmaster of Wellington before he became Bishop of Norwich in 1910. He felt that the description of himself as an Evangelical Bishop was inaccurate, though he acknowledged the support of many Evangelicals and even a few Anglo-Catholics. 'I preferred to follow the lead of my great master, Bishop Westcott of Durham, who, I think, described himself as a historic churchman. It was as an Englishman that I was against sanction being given to the new Book; but many of those who joined in opposing it were out-and-out Evangelicals.'¹

Pollock's main and unchanging contention was that the non-controversial aspects of the Book should be accepted and that the controversial aspects (i.e. Reservation and the Alternative Order of the Holy Communion) should be postponed until fuller agreement within the Church could be reached on them. This was his positive proposal, and one which found little support among his episcopal colleagues. His objections to the Book were expressed on numerous occasions throughout the controversy and a summary exists in his biography. Foremost among his objections was the fact that the Book was not in the tradition of English devotion; he considered that 'Though not intended to do so', it did alter 'the doctrine of the present Book', that the bishops would be unable to enforce the regulations on Reservation, that the Book 'resuscitated

1. B. Pollock: A Twentieth-Century Bishop, Recollections and Reflections, London, 1944, pp. 154-155.

ways of devotion which Englishmen had discarded', that it would be unfortunate to change the 1662 Book 'beyond recall' (something which was in fact not intended) only to discover that the bounds of the new Book were being over-stepped. His final objection - with which he met the contention that the Book had secured thorough ecclesiastical approval - was that 'the Church Assembly does not as yet adequately represent the mind of the Church of England.'¹

Many of these points were brought forward in Pollock's speech to Convocation on March 29, 1927. He placed particular attention upon the fact that the Book would bring discord to the Church, especially in rural areas, and he alleged an illogicality in at once allowing Reservation but forbidding adoration of the reserved Sacrament.²

The immediate response to Pollock came from the Bishop of Durham, the Right Reverend H. H. Henson who, apart from the two Archbishops, has claim to be regarded as the most stalwart of the Book's episcopal supporters. He possessed a style of writing and speech that was both vivid and graceful, based on eighteenth-century forms; indeed, he had about him something of the manner and attitude of an eighteenth-century prelate. His career as cleric and bishop was marked by controversy, the most acute having been that which surrounded his appointment to the See of Hereford in 1917 and which had

1. Ibid., p. 154.

2. Chronicle of Convocation, March 29, 1927, pp. 81-91.

been brought about by the allegation that his views on some doctrinal points were modernist; his three-volumed autobiography, Retrospect of An Unimportant Life, abounds in instances of further controversy. Into the issue of the Prayer Book, Henson threw himself with vigour and conviction, though some had expected him to oppose the idea of revision and he had shown a lukewarm approach in the early twenties. He disliked features of the new Prayer Book - most especially Reservation - but like other episcopal supporters, he valued a spirit of compromise: 'If vestments are to remain illegal, no Reservation for the Sick is to be permitted, no Unction of the Sick, and, in the case of the Holy Communion, no change is to be tolerated, what kind of an olive branch is offered to the High Church Party?'¹ On this occasion Henson spoke sternly against the Bishop of Norwich, whom he linked to a movement which he called the 'Protestant Underworld'. His own words convey most vividly the strength of his feeling on this issue:

'The Bishop of Norwich reminds me of that rather enigmatic but extremely interesting figure, the Stylites or Pillar Saint of the Primitive Church, whose aloofness was as impressive as his altitude was apparent. His Lordship, I know, will forgive me if I say that he unites the remoteness of the saint with the rigidity of his pillar. About the base of the column a mingled crowd has collected, which the

1. Henson to Sir Edward Clark, November 12, 1926, quoted in H. H. Henson: Retrospect of an Unimportant Life, vol. ii, p. 157.

Bishop himself is so far removed from that he hardly understands its composition, for in truth what I will take leave to call the Protestant underworld has been profoundly stirred, and a number of moribund Protestant Societies whose very names are passing out of memory have suddenly blossomed into prominence. They perpetuate in the twentieth century the conflicts of the sixteenth, and they echo the half forgotten, almost unintelligible shibboleths of the seventeenth. These men cannot be argued with; they must be left to the sure but slow process of extinction through moral and intellectual penury. From my heart I compassionate the Bishop of Norwich for being driven to accept the support and endure the applause of these deplorable fanatics.¹

Henson then argued that the new Book was required in order both to restore discipline in the Church of England and to affirm the actual character of the Church of England 'which the existing anarchy had perilously obscured'.² He also countered the criticism that Pollock had levied at him, on the ground of his inconsistency in recent years, by suggesting that the situation had changed since 1923 and that he had subsequently been drawn into agreement with his fellow bishops. To follow Pollock's suggestion would imply abandonment of the idea of the restoration of discipline and would be a heavy blow at episcopal authority which Henson, in common with the

1. Chronicle of Convocation, March 29, 1927, p. 92.

2. Ibid., p. 93.

other bishops, valued and which he felt was 'the only authority at present available for the maintenance of discipline'.¹

Darwell Stone had what he called the 'hard task' of following Henson in the debate. On this occasion he spoke of 'two features in which my difficulty reaches its greatest height: the form of the Canon and the rubrics on Reservation'.² The Canon presented difficulties to him as it departed markedly from the tradition of the history of liturgy in the English Church. Reservation he regarded as 'part of the immemorial Common Law of the Church' for which the permissive features that the Book contained were inappropriate. Somewhat in the vein of Pollock, he placed stress on the lack of unanimity within the Church about the proposals and referred in particular to the very small majorities that were obtained for certain proposals. He also made what was for an advanced Anglo-Catholic a somewhat curious appeal to 'old-fashioned Churchpeople' who were distressed at the changes, an appeal which reminded Lang later in the debate of the 'solicitude of the Wolf for Little Red Riding Hood'.³ Stone's final proposal was that there should be progressive revision and that 'a fair measure of agreement' be found on one point before another was taken in hand.

1. Ibid., p. 94.

2. Ibid., p. 96.

3. Ibid., p. 156.

The speeches of Davidson, Pollock, Henson and Stone thus afforded expression of view by two leading protagonists on either side. After Stone's speech, Davidson made a request for brevity, so that it would be possible to take a vote on the following day. Strong spoke of his long association with Prayer Book revision and of his support of the present project. Frere spoke of the need to provide for the revived thought that occurred in the Church of England in the nineteenth century, 'a sudden fertilizing of a garden that had lain a great time fallow'.¹ But support for Pollock's position came from Cecil, who advised the partial approach commended by Pollock and Stone, and who spoke generally about the danger of changing things of this kind, thereby causing the unsettlement of people.²

Barnes also spoke against the Book, though he was not positioned so closely behind Pollock as was Cecil. He had some time previously made himself highly unacceptable among Anglo-Catholics by his strict prohibition of Reservation and had offended many by his occasional crude expressions of opinion about the nature of the sacramental presence. He was probably surprised to be taken to task in Convocation itself for his attitudes, ^{by} the Reverend Canon C. N. Long, Proctor for the Birmingham Diocese, who said that he was happier to be stating these matters in Barnes' presence

1. Ibid., p. 114.

2. Ibid., pp. 103-106.

rather than in his absence, and who disliked the power that the new Book proposed to place in the hands of individual bishops so far as Reservation was concerned.¹ Dr. Sparrow Simpson also supported Long's point. Barnes had clearly not anticipated this onslaught in Convocation itself and expressed the wish that Long had given him advance notice of it. The bulk of his speech was taken in justifying his policies on Reservation and in explaining that the precautions he took were to prevent adoration.² He said little else in opposition to the Book, though his dislike of it and his opposition to it were well known.

On March 30, 1927, Davidson again appealed for brevity, an appeal that was not popular with some speakers, notably the Evangelical Guy Rogers, who felt that an unfortunate impression would be conveyed if undue haste was shown. At rather greater length than most he explained his acceptance of the Book as a 'Liberal Evangelical' and that, contrary to the opinion of the Daily Express, he was not in touch with opponents such as Bishop Knox and Sir William Joynson-Hicks: 'I am not to be associated with those giants of the Protestant Party'.³ Further support came from the Reverend Canon H. A. Wilson for the Evangelicals and from the Reverend Dr. Charles Harris and the Reverend Dr. B. J. Kidd for the

1. Ibid., pp. 106-108.

2. Ibid., pp. 111-113.

3. Ibid., March 30, 1927, p. 133.

Anglo-Catholics.

A fine speech of support came from the Bishop of Gloucester, the Right Reverend A. C. Headlam. He covered familiar ground in his speech and at the end appealed to those who had shown opposition up to that point to give their support. 'Those who have fought against it have fought against it in a very sporting and admirable way, and I would appeal to them now to recognise that the time has come for them to join in accepting it unanimously.'¹ Headlam had devoted much time and thought to liturgical revision in the late twenties, though it had not been an earlier interest of his and it was one that he appears to have taken to with no great love of the study, but rather as an inescapable obligation.² He was much concerned at this time and throughout the controversy that the voice of the Church, as expressed in Convocation and the National Assembly should be accepted and that other views should be rejected. As the controversy wore on, Headlam became increasingly convinced of the accuracy of his point of view in this respect and his language in some of his letters surrounding the second rejection in June 1928 was extravagant.³ Around the time of

1. Ibid., p. 131.

2. R.C.D. Jasper: Arthur Cayley Headlam, The Life and Letters of a Bishop, London, 1960, p. 183.

3. Example of this is provided in two letters, both dated September 18, 1928, addressed to Darwell Stone and to the Reverend Canon A. Linwood Wright, found at LPL among the Headlam Papers, MSS. 2625. Reference is made to the letter to Darwell Stone in R.C.D. Jasper: Headlam, p. 189. The letters are startling in their directness.

the Convocation discussions in March 1927 this view received strong expression in his correspondence, well illustrated by a letter to Lord Halifax in which he asked 'Don't you think that it is time that people who are called the extreme Anglo-Catholics should get out of their Protestant mental attitude?Their whole mental attitude is that of putting their individual opinions against that of the Church to which they owe corporate loyalty'.¹ Later in 1927, Headlam was to give himself fully to the cause of the Prayer Book and wrote and spoke fully in its support, though never with quite the pungency employed by Henson, with whom he shared many characteristics; and as he was not a member of the House of Lords he did not participate in the debates there in December 1927.

The final speech on the second and last day of the Convocation debate came from the Archbishop of York, the Most Reverend C. G. Lang, the firm ally of Davidson throughout the entire controversy and his successor to the See of Canterbury a few months after the second rejection. Davidson relied greatly upon Lang at all stages. Correspondence at Lambeth shows a desire on Davidson's part to secure the approval of Lang for proposed courses of action; minutes of meetings of the House of Bishops reveal a keener participation in proceedings by Lang than there was by Davidson; and Lang's interest in liturgy was more wholehearted than was that of

1. Headlam Papers concerning revision of the Book of Common Prayer, MSS. 2624, Headlam to Halifax, April 14, 1927.

Davidson. It was felt that Lang's sympathies lay somewhat in a High Church direction and he had in the earlier stages of revision advocated, somewhat to the concern of Davidson, the adoption by the Church of England of the Liturgy of 1549, a course of action in which he appears to have been strongly influenced by the Reverend Dr. Charles Harris in the Autumn of 1925.¹ The private memoranda of Davidson suggest that the degree of harmony between himself and Lang was not perhaps as great as was popularly supposed. Davidson found difficulty in understanding some of the approaches that Lang adopted: 'The Archbishop of York sometimes puzzled me by his desire to build a bridge for the extreme High-Churchmen in such fashion as would I honestly think render the proposals unlikely to carry lay opinion in the country, or in Parliament, or perhaps even in the Church Assembly'.² Lord Stamfordham clearly conceived Lang's influence to be considerable and wrote a letter to him from Buckingham Palace a month after the first rejection, requesting Lang's influence on concessions over Reservation in order to prevent a second rejection.³

Lang therefore brought to the cause of Prayer Book revision a degree of involvement and interest which Davidson lacked, and which had already become apparent in the earlier

-
1. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Letters between Lang and Harris, Autumn 1925, passim.
 2. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, vol. xvi. Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-30, Memorandum of February 13, 1927, p. 9.
 3. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Stamfordham to Lang, January 22, 1928.

discussions. He also brought a fine speaking ability, and he was able to inspire the doubtful; some of the finest speeches in the whole controversy are by Lang. In the debates in Convocation, National Assembly and the House of Lords it was always Davidson who spoke first and always Lang who gave the final speech. In the concluding speech to the Convocations, Lang put clearly the role of Convocation in correct perspective. 'It was a constitutional principle old and settled that legislation affecting the doctrine or ceremonies of the Church comes to Parliament only with the consent of the Convocations' but he added that 'It is true that the deciding vote will be given not here but in the Church Assembly'.¹ He commended the Book to the Convocations in general terms: doctrine was not changed, catholic principles were not compromised and Reservation would now be brought into the 'settled order of the Church'. He concluded with an appeal to the Convocations to give a decisive majority for the Book and suggested that this would have a 'moral effect' upon the Church.²

The voting was taken then and there by both Upper Houses and by the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation; the Lower House of York Convocation preferred to withdraw and take its vote separately. The voting figures showed decisive majorities in favour of the Measure and the Book.

1. Chronicle of Convocation, March 30, 1927, p. 152.

2. Ibid., p. 158.

	For	Against
Upper House of Canterbury	21	4
Lower House of Canterbury	168	22
Upper House of York	Unanimously in favour.	
Lower House of York	68	10

I

1. Ibid., pp. 158-161, passim.

CHAPTER 3.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC OPINION OF THE 1927 BOOK

Opinion among Anglo-Catholics on the proposed Prayer Book of 1927 lacked unity. Most societies, newspapers and journals that gave expression to Anglo-Catholic thought wrote in guarded terms about the Book's advantages and lost few opportunities of explaining also its disadvantages. Beneath the division of opinion thus shown there can be discerned an anxiety held by many Anglo-Catholics that their movement was unable to speak with one voice on the matter and the entire controversy gave further illustration to the fact that Anglo-Catholicism of the early twentieth century lacked a cohesive unity and that its only home was within the broad bounds of the Church of England.

The English Church Union was the oldest and most significant of the organisations representing Anglo-Catholic opinion, both clerical and lay. The Acta of the Council of the E.C.U. reveal the sharp conflict of opinion within the Council and the distress that this conflict caused to members. The first meeting after the publication of the Book was on February 16, 1927, and it considered a draft submitted by the Central Council of Catholic Societies, on which the E.C.U. was represented. The draft, while making the usual references to the gains that the Book afforded, also noted that 'having regard to the state of the Church of England, it is unlikely that any Book (which is in any way possible) could be made

the basis of rigid discipline without grave disaster'.¹ Various points of objection, focusing upon the Holy Communion and the proposed restrictions upon the mode and purpose of Reservation, were then listed and Darwell Stone spoke to most of these. No communication was made to the press, but the atmosphere at this first meeting was clearly hostile to the Book. A special Council meeting was held on March 1, 1927, which members of the Executive of the Fellowship of Catholic Priests joined at a later stage in the day, and a memorandum was accepted and sent to the bishops above the signatures of Lord Shaftesbury, President of the E.C.U., Darwell Stone, Chairman of the Fellowship of Catholic Priests, and the Reverend C. P. Shaw, Superior General of the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament. The memorandum contained two bold suggestions: that liturgical revision was preceding and not following agreement in the Church of England on the matters involved in the Prayer Book, and that a parliamentary debate on doctrinal issues was unsuitable.² So far as liturgical revision was concerned, the Council felt that the truth of their contention was proved by the fact that 'the proposals in question fail to commend themselves in important particulars both to much Protestant and to much Anglo-Catholic opinion'.³

-
1. E.C.U. Papers, Acta of Council of the E.C.U., February 16, 1927.
 2. E.C.U. Papers, Special Council Meeting of the E.C.U., March 1, 1927.
 3. Ibid.

But the problems that Prayer Book revision posed to the E.C.U. appear to have been highlighted most vividly at a meeting of April 27, 1927, the minutes of which suggest that the atmosphere was very far from harmonious. Before that meeting there had taken place the important debates in Convocation on March 29 and 30, 1927, in which the division of thought among Anglo-Catholics had been made clear to all. An important attendant problem was posed by the large Convocation majorities in favour of the Book: should Anglo-Catholics accept the decision of Convocation as the 'Sacred Synod', sink their differences and accept the Book even though without enthusiasm? Stone considered this problem carefully and concluded that continued opposition to the Book was justifiable,¹ but this matter was henceforth a further cause of friction among Anglo-Catholics and of attack upon them from outside their own ranks.

The meeting on April 27, 1927, must have been most unsatisfactory from the point of view of those E.C.U. members who valued the movement's unity. The two leading views at the meeting were expressed by Shaftesbury and Stone. Shaftesbury traced the history of the E.C.U.'s work of revision, regretted that the Book had not followed more closely the form of the Green Book and concluded somewhat equivocally, that as Convocation had approved the Book 'there, he proposed, the Union should leave it, taking no

1. F. L. Cross: Stone, p. 185.

further action' and assuring members that they should feel free to vote as they wished.¹ A sterner view was taken by Stone, though he welcomed the freedom of approach that Shaftesbury commended. Stone opposed the Book per se because 'there were elements in the proposals which.....if carried into law were likely to be mischievous and even so disastrous that whatever good there might be in some other parts of the proposals, he and others would deem it their duty to oppose the proposals as steadfastly and as forcibly as they could through all the stages that remained open to them'. A second issue that Stone dealt with was that of the Convocation vote. He defined the nature of the Convocation motion strictly as one assenting to the Measure and the Book being sent to the Assembly for final consideration. Synodical ratification by the Convocations would follow the consideration which the National Assembly would give.²

Stone's speech was followed by a 'considerable discussion' in which 'Lord Phillimore and Dr. Stone took part'. This unrecorded discussion was in all probability a lively one, as the views of Phillimore, Vice President of the E.C.U., were different to those of Stone and at an earlier meeting on March 16, 1927, he had stated his intention, as the acknowledged leader of Anglo-Catholics in the National

1. E.C.U. Papers Acta of Council of the E.C.U., April 27, 1927.

2. Ibid.

Assembly, of supporting the Book. Even at that stage he had realised the unpopularity that his attitude would evoke in certain sections of the E.C.U., as he followed it by saying that 'he should be sorry if the Council felt that as a Vice President his conduct merited censure, and said that he did not propose to resign his position as leader of the group in the Assembly, unless he should be asked to do so'.¹ The discussion between Phillimore and Stone must therefore have confused still further the many members of the Union who, the secretary said, had written to him to request guidance from the Council of the E.C.U. and it is most doubtful that they were satisfied with the bland suggestion that the two speeches be published and the freedom of vote by members of the E.C.U. reiterated. Dr. Sparrow Simpson regretted the Council's inability to agree a united policy, and he had a special regard for members of the Union who could not accept the proposals and who might feel that they were being left in the lurch. The meeting concluded with a speech from Phillimore in which, despite his own support of the Book, he supported the non-committal line that most members of the Council appeared to take. 'Lord Phillimore explained that the Union could not take a line for or against the new Prayer Book. The Union was a great body of individuals. The Secretary's answer to those who wrote saying that they wished to be loyal to the Union but they wished to take this

1. Ibid., March 16, 1927.

or that line, should be "You can be perfectly loyal to the Union and take whichever course you think best, as the Union qua Union is not going to commit itself to either view".¹

After the April meeting, the issue of the Prayer Book fails to attract very much attention in the Council minutes and the stance then precariously adopted was maintained for the rest of the year. The E.C.U.'s reply to the Ecclesiastical Committee's invitation to submit views on the Prayer Book Measure was approved at a meeting on October 19, 1927, and was studiously negative: 'The President and Council do not...in the circumstances, desire to offer any observations upon the Book and Measure, though they are sensible of the courteous intention of the Sub-Committee of the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament in this desire to consult the Union on the matter.' Such phrases in the minutes as 'a considerable discussion followed' and 'ultimately it was agreed, almost unanimously.....' suggest that the matter was still capable of arousing strong feelings.²

No other Anglo-Catholic organisation held the position enjoyed by the E.C.U. and the approach of such other organisations as the Anglo-Catholic Congress, the Fellowship of Catholic Priests and the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament tended to follow the non-committal lead that the E.C.U. gave. Indeed, to an organisation such as the Anglo-

1. Ibid., April 27, 1927.

2. Ibid., October 19, 1927.

Catholic Congress, the main consideration was the effecting of closer relations between the Catholic societies and it wished to do nothing that might hinder the ideal or creating 'one great catholic organisation'.¹ The Catholic societies were not so numerous and possibly not so strong financially or numerically as were the Protestant societies, which in any case were able to cast their net beyond the bounds of the Church of England towards Nonconformity, in a way that was quite impossible to the Catholic societies. Their unity of purpose - certainly stronger than that possessed by the Protestant societies - may have been attributable both to their comparatively small size as well as to the weak formulæ to which they pledged themselves.

If the existing Catholic societies and the High Church press felt unable to take a line of positive commitment for or against the Book, this fact did not inhibit High Churchmen from supporting the Book. Many High Churchmen, who might not have appreciated being accorded the description of 'Anglo-Catholic', with the Romeward suggestion that it carried in the 1920s, but who had been nurtured on High Church, Tractarian traditions, were throughout advocates of the Book. Amongst leading figures in Liberal Catholicism in these years was Gore, who had earlier worked upon revision while he was Bishop of Oxford (1911-19), who had refused an invitation to examine the bishops' proposals before the

1. E.C.U. Papers, Anglo-Catholic Congress Executive Meeting, October 26, 1927.

publication, on the grounds that he possessed no actual responsibility in the matter, and who welcomed the Book as representing 'on the whole an advance altogether beyond what I had dared to expect'.¹ Gore took little immediate part in the events of 1927, but he strongly advocated acceptance of the Book by the Convocations and the National Assembly and remained virtually unmoved by such issues as the new Prayer of Consecration and the restrictions on Reservation, which excited so much of the Catholic opposition. Gore's approach had changed little since the publication of his The Body of Christ, just after he had attended as one of fifteen members of Bishop Creighton's Round Table Conference on ecclesiastical disorders in October 1900, and in which he pleaded for 'a measure of healthy agnosticism about questions which are at present arousing considerable frenzy, were really quite secondary and perhaps did not admit of any certain answer'.² For Gore, then and later, 'loyalty, toleration and moderation' were needed if the Church of England were to solve her liturgical problems and the 1927 Book provided a satisfactory framework in which these qualities could be developed.³ The advocacy of this revered elder statesman of the High Church school would not have been without its effect.

-
1. G.L. Prestige: Life of Charles Gore, A Great Englishman, London, 1955, pp. 504-505.
 2. R.C.D. Jasper: 'Gore on Liturgical Revision', in The Church Quarterly Review, vol. clxvi, S.P.C.K., 1965, p. 24.
 3. Ibid., p. 21.

Frere, who still retained his connections with the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, was acknowledged as the leading High Churchman among the diocesan bishops and as a leading authority on liturgy, of which he made a lifetime's study. His appointment as Bishop of Truro in 1923 had aroused vociferous Protestant opposition and had been initiated by Davidson with the express purpose of raising to the bench of bishops a man of definite Anglo-Catholic commitment.¹ Frere had therefore a unique contribution to make in the bishops' meetings, 1925-27. His advocacy of the 1927 Book brought many Anglo-Catholics to the support of the Book; just as his opposition to the 1928 Book turned many away.

Other High Churchmen made clear their support of the Book. Kidd, Warden of Keble College, Harris of Christ Church, the Reverend A. S. Duncan-Jones, Vicar of St Mary's, Primrose Hill and the Reverend Francis Underhill, Warden of Liddon House, were among High Churchmen who took a view of the Prayer Book very similar to that of Gore and Frere. Their advocacy was given expression in articles and letters in the secular and ecclesiastical press, in pamphlets and books, and in private correspondence.

Concern was felt throughout 1927 by supporters of the Book that the extent of Anglo-Catholic support was remaining

1. R.C.D. Jasper: 'On Some Episcopal Appointments: The Comments of a Biographer', Friends of Lambeth Palace Library, Annual Report, 1971, pp. 10-12.

inarticulate and was failing to reveal the strength which the Book's advocates often suggested it possessed among Anglo-Catholics. Thus, The Guardian in March 1927 countered a suggestion of the Daily Telegraph that Anglo-Catholic opposition was widespread, by suggesting that it was not easy to define the term 'Anglo-Catholic' and many who might be thus described were not members of Catholic societies. The Guardian appealed to 'these unorganized Anglo-Catholics' to ensure that the others came to the support of the Book.¹

An ad hoc organisation came into being in the Summer of 1927 around which Anglo-Catholic support for the Book was able to gather. No specific name was given to this organisation and it became generally and popularly known as the '1,300 Anglo-Catholics' from the number of supporters that it attracted. The origin of the group lay in a meeting held during the week of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, in July 1927, at Liddon House, where Anglo-Catholic supporters of the Book met together, Gore also being present. As a result of the meeting, Gore, Underhill and the Reverend Canon A. Linwood Wright, Vicar of St Mark's, Leicester, who became secretary to the organisation, drew up a series of resolutions and submitted them to clergy for signature. The four points of the resolution were:

1. The Guardian, March 11, 1927, p. 194.

1. A pledge 'as Catholic priests to give loyal acceptance to the Deposited Book', though also retaining the right to continue to use the Book of 1662.
2. A request that the bishops deal synodically with difficulties that may arise in connection with the eventual use of the Deposited Book.
3. A promise that the signatories would seek common counsel in connection with the manner of celebrating the Communion Service and the matter of episcopal permission for Reservation.
4. Plans for an eventual deputation to each Archbishop in order to make known the corporate position of the signatories.¹

This list of resolutions was sent by Linwood Wright, with a covering letter, above the signatures of an impressive list of seventeen High Churchmen who constituted themselves 'a temporary consultative committee' and who had evidently approved the four resolutions. They were headed by Gore, and included the Reverend E. J. Bicknell (Vice Principal, Cuddesdon), the Reverend F. L. Donaldson (Canon of Westminster), the Reverend E. K. C. Hamilton (Vicar of Chiswick), the Reverend T. A. Lacey, (Canon of Worcester), the Reverend S. R. P. Mouldsdale (Principal, St Chad's College, Durham) and the Reverend Francis Underhill (Warden, Liddon House).

1. Davidson Papers, Box 12, A printed copy of the resolutions.

The covering letter, dated August 1927, touched upon an issue that became increasingly important between the successful passage through the National Assembly in July and the presentation in parliament in December 1927: the issue, not only of the Book's general acceptability, but of consequences, fraught with sinister though ill-defined disaster, of the rejection by parliament of a matter that had obtained the approval of Convocation and the National Assembly. The declaration containing the resolutions was commended important 'not only because of the principles it contains, but because the support of the Deposited Book in its present stage by a group of Catholic priests might have some influence in preventing the rejection by either House of Parliament of the considered proposals of the Bishops, accepted by the Convocations and the Church Assembly. Whatever view we may have of the value of the Deposited Book, yet most of us will agree that such action on the part of Parliament would be a serious disaster, threatening the whole relation of Church and State as recently amended'.¹

The 1,300 clergy who signed the declaration represented a body of considerable weight in the Church of England. Linwood Wright thus summarised its composition in a verbal statement to Davidson: 'The signatories are chiefly from incumbents in parishes, many of whom are of large experience and influence in the Anglo-Catholic movement, and of high

1. Ibid., Circular letter sent by Linwood Wright.

position in the Church. There is also a fair proportion of junior or assistant clergy. Our signatories include a number of scholars, public schoolmasters, examining chaplains and Proctors in Convocation. We have, moreover, obtained the signatures of the Principals and Vice Principals of most of the Theological Colleges in England, namely, Ely, Cuddesdon, Salisbury, St. Chad's, Durham, Lincoln, Chichester, Dorchester, Warminster, St Oswald's, Manchester and the C.R. Hostel, Leeds, the C.R. Prep School of Ordinands, Lichfield and Burgh'. Linwood Wright added that the signatories 'express relief and gratitude that at length a united act of support for the new Prayer Book has been made possible for clergy who genuinely call themselves adherents of the Anglo-Catholic movement'.¹

Davidson welcomed the support of the 1,300 Anglo-Catholics. He received a number of them, led by Underhill, in an hour-long meeting at Lambeth Palace on September 26, 1927, and regretted that for practical reasons it had not been possible for Lang also to attend. In a letter to Lang just after their departure from the Palace, Davidson wrote 'Nothing could have been more friendly or more reasonable than their attitude'.² A verbatim report of the meeting was made and the impression it conveys is of a thoroughly agreeable hour. Underhill had forewarned the Archbishop that the major point

1. Ibid., Box 8, Deputation on behalf of certain Anglo-Catholic Clergy Concerning the Deposited Book, Monday 26th September, 1927.

2. Ibid., Box 13, Davidson to Lang, September 26, 1927.

they wished to discuss with him was the significance of resolutions 2 and 3 in their declaration and in particular the eventual employment of synodical action by the bishops when administering the Book in their dioceses, a matter on which the Reverend E. Gordon Selwyn, Editor of Theology and Rector of Red Hill, Portsmouth, was to speak during the deputation's reception. After an introductory re-affirmation of support for the Book by Underhill and a synopsis of the history of the group and the extent and nature of its support by Linwood Wright, Selwyn embarked upon a justification for the employment of synodical action by the bishops, not only on the ground of the suitability of such action in the light of precedent in the history of the early church, but on the ground that such action would bring about the atmosphere of 'confidence and concord' for which the supporters of the Book hoped.¹ Davidson, as usual, preferred not to commit himself too strongly on a solution to this problem, though he made fairly clear his liking for the general conception of synodical administration, but Ecclesiastical Courts might be needed. In his letter later in the day to Lang, he made much of the delegation's suggestions about synodical government and added 'We are not going to be bullies, but we do "mean business" and intend to press for obedience to the Revised Prayer Book'.²

-
1. Ibid., Box 8, Deputation on behalf of certain Anglo-Catholic Clergy Concerning the Deposited Book, Monday 26th September, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Davidson to Lang, Box 13, September 26, 1927.

The group of 1,300 Anglo-Catholics therefore illustrated the extent of moderate Anglo-Catholic support and the influence of the clergy belonging to the group could not have been without effect upon those to whom they ministered. Its existence must further have encouraged the bishops that their policy of satisfying reasonable demands from Anglo-Catholics might well work. A number of references to the group were made in the parliamentary debates in December 1927.

But Anglo-Catholic opposition to the Book also formed itself into groups, similarly described by the approximate number of their adherents. A letter from the Reverend E. A. Cornibeer, Vicar of St Matthew's, Westminster, informed Davidson of an Anglo-Catholic opposition group which by June 29, 1927, numbered some seven hundred. This group of seven hundred found the Book 'subversive of Catholic principles in certain matters' and specified the treatment the Book accorded 'the traditional standing of the parish priest'. These uncongenial features had been discussed at a conference of priests from every diocese held at Trevelyn Hall, Westminster, on June 8 and 9, 1927, as a result of a letter from Prebendary Mackay, Vicar of All Saints, Margaret Street and the Reverend Henry Ross, Vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, to The Times on April 28, 1927. The list of seven hundred supporters was a practical one to facilitate the calling of meetings 'in the event of further action becoming necessary'.¹

1. Ibid., Box 8, Cornibeer to Davidson, June 29, 1927.

In early July, the main contents of the letter to Davidson were sent to every diocesan bishop.¹ This group of seven hundred, the first ad hoc body of Anglo-Catholic opinion to reveal itself, attracted comparatively slight attention, and many of its members were doubtless incorporated in the 1,400 Anglo-Catholic opponents later in the year. Its existence was however employed by Stone in the National Assembly debate on July 6, 1927, only a few days after the opposition of the group was known. Stone referred to the group's 'most complete and uncompromising opposition to what was proposed' and linked it with Evangelical and Modernist opposition in an attempt to illustrate the inadequacy of the Book in forming the basis of a settlement.² Selwyn, in the Lambeth discussions of the 1,300 supporters on September 26, 1927, clearly envisaged the seven hundred as the opposing group within the Anglo-Catholic fold and he expressed a wish to avoid 'warfare' with them.³

The group of 1,400 Anglo-Catholics opposed to the Book attracted considerably more attention and the numerical extent of its support was, rightly, cast into some doubt. The Fellowship of Catholic Priests consisted of about 1,400 priests and its executive passed a resolution that was generally circulated on November 7, 1927, in which they

-
1. Ibid., Copy of circular letter to diocesan bishops, July 2, 1927.
 2. Church Assembly, Report of Proceedings, vol. viii, no. 2, Summer session, 1927, p. 105.
 3. Davidson Papers, Box 8, Deputation on behalf of certain Anglo-Catholic Clergy Concerning the Deposited Book, Monday 26th September, 1927.

stated that in the event of the Prayer Book being legalised, its members would continue to maintain perpetual Reservation in spite of the possible opposition of the diocesan bishop, that they would give Communion from the Reserved Sacrament to the whole as well as to the sick, that they would encourage corporate acts of Devotion to the Sacrament and that they would encourage Reservation in one kind. All four propositions were acts of rebellion against the bishops. Davidson was sent a printed copy of this resolution on November 7, 1927, by the secretary of the Fellowship of Catholic Priests, the Reverend W. Dudley Dixon, and it drew from him a sharp letter of rebuke in which, while forbearing to comment upon the nature of the resolutions, he expressed his difficulty in understanding 'the attitude of a Catholic Priest who declares beforehand that he intends to support those who defy the injunctions of the Diocesan Bishop to whom they have sworn canonical obedience'.¹

The existence of this opposition from the Fellowship of Catholic Priests, popularly known as the 1,400 Anglo-Catholics, attracted a good deal of attention, as it entered the arena of controversy only a little more than a month before the parliamentary debates of December 1927. The existence of the '1,400' was employed by a number of speakers in both houses, as revealing that there were elements among the Anglo-Catholic clergy who would not accept the concessions

1. Davidson Papers, Box 13, Davidson to Dixon, November 12, 1927.

to Anglo-Catholicism that the Book made. Lord Danesfort's speech on December 13, 1927, made particular use of this information.¹ But the nature and extent of this opposition was in fact not as great as was suggested by the Book's opponents. The opposition to Reservation was to come into being only in the case of a bishop's prohibition of Reservation and there was at that stage no certainty of how the bishops might act on that issue. Further, the resolutions had no binding force upon the members of the Federation, a point seized upon by The Guardian in a short article entitled 'A Misleading Statement', though The Guardian may have been following too closely the optimistic approach that it cherished throughout 1927 in stating that 'There is little doubt that a large majority of the federation will obey the decisions of the Church in which they are priests, when these decisions are clearly and canonically uttered'.² Further evidence of the unreliability of the figure '1,400' is afforded by a telegram from the clergy of St Batholomew's, Brighton, whose Vicar was among the leaders of the group of 1,300 Anglo-Catholic supporters, to Burrows on December 13, 1927, referring to Lord Hanworth's easy use of the figure 1,400 in his speech on the first day of the House of Lords debate, 'Re. Ld. Hanworth's statement that 1,400 priests refuse obedience to Bishops based presumably on F.C.P. resolutions

-
1. Parliamentary Debates, (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5s,
 2. The Guardian, November 18, 1927, p. 855. [column 900.]

at Chelsea subsequent referendum to whole membership revealed only 700 against new Bk'.¹ The telegram was presumably passed to Lang and the information that it contained was employed by him in his concluding speech in the House of Lords on December 14, 1927. It was later considered by Warman that the F.C.P. memorial did much harm before the Commons debate.²

-
1. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Clergy of St Bartholomew's, Brighton, to Burrows, December 13, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Warman to Lang, January 28, 1928.

CHAPTER 4.

PROTESTANT OPINION OF THE 1927 BOOK

Protestant opposition to the Book was stronger and more vociferous than was Anglo-Catholic opposition and it was held after the rejection of December 1927 to have been the major reason for the Book's defeat in parliament; a number of peers and M.P.s spoke against the Book from a Protestant standpoint, and a few referred to the Anglo-Catholic opposition, but their opposition in all cases was on Protestant and not on Catholic grounds. Protestant societies were more numerous, were more effectively organised and presented a more solidly united front than did the Anglo-Catholics. The main societies involved in opposition to the Prayer Book were the Church Association, the National Church League, the Protestant Truth Society, the League of Loyal Churchmen and Protestant Alliance and the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen. Two ad hoc organisations of importance came into existence: the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith on which were represented almost all the Protestant societies and the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage, which did much to spread opposition to the proposals in different parts of the country. The Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, though it shared some of the fears of the Protestant societies, adopted an attitude towards the Book not dissimilar to that of the 1,300 Anglo-Catholic supporters: liberal Evangelicals and liberal Catholics were therefore able to find some important common ground in the controversy.

The Church Association was the oldest and in many ways the most significant and best organised of the Protestant societies, maintaining a position among Evangelicals similar to that of the English Church Union among Anglo-Catholics. Both organisations had vigorously championed their respective causes within the Church of England since the 1860s, when they originated in an atmosphere of ritualistic controversy, and though the E.C.U. gave uncertain lead in 1927, the same could not be said of the Church Association. After the rejection in June 1928, the Church Association, whilst paying tribute to the work of the other Protestant societies, made clear that it held itself still in a position of leadership among them: 'the final defence of the Reformation principles in the House of Commons fell naturally to the Church Association. We alone possessed a staff with the necessary qualifications and experience'.¹

The views of the Church Association were broadcast in the sharply composed monthly editions of the Church Intelligencer, and in all the issues of 1927 and 1928 the Prayer Book is given prominence over all other material. The appeal, unlike that of some other societies, was strictly to members of the Church of England. The Association's immediate reaction to the Book was highly unfavourable, and criticism was directed against the inadequate discipline asserted by the bishops who 'To cover their own unfaithfulness in the

1. Church Association, 64th Annual Report, 1928, p. 14.

past and to secure the position of their law breaking protégés in the future,.....now propose a revision of the Prayer Book which would render legal the more common forms of Romanising illegality'.¹ Particular dislike was expressed against such features as the alternative consecration prayer, vestments, prayers for the dead and Reservation. The bishops' assertion that the 1662 Book would continue as the standard of liturgy of the Church of England and the alternative Book would simply be a concession to those who wished to use it, was regarded as 'misleading' and the abandonment of the principle of uniformity by the adoption of two Prayer Books was regretted. There was virtually nothing in the revision, apart from some aspects of the modernisation of language, that the Church Association was able to welcome and its catalogue of condemnation could scarcely have been more entire.² But the Church Association was not without its own proposals for the revision of the Prayer Book, even though these proposals were marked by extreme caution. Thus, at the Association's Spring Conference at Worthing, March 20-25, 1927, at the final meeting the main speech was given by Sir Malcolm Macnaghten, who suggested that the model of the revised Irish Prayer Book of 1869 might have been employed by the

1. Church Intelligencer, March 1927, p. 25.

2. Ibid., March 1927, pp. 25-27.

bishops as a model on which to base their work.¹ That Book, needless to say, would not have met the demands of the Church of England in the 1920s.

Throughout 1927 the Church Association kept up a constant campaign against the Book and its supporters. The activities of other Protestant groups received encouragement in the Church Intelligencer: the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage was commended in warm tones;² a demonstration outside Lambeth Palace by the League of Loyal Churchmen and others, in which a banner exhorted the bishops to 'Remove not the ancient landmarks which thy fathers have set' (Proverbs xxii) was favourably reported;³ and advertisements were carried in many issues for The English Churchman, described as 'the best Protestant and Evangelical newspaper'.

Criticism was made of the fact that the Prayer Book Measure presented to the National Assembly at the end of March 1927 was not identical to the bishops' proposals as published on February 7, 1927, and the Church Association was especially anxious about the exclusion of the Act of Uniformity from later proposals.⁴ An article by Hugh Cecil in the May issue of the National Review, 'an article which

1. Ibid., May 1927, p. 59.

2. Ibid., February 1927, pp. 15-16.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

4. Ibid., April 1927, pp. 41-42.

certainly expounds the case put forth by most defenders of the Deposited Book, if indeed it may not be regarded as its official apologia', was criticised in particular due to the fact that the first recommendation of the Royal Commission's report in 1906, that illegal practices be made to cease, had not been accorded adequate place in the bishops' proposals; Hugh Cecil fell down on 'the badness of the cause he has had to defend'.¹ The voting figures in the various diocesan conferences in the Summer of 1927 were held to present a far from accurate picture of the position in the dioceses; both the means by which the votes were obtained and the matter of abstentions were treated in a highly critical article that dwelt especially upon the London Diocesan Conference and which was entitled 'The Bishop of London's Fiasco'. Of the diocesan conferences in general it was said that 'A vote secured in a conference by the Bishop using the whole weight of his personal and official influence, sometimes backed by two or three curate-Bishops, by dint of partisan manipulation of the case and dire threats of the mysterious horrors which must supervene if the Book be not passed, is not very imposing. When we also find that about half the persons entitled to vote abstained from exercising their privilege, and that abstentions by the clergy actually attending the conferences were very noticeable, our suspicions are aroused, and are certainly not allayed by the fact that in the Protestant diocese of Liverpool-

1. Ibid., June 1927, pp. 65-67.

where the Bishop would not allow a vote on the Book - an official postcard ballot of the members of the conference gave the result of 46 for and 172 against the Deposited Book'.¹

Despite the strong efforts that were made, the Church Association held out little prospect for the success of their cause on the eve of the parliamentary debate of December 1927. The report of the Ecclesiastical Committee depressed the Association and though hope was still held out that parliament might 'save our Church and country from the catastrophe by which they are threatened' it was but a slender hope and the Association was possessed of the fear that 'our National Church may no longer be the spiritual home of numbers who hitherto have highly valued the impress of truth and piety which the Reformers stamped upon it'.²

But the Church Association had in the months before December 1927 conducted a vigorous campaign among M.P.s to persuade them of the ills they conceived to be a part of the Prayer Book Measure. Mr. Patrick White, an organising secretary of the Church Association, was appointed Honorary Secretary to the Parliamentary Sub-Committee of the Church Association and worked full-time in that capacity.³ The Church Association in addition encouraged its members to

1. Ibid., July 1927, p. 77.

2. Ibid., December 1927, p. 137.

3. Church Association, 63rd Annual Report, 1927, p. 19.

write to their M.P.s against the Prayer Book and distributed 5,000 petition forms and 25,000 postcards to assist in this process. District secretaries were encouraged to arrange protest meetings which were to conclude with the passing of motions against the Prayer Book and the sending of the results of this motion to M.P.s. Contact was made with 15,000 Parochial Church Council secretaries who might be expected to favour rejection of the Book and they were similarly encouraged to arrange for motions to be passed and forwarded to M.P.s.¹

The Church Association continued to receive generous financial assistance from its supporters and thus the administration of these large tasks was eased.² The success of all this activity depended much on the permanent secretary of the Church Association, Captain J.W.D. Barron who, it was remarked at the annual meeting on May 2, 1927, 'did not give them much rest, whether it were in connection with the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, or with Prayer Book Revision or any other matter with which he thought it was their duty to deal in support of the Protestant cause'. Sir John Pennefather, who paid this generous tribute to the work of Captain Barron, said that he 'did not quite know where the Church Association would be without Capt. Barron'.³

1. Ibid., pp. 19-20.

2. Ibid., List of Subscriptions and Donations, pp. 40-61.

3. Church Intelligencer, June 1927, p. 68.

The National Church League worked in quite close cooperation with the Church Association and there was little that differentiated the two organisations.¹ The League's outlook was less stringent than that of the Association, a factor possibly attributable to the circumstances and period of its origin as the National Protestant Ladies' League in 1899,² and to the fact that it was influenced more readily than was the Association by the more liberal thinking on ecclesiastical issues in the 1920s. Its general attitude was shown in June 1927 in the Church Gazette when reference was made to the fact that the sermon at the annual service at St Dunstan-in-the-West was preached by Pollock, a non-party bishop, 'whose presence on such an occasion was an ample indication of our contention for many years past that the National Church League is not a party society in the sense of desiring to make the whole Church conform to the teaching and worship of any one section of the Church in every detail, but that it welcomes all who are prepared to maintain the old position of our church as it has been presented for nearly four centuries, and to support the broad principles of the Reformation'.³ Such a definition of aim represented a more liberal attitude than was shown by the Church Association.

-
1. In 1950 they were amalgamated as the Church Society.
 2. G.R. Balleine: A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England, London, 1908, p. 294.
 3. Church Gazette, June 1927, p. 61.

The National Church League had the advantage of some adherents who were distinguished for their work in Church and State: Sir William Joynson-Hicks was its president, Bishop Knox was its chairman and Sir Thomas Inskip was its treasurer. Sir William Joynson-Hicks had held minor office in the Conservative governments earlier in the 1920s and had been appointed Home Secretary by Baldwin in October 1924; this position alone gave him a certain position of moral leadership in the country and was to his advantage in his Prayer Book campaigns. It fell to him to act as the virtual lay leader of Evangelical opinion in opposition to the Book. He spoke at many meetings that were designed to demonstrate opposition to the Book, he employed with effect his position as president of the National Church League, he gave impressive speeches in the National Assembly and in Parliament, and in 1928 he wrote a book about the controversy. By contrast with Joynson-Hicks, other prominent opponents fall into a different category. Knox and Pollock were bishops and Inskip was never acknowledged to have the same standing as a leader of opposition: during important debates in which both of them spoke, it was always Joynson-Hicks who spoke first and Inskip who wound up.

Joynson-Hicks was throughout conscious of the need not to alienate his support by associating himself with the more extremist Protestant position, the 'Protestant Underworld' made famous by Henson. Thus, he was nervous of allowing his name to be too closely linked with that of the Protestant

Truth Society, when it planned a large meeting in May 1928. Joynson-Hicks wrote to Prebendary Hinde, Secretary to the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith that 'while I have nothing but good to say of Mr. Kensit and his crusade, I have carefully abstained from ever going on his platform, because the campaign is conducted on different lines from my own.....you will understand that, as the Leader of our cause in the House of Commons, I have to be exceedingly careful, as our success depends entirely upon getting the moderate vote on our side'.¹

It is surprising that there are comparatively few letters from Joynson-Hicks among the Davidson papers and the only correspondence that can be found relates to February-March 1927; it was in any case made public, and is located among the Davidson papers in a most obscure and unexpected place.² Joynson-Hicks' concern about Prayer Book revision had been expressed to Davidson shortly after the publication of N.A. 84, and when the final version of the Book was known, Joynson-Hicks once more took up the attack. His letter of February 24, 1927 shows his concern over four matters: firstly, the steps that bishops might take in order to secure obedience to the new Book; secondly, whether the Book was to be regarded as a final or as an interim settlement; thirdly, how far the Book excluded 'unauthorised teaching and practice' that was not explicitly condemned by the Book; fourthly,

1. CSA, FCTF, Joynson-Hicks to Hinde, May 11, 1928.

2. Davidson Papers, Box 13, The letters are at the back of an unentitled file in that box.

whether the Book would continue to sanction illegal practices.¹ Davidson replied the next day and suggested a meeting with Joynson-Hicks. He clearly envisaged being able to win him over. 'I think the quotations you make in your letter are quite fair,' he wrote, 'and I hope to find that we are not in much disagreement, if any.'² Delay occurred, due to illness, and the meeting between the two men eventually took place on March 7, 1927. Davidson's own memorandum of this meeting gives further evidence of his hope that he would succeed with Joynson-Hicks. 'He led me to think that he regarded my answers as satisfactory to his mind.....He did not.....give me to understand that it is his intention necessarily to vote against the authorisation of the Book.'³ Davidson made also an official reply to Joynson-Hicks, for publication, but this was far from satisfactory. In acknowledging it, Joynson-Hicks felt compelled to write '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'.⁴ It certainly was a vague document; Davidson necessarily had to be cautious about what he wrote in a letter that was to become public. On the issue of discipline, he felt that the Book would assist and that these matters

1. Ibid., Joynson-Hicks to Davidson, February 24, 1927.

2. Ibid., Davidson to Joynson-Hicks, February 25, 1927.

3. Ibid., Davidson's memorandum, March 7, 1927.

4. Ibid., Joynson-Hicks to Davidson, March 18, 1927.

'will be more happily and harmoniously handled'; on the issue of the Book being a final settlement he would not be positive, but he did not anticipate 'any re-opening of the matter at any early period in our future history'; Joynson-Hicks' third and fourth points were held to have been answered by Davidson in his answers to the first two.¹ From Joynson-Hicks' point of view it was an unsatisfactory reply and he was particularly concerned at the lack of assurance on discipline; he did not want 'wholesale prosecutions' but he did feel that offenders should not be promoted. 'I am deeply sorry;' he concluded, 'I thought there might have been in 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.'² The correspondence continued a little after that, but it was apparent that the hope of an understanding had broken down. Thereafter Joynson-Hicks pursued against both the 1927 Book and the 1928 Book a policy of complete opposition and there is no evidence of his resuming contact of this kind with Davidson.

Another member of the National Church League who played a part in the controversy, virtually in his own right, was Bishop Knox. He had earlier been responsible for the largest of all the memorials presented to the bishops, said to contain 303,211 signatures of which 2,628 were of clergy;

1. Ibid., Davidson to Joynson-Hicks, March 12, 1927.

2. Ibid., Joynson-Hicks to Davidson, March 18, 1927.

it was presented to Davidson in July 1924.¹ Knox had been Bishop of Manchester from 1903 to 1920 and was acknowledged as a leading Evangelical bishop, who involved himself in continuing opposition to the Book, not only by his work on the National Church League but by the publication of tracts and the writing of letters, many of which were intended for public consumption. It is doubtful whether his role was by any means as important as that of Joynson-Hicks. He certainly occasioned Davidson considerable irritation and there is evidence to suggest that he produced a similar effect on others. A letter of Davidson to Knox in late April 1927 illustrates the sort of irritation that Knox was capable of arousing. Knox had written to Davidson on behalf of the National Church League to express the League's sorrow at the interruptions that Davidson had suffered at a meeting of the Religious Tracts Society at the Queen's Hall on April 26, 1927, when the Archbishop was virtually shouted down by Protestant demonstrators. Davidson took the opportunity of writing to Knox the 'I do not think you write fairly about what I myself at least am trying to do in steering a difficult course through a most anxious and troubled bit of water with shoals and breakers'.² In a later exchange between the two men - in this instance commenced by Knox on the issue of ordination and the 1927 Book - Davidson wrote that he could

1. Ibid., File: Prayer Book Revision Memorials.

2. Ibid.; Davidson to Knox, Box 6, April 28, 1927.

not 'undertake at present the discussion by correspondence of such questions as your letter raises or write my views upon quotations which you make from utterances of former days. Perhaps in what is now your comparatively leisured life you scarcely realise what is the hourly stress of weeks like these upon those of us who are carrying central responsibilities'.¹

Some observers did not rate Knox's contribution as being at all significant. Thus, the Reverend E. L. Macassey, Vicar of St Andrew's, Stoke Newington, a correspondent of Bell and Winnington-Ingram and a most astute observer of the entire controversy, wrote after the December rejection 'if we had left the propaganda to Bishop Knox we should have won through'.²

The immediate reaction of the National Church League to the 1927 Book was unfavourable, though it was able to see more good in the proposals than could the Church Association: it welcomed the alternative orders of Morning and Evening Prayer, the restrictions on the use of the Quicumque Vult, the divisions of the Litany and the changes in the services of Baptism, Confirmation and Matrimony. But it held that the changes in the Holy Communion and the resuscitation of such festivals as All Souls and Corpus Christi were concessions to Anglo-Catholics, and it was critical of the inadequate

1. Ibid., Box 12, Davidson to Knox, October 25, 1927.

2. Bell Papers, Pink file, Macassey to Bell, January 6, 1928.

safeguards for Reservation.¹

The Church Gazette gives evidence of continuing opposition throughout 1927, though the issue attracts proportionately less space than it does in the Church Intelligencer. Members of the League were urged to support the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith by sending their names to the secretaries and by sending to them resolutions of opposition, passed by Easter Vestries, Church Councils, Meetings and Conferences.² The League provided an important platform from which Joynson-Hicks, as president, could speak, as he did at the annual meeting in May 1927, when he made critical reference to his correspondence with Davidson: 'All the giving up is to be on our side,' he assured his audience, 'there is no suggestion of giving up on the other side'.³ Encouragement was further given for subscription to the 'Forward Movement', and part of its funds were employed in financing ventures of opposition to the Prayer Book.

The Executive Committee Minute Book of the National Church League reveals more clearly the work that the League did in frustrating the bishops' intentions. The financial situation with which to develop such work was sound and its health may well further reflect the enthusiastic opposition

1. Church Gazette, March 1927, pp. 25-26.

2. Ibid., April 1927, p. 42.

3. Church Gazette, June 1927, p. 67.

of many League members to the proposals: in October 1927, at the height of activity against the Book, the Protestant Forward Movement stood at £8,168-15-0 and this included one individual donation of £1,000.¹ But a great deal of the work of the Executive Committee so far as the Prayer Book was concerned, was directed towards supporting, patronising and encouraging other bodies on which a more united Protestant stand might be made. The National Church League certainly produced its own manifesto of opposition to the Book and had its annual meeting at which opposition was ventilated, but work specifically by the National Church League in addition to activities such as that - which in any case were only natural in such a body - was slight.

The Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage was in the category of organisations encouraged by the League; indeed, it was virtually the League's offspring. Its origins ante-date the publication of the Prayer Book and were the results of the indefatigable enthusiasm of the Reverend George Denyer, Rector of High Roding, who in the Summer of 1926 sent out a letter to explain the fears he held about the progress of Prayer Book revision and the action that he proposed. A copy of this circular letter, marked 'Strictly Private' is included in the Minute Book of the National Church League and gives a picture of Denyer's conception of the work of the movement he was to lead, jointly with the Reverend F. Martyn

1. CSA, National Church League, Executive Committee Minutes, October 26, 1927.

Cundy, Vicar of New Ferry, Birkenhead. His letter refers to 'a little group of Conservative Evangelical Incumbents' who had for some time been meeting to prepare plans of opposition should the bishops' proposals show concession to Anglo-Catholic or Modernist thought. Whilst entertaining lively fears about the nature of the eventual proposals, he realised that they may possibly prove ill-founded and 'in that unlikely case we shall thank God and shall I hope proceed to use the machinery thus created as an instrument in God's hands for the promotion of that spiritual revival for which we have so long been looking'.¹ In the event, Denyer's fears proved justified, but in April 1928, the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage did follow this ultimate direction, changed its name to 'Britons Back to the Bible',² and supported the 'Back to the Bible' campaign that caught the attention of many of the Evangelical opponents to the Book, and that stressed the need for a return to a strictly biblical form of Christianity.

Denyer's letter gives detail of the general and particular plans that the small group of incumbents had considered. 'It is proposed that a campaign of instruction be carried on throughout the country by a group of not less than 20 Incumbents, who will visit the principal towns in

-
1. Ibid., June 23, 1926, p. 74. Circular letter of the Reverend George Denyer, undated.
 2. I am indebted to Professor H. Martyn Cundy, University of Malawi, for giving me a piece of notepaper thus headed. The matter is reported in The Record, April 5, 1928, p. 246.

groups of 2 or 3, and place before the laity the real position with regard to the Anglo Catholic and Modernist attacks upon our Prayer Book. Public halls would be hired for this purpose, and while the help of sympathetic clergy would be warmly welcomed we should not seek for local clerical sanction.' Such a programme would involve an incumbent in absence from his parish for a period of four weeks and the need for a 'substantial fund' was acknowledged.¹

Denyer was a member of the National Church League, as well as of other Evangelical societies. The need for financial support for such an ambitious project, as well as the value that would fall to the movement by the patronage of a well-known and well-established Evangelical society, may have been the twin motives that caused Denyer to approach the National Church League, through the League's chairman, Bishop Knox. Denyer was invited to explain his plans at the Executive Committee meeting on June 23, 1926, and at that meeting his particular suggestion was that the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage could be linked with the proposed Forward Movement of the League.² The League took care before committing itself to patronage of this new organisation. The chairman and secretary were requested to interview Denyer and his companions more closely and to report at the

1. CSA, National Church League, Executive Committee Minutes, June 23, 1926, p. 74. Circular letter of the Reverend George Denyer, undated.

2. Ibid., p. 73.

next meeting. A favourable impression was evidently made thereby, and at the next meeting on July 21, 1926, the chairman and secretary gave strong support for Denyer's movement and recommended the committee to finance it from the new Forward Movement. But the committee would not accept the financial recommendations partly, perhaps, because the Forward Movement was still in its early days. Denyer and his companions were to be informed 'that the N.C.L. seriously intend as soon as possible to issue the appeal of the Forward Movement, and will assist them as liberally as they can out of the funds so collected'.¹

The minutes of the meetings later in 1926 suggest that there was by no means unanimity among members of the committee on this matter of financing the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage. On September 22, 1926, a motion was proposed by Mr. E. A. Denyer, brother of the Reverend George Denyer, from the Finance Committee of the National Church League, urging that £500 be allocated at once to the incumbents campaign.² The next month objection to the general idea of financing the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage was made by Mr. Clarence Hooper, who felt compelled to resign his membership of both the Finance and Executive Committee as he was unable to agree to 'the financing by the League of an outside body over whose

1. Ibid.: July 21, 1926, p. 81.

2. Ibid., September 22, 1926, p. 94.

expenditure and methods of work it would have no direct control.¹ At the same meeting the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage benefitted, as it did on other occasions, by the warm support of Knox, who urged that the League should finance the venture. Knox left the room while the matter was discussed and a compromise arrangement was worked out, to which Knox subsequently agreed. The committee was prepared to do its utmost to raise funds but was 'unable and does not pledge or bind itself to the guarantee of the payment of any specific or indefinite sum to such Campaign'. It also proposed that Dr. Downer join Guy Johnson and Knox as representatives of the League on the committee of the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage.²

After the initial uncertainty that surrounded the League's financing of the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage, a healthy financial situation existed throughout 1927 and there is evidence of a degree of generosity both in the grants made by the League to the P.P.P. and by the return of funds by the P.P.P. to the League, obtained from collections taken at meetings and itself a measure of success.

Thus in March 1927 the League's appeal for the Protestant Forward Movement had resulted in gifts and promises totalling £7,100 and of this amount grants totalling

1. Ibid., October 27, 1926, p. 106.

2. Ibid., p. 108.

£3,950 had been made to the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage.¹ Three months later £2,102-4-4 of this latter figure had been returned to the League by the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage.²

How effective was the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage? Evidence suggests that it did a very great deal to rouse opinion among the laity against the Book and it is possible that through its specific approach to and by the laity, it touched upon the Achilles heel of the whole Prayer Book venture, the comparatively minor role played in the structure of the new Prayer Book by the laity. Denyer and Martyn Cundy were the joint secretaries and messages and letters in 1927 proceeded above the signatures of these two men. An explanation in February 1927 of the approach of the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage emphasised this specific approach to the laity. 'Public Meetings are being organised in Town Halls and other neutral buildings in nearly 100 of the principal cities and towns of England, to which the laity are warmly invited, and these meetings will (D.V.) be addressed by these incumbents who will for the time being leave their Parishes to go on Pilgrimage throughout the land, in little companies of two or three, with, wherever possible, a Layman to preside over their gatherings.'³

1. Ibid., March 23, 1927, p. 145.

2. Ibid., June 22, 1927, p. 167.

3. Church Intelligencer, February 1927, p. 15.

The Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage did not restrict its appeal to the laity of the Church of England alone. The same account, of February 1927, shows that the appeal was also to Nonconformist opinion. The movement was to put its case 'before the Laity of England - Churchmen and Nonconformists alike'.¹ But it did not prove at all easy to persuade laymen to participate. Denyer wrote almost weekly reports about the success of the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage for The Record and in late February 1927 he noted that 'Our chief difficulty has been in securing lay chairmen, for although the laity are on the whole thoroughly with us, yet comparatively few are willing to accept a position of leadership'.²

The Guardian in an article on Protestant agitation against the Book, informed its readers that 'By those who understand the weight of influence to be attached to their efforts, such bodies as the Protestant Parsons' Pilgrimage are not taken seriously' though it regretted the fact that 'these meetings make good "copy" for the local Press, and some of them find their way into more important newspapers'.³ This was in fact evidence of success in a key aim that the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage gave itself and Denyer in a report in March 1927 to the National Church League about

1. Ibid., February 1927, p. 15.

2. The Record, February 24, 1927, p. 138.

3. The Guardian, February 25, 1927, p. 147.

the work of the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage stated specifically, after a catalogue of the number of meetings recently held, that 'Newspaper reports, outside of London, had been excellent'.¹ Evidence suggests that of all the organisations, the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage reached the greatest number of people in the country. An estimate by the secretary of the National Church League in December 1927 of the attendance at meetings organised by three groups, gives the following figures:

National Church League	33,125
Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage	100,000
Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith	<u>23,370</u>
	156,495

2

With the very considerable lead that the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage had in this way, it is surprising that not more of it has been heard in accounts of the Prayer Book controversy. References to its activities in secondary works are slight. Is one of the reasons for this the appeal that it appears to have made quite specifically to working people? Knox pays tribute to its work in his autobiography

1. CSA, National Church League, Executive Committee Minutes, March 23, 1927, p. 150.

2. Ibid., December 14, 1927, p. 200.

and describes it briefly as an organisation that 'reached the masses of our poorer churchmen'.¹ It appears to have done so on a wider scale than many other organisations and its work cannot have been without effect in stimulating much Protestant feeling against the Book. Its specific appeal to the Laity may have touched upon the issue of anti-clericalism, that was a factor underlying some of the opposition. There is little evidence to suggest that the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage involved itself in approaches to M.P.s or in other more sophisticated forms of opposition.

Better known, and of far greater significance so far as approaches to M.P.s were concerned, was the other ad hoc Protestant organisation, the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith. It was simply an organisation of Evangelical societies that were pledged to oppose the Book and there appears to have been comparatively little that caused division within the ranks of its membership. Cooperation among the Evangelical societies existed before the Prayer Book controversy infused a clear goal into their joint activities: there had existed for a few years previous to 1927 a Joint Committee of Evangelical Societies, formed by the Reverend A. E. Hughes, Vicar of St James, Clapham Park, and secretary to the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen, on which were represented in addition to Hughes' own organisation, the Church Association, the Protestant Alliance,

1. E. A. Knox: Reminiscences of an Octogenarian, 1847-1934, London, 1935, p. 322.

the Protestant Truth Society and the National Church League. This vague organisation had some life in it at the end of 1926.¹

It fell to the Vicar of Islington, the Reverend H. W. Hinde, to take the initiative in uniting the Evangelical societies more positively against the 1927 Book. Hinde occupied, as Vicar of Islington, with its strong Evangelical traditions stretching back for well over a century, a position of leadership among Evangelicals that could be equalled by few other clergy of the Church of England, and his function by virtue of his living, as President of the Islington Clerical Conference, enhanced this position of leadership. Hinde proposed in January 1927 that a small conference should be held to consider steps to be taken in regard to the bishops' report on Prayer Book revision and he invited sympathetic societies to send representatives.² But the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith, as such, was clothed with its full authority only in March 1927 and it appears to have been prompted to take upon itself this authority by knowledge of the establishment of the League of Loyalty and Order, whose aim was summarised in its pithy *slogan* 'Pass the Prayer Book'. The secretary to the National Church League, Mr. W. Guy Johnson, reported at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the National Church League on March 23,

1. CSA, National Church League, Executive Committee Minutes, December 15, 1926, p. 122.

2. Ibid., January 26, 1927, p. 130.

1927, that 'On learning of this,' [i.e. the establishment of the League of Loyalty and Order] Hinde and he 'had arranged for the calling together of a small Committee, which had met that morning at Dean Wace House, when it was resolved that a Committee of an independent kind should be immediately called into being as a counteraction with the aim of opposing the provision of alternative forms of service for Holy Communion and Reservation of any kind. The title of the Committee was to be "The Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith". A short statement had been drawn up, and it was proposed to get a first list of influential names and send them to the press with it'. The National Church League approved participation in the new committee and allowed it up to £500 from the Protestant Forward Movement.¹

Hinde's was the chief inspiration that underlay the continuing and wholly successful work of the influential committee of which he was chairman. There is in the possession of the Church Society a file of correspondence relating to the committee in 1927 and 1928 and it affords striking testimony to the organisational and tactical abilities that Hinde possessed and that he zealously developed in the cause he held to be so vital for the maintenance of the doctrine and formulae of the Church of England as he conceived them to be. After the rejection of the Book in December 1927, Knox wrote to Hinde in admiration and

1. Ibid., March 23, 1927, pp. 144-146.

gratitude for 'The way in which you have so nobly carried on when you might quite justly have withdrawn from the fighting line and left the battle to younger men'¹ and Knox was not alone in paying tribute of that kind. The stamina that Hinde possessed drew special admiration from the Reverend T. J. Pulvertaft, a leader writer for The Record: 'How you stand the strain I know not. I am about done up between anxiety and the many claims on my not too powerful physique & tired brain'.² But in spite of the undoubted force of his opposition, Hinde displayed a quality of reasoning that not all his fellow-travellers were able to share. He acknowledged that parts of the proposed Book were sound and should be kept, and in a letter to the Reverend C. M. Chavasse, not a month after the publication of the Book, he wrote that 'When the Book is finally shipwrecked we must try hard to salvage parts of it. Some parts are too good to be lost. If only they would throw over their Jonahs the hulk might be saved but they do not seem to have the sense of those ancient mariners.'³ He was able also to pay generous tribute to those Evangelicals who felt cause to support the Book and said of the Reverend H. A. Wilson's speech of support in Convocation that 'I thought Wilson.....spoke with great taste, however much I regret

1. CSA, FCTF, Knox to Hinde, December 16, 1927.

2. Ibid., Pulvertaft to Hinde, November 18, 1927.

3. Ibid., Hinde to Chavasse, March 4, 1927.

the line he took'.¹

So far as the federal structure of the Committee was concerned, Hinde conceived that progress would be best fostered by holding it on a slack rein. Its composition, though united in its immediate purpose, required cautious handling, and its record is not without some instances of strained relations between the Committee and its member organisations. The Church Association was naturally approached as a possible member of the Committee, but Hinde was disappointed by the comparatively feeble form of the resolution of support that the Church Association gave. 'It is not "ex-animo",' wrote Hinde, 'but reads as though their cooperation were conditional'.² Was the Church Association conscious of the historic lead it had taken in the ritualistic struggles in earlier decades and nervous that this lead and its influence in parliament might be undone by this new and less well disciplined organisation? That such was the attitude of the Church Association is further suggested by criticism made in January 1928 against the Committee by the United Protestant Council on which the Church Association and the Protestant Truth Society were represented. The secretaries of the organisations forming the united Protestant Council wrote that 'We hardly think that the Committee of Truth and Faith have given sufficient

1. Ibid., Hinde to Chavasse, March 30, 1927.

2. Ibid., Hinde to Lunn, September 14, 1927.

weight to the fact that for over twenty-five years this Council has been in existence and has led public opinion on numerous matters associated with the maintenance of Reformation Principles'. The secretaries continued by paying tribute to the work of the Committee but they also made a request for fuller and better defined participation by member organisations.¹ Hinde's reply to this request reveals his cautious approach to the matter of relations between the Committee and member organisations and his feeling against direct representation.

By June 1927 the Committee had attracted 1,710 clerical members and over 9,000 lay supporters,² and it was apparent that it was continuing to receive support from the staff of the National Church League. The links with the League appear to be the firmest that the Committee was able to forge and in July 1927 the League unanimously assured the Committee that it would be consulted before any independent action in the campaign was taken; at the same time, the League advised the Committee of the value that might exist in the sending of deputations to M.P.s and that the League would assist in the organisation of such deputations.

Despite the suggestion of contact with M.P.s, the Committee kept as its main object in the early stages of 1927 the formulation of resolutions of opposition focused upon

-
1. Ibid., United Protestant Council to Hinde, January 31, 1928.
 2. CSA, National Church League, Executive Committee Minutes, June 22, 1927, p. 172.

the different stages of Church ratification. Thus Hinde in March 1927 conceived what at first sight appears to be a comparatively limited role for the Committee. 'My suggestion is that we should seek diocesan or more restricted, secretaries, and that ordinarily these should be the same as represent the N.C.L., to avoid friction. That we should take definite steps to work the provincial press. That we should supply copies of resolutions. That we should take some steps to help with regard to the Diocesan Conference elections. That we should supply posters after the type of the Wayside Pulpit, with careful, reverent statements on the burning topics. That meetings be held in certain areas.'¹ He expressed at the same time much gratitude that The Record was giving firm support to the Committee's stand. There is evidence of continuing contact between Hinde and Pulvertaft, a leader writer of The Record.

One of the most important moves of opposition made by the Committee was its submission to the Ecclesiastical Committee in September 1927. At that time the Committee claimed the adhesion of 1,700 clerical members and 22,000 lay members, which shows a doubling of the lay membership in less than two months;² itself further evidence of the lay opposition to the Book, of which M.P.s were becoming increasingly aware. The Committee's submission to the

1. CSA, FCTF, Hinde to Chavasse, March 30, 1927.

2. These figures form part of the submission to the Ecclesiastical Committee by the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith.

Ecclesiastical Committee revealed opposition on many grounds: the allegedly unscriptural nature of some of the changes, the fact that in cathedrals and collegiate churches no Parochial Church Council would exist to be in a position to oppose the introduction of the Book, the wide discretion given to the bishops in the Book's administration, the offence caused to Ordinands by reason of their ordination vows, the fact that the Book differed from N.A. 84, C.A. 158 and C.A. 169, all of which had received clerical and lay support in the National Assembly, and that there was now produced a 'composite' and not an 'alternative' Book.¹ Throughout, the burden of the opposition was upon the comparative exclusion of the laity from the key points in decision making.

The Committee took seriously to the work of influencing M.P.s in July 1927. Hinde revealed the Committee's feelings on this matter in a letter to Inskip, when he explained that the Committee proposed to appoint a Parliamentary Committee which would direct 'all that is done by way of approach to Parliament' and to which it was hoped the various Protestant organisations would give their support and would take no action except with the approval of this Parliamentary Committee.² Inskip felt that the approaches to M.P.s ought to be conducted with considerable caution and that there

1. CSA, FCTF, Submission to the Ecclesiastical Committee by the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith.

2. Ibid., Hinde to Inskip, July 20, 1927.

was danger in bombarding them with literature. 'We shall have to prepare our own literature for the information of members and this can only be done by those who know their temper and can appreciate the points which interest them.'¹ In a subsequent letter he expressed stronger reservations about the proposed Parliamentary Committee. He himself - for practical reasons - would find difficulty in attending it and in any case he stressed that 'the Chief necessity at the moment is to keep the Protestant organisations quiet so far as direct communication with Members of Parliament is concerned'. He also appears to have been jealous of the position of a committee evidently already in existence and pledged to the same goal: 'whatever is done ought to be done through them or at any rate with their concurrence'.²

The final acceptance of the Book by the National Assembly in July 1927 was followed by approaches from the League of Loyalty and Order to the Committee. A plea was made for an end to the Committee's opposition, as the Book was by then accepted by the Church's own legislative machinery; Colonel Oldham of the League of Loyalty and Order asked if a Round Table Conference would be of any use.³ This approach was unanimously rejected by the Committee; as the

-
1. Ibid., Inskip to Hinde, July 21, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Inskip to Hinde, July 22, 1927.
 3. Ibid., Oldham to Hinde, undated letter.

Book involved doctrinal changes, the Committee felt bound to continue opposition to it.¹

Protestant organisations other than the Church Association, the National Church League, the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage, the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith tended to perform, by comparison, a minor role. Certainly many of the other organisations were vociferous in their opposition and may well have been instrumental in arousing opposition to the Book, but it is unlikely that they possessed the degree of influence in Church circles and among M.P.s held by the major organisations.

The Protestant Truth Society was under the leadership of Mr. John Alfred Kensit, son of Mr. John Kensit, the leader of the vigorous demonstrations against ritualism at the turn of the century, in the course of which programme he had been killed at the hands of a Liverpool mob in 1902. Its appeal was inter-denominational and though its leadership was Anglican, it drew on Nonconformity for much of its grass-roots support. Its monthly journal, The Churchman's Magazine and Wickliffe Preacher's Messenger gives evidence of the strength of feeling that the organisation inspired and of the activities it encouraged in making opposition to the Prayer Book. The Society held to the 1662 Book, which it regarded as the key standard for the doctrine of the Church of England and it strongly opposed the concession to

1. Ibid., Hinde to Oldham, July 26, 1927.

both Anglo-Catholicism and to Modernism that were, the Society believed, implicit in the Book as published in February 1927. The initial protest against the Book revealed the atmosphere of the Society's campaign: 'A Call to Action', sub-titled 'Shall Cranmer's Prayer Book be sacrificed on the Anglo-Catholic Altar?' It alleged that the new Book introduced a variety of Roman practices and that these points changed the character of the Church of England 'from Protestant to anti-Protestant, and by so doing undermine the right of the Church of England to be regarded as the National Church of a Protestant people'.¹ It was the Society's view that the 'Anglo-Romans are bigger dissenters than the Nonconformists' and that revived sacerdotalism was a challenge to the work of Nonconformists.² The point is thus stressed that the Prayer Book was not just a matter for the Church of England and that Protestants should combine to press their opposition upon M.P.s³ - and this suggestion is made just after the publication of the Book and some months before its final acceptance by the Church; unlike most other organisations, the Society looked ahead to the ultimate stage.

The metaphor that is given the greatest prominence in the Society's campaigning is that of war. Thus in March 1927 the contention that 'The proposed Prayer Book is a declaration

1. Churchman's Magazine, March 1927, pp. 56-57.

2. Ibid., June 1927, p. 147.

3. Ibid., March 1927. p. 58.

of war' was printed in heavy type. The Book was to be met as such and 'may God give us the victory'.¹ From the start, opponents of the Book were urged to write to their M.P.s. Meetings were organised by the Society all over the country and a considerable emphasis was placed on the production of literature. It was reported in April 1927 that 'In the attempt to flood the country with printed messages concerning the present crisis, our Society's Press has been working at the utmost speed with many hours' overtime. We have now three presses turning out nothing but Protestant literature and notices of our never ceasing Protestant demonstrations and Wickliffe Preachers' missions'. There were at that time twelve tracts all devoted to opposition to the Book and all of them bearing flamboyant titles such as 'Does it Matter whether our National Church is Protestant or Roman?', 'Why Reservation Implies Idolatry', 'The Bishops' Pen-Knife' and 'Keep your eye on the Father Confessor'. The crucial tract in the early stages was 'A Call to Action', reproduced in the Churchman's Magazine in March 1927. 1,000 assorted tracts could be bought for 10/6 and readers were urged to purchase that number and gather together ten friends to distribute the tracts among 1,000 houses: then 'the country would soon lose its apathy, and indifference would be dispelled'. It was also suggested that the ten friends should form a prayer circle.²

1. Ibid., p. 58.

2. Ibid., April 1927, p. 88.

Though the spread of literature was a fundamental means of opposition pursued by the Society, the holding of meetings - some of them very large - appears to have been another. Issues of the Churchman's Magazine throughout 1927 contain many instances of meetings throughout the country and especially meetings connected with what was known as the 'All-Round London Campaign' which began in July, was suspended in August and resumed in September, reaching its climax in a large meeting at the Albert Hall on October 10, 1927. The purpose of this very well attended meeting was to pay tribute to the memory of John Kensit as well as to 'call loudly to Parliament to veto the new Prayer Book'.¹ A distinguished platform spoke against the Book. Amongst other meetings that attracted attention was one of 3,000 people at the Free Trade Hall, Manchester on September 26, 1927. A meeting had also been held at Ipswich on October 12 during the meeting of the Church Congress, 'but the Protestant meeting surpassed in numbers and enthusiasm any of the Congress sessions', according to the Churchman's Magazine.² The Church Congress of 1927, surprisingly, had almost nothing to do with Prayer Book revision.

The Society also employed the more orthodox means of opposition by presenting submissions to the Ecclesiastical Committee, though it did so in conjunction with others

1. Ibid., November 1927, p. 275.

2. Ibid., December 1927, p. 308.

forming the United Protestant Council, consisting of a federation of about thirty Protestant societies. Amongst the many reasons for opposing the Book, the Society put forward the fact that the Book was, so the Society held, opposed by Nonconformists, who were unable to give expression to their views through the constitutional machinery of the Church of England; that it made for difficulties to those clergy who had sworn allegiance to the old Book; that it was inadequate as a means of restoring discipline within the Church of England; and that the reduction in the number of prayers for the King was 'indicative of an attempt to overthrow the royal supremacy'.¹

As the important parliamentary debate of December 1927 drew nearer, the Society continued to pursue its opposition through the three broad methods it had fostered throughout the year: the dissemination of literature, the organisation of meetings and the approaches to M.P.s. All continued to be encouraged - literature was available in packets of a hundred for 1/2 in October 1927 - but the approaches to M.P.s received greater attention at this stage. Opponents of the Book were constantly encouraged to do this and to 'write personally in their own way, and without any set form',² an approach which must surely have been more convincing to M.P.s

1. Ibid., October 1927, p. 253.

2. Ibid., October 1927, p. 253.

than the stereotyped approaches used by some other organisations, such as the Royal Orange Order. There seems little doubt that the pressure thus asserted by the Society had impact, even though it possibly rarely went so far as the pressure asserted by the Reverend H. J. Bryan, Vicar of St Nathaniel's, Liverpool, who himself acknowledged that 'some had commented that he had gone mad on the new Prayer Book' and who challenged the Conservative M.P.s of Liverpool to 'Help us or go'.¹

The Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen was Anglican and largely clerical in composition and was throughout pledged to oppose the Book. The general committee of the Fellowship issued a statement on February 18, 1927, in which opposition was based upon the 'radical change in the doctrinal position of the Church of England' which the Book represented by reason of its possessing in particular provision for such features as an Alternative Communion service, Reservation, vestments and prayers for the dead. Further, the Book made for confusion in men's minds and in the Church where there were 'two diverse bodies practising different Religions within the same National Church'.² The Secretary to the Fellowship was the Reverend A. E. Hughes, Vicar of St James, Clapham Park and the statement of opposition of February 18,

1. Ibid., December 1927, p. 311.

2. Davidson Papers, Box 8, Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen: Statement by the General Committee concerning the Proposed New Prayer Book,

1927, was accompanied by a printed letter from him, itself highly critical of the Book that 'will bring no peace to our troubled Church'. The statement and letter were presumably sent to those whom the Fellowship felt would profit by their receipt. Among them was Davidson, who wrote to Hughes' diocesan bishop, the Right Reverend C. F. Garbett, Bishop of Southwark, to ask if Hughes was 'a man to whom I ought to write on the subject or is he one of the hopeless men who must simply be regarded as opponents to be reckoned with as best we can?'¹ Garbett replied with his habitual frankness that 'no advantage would be gained through correspondence with Mr. Hughes on the subject of Prayer Book revision. He is a good man, and a gentleman, but quite hopeless on matters of this kind'.²

Nevertheless in the Summer of 1927, Davidson went further than mere correspondence with Hughes, and received a small Evangelical deputation, which included Hughes, at Lambeth Palace on July 11, 1927. It is apparent that relations between the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen and the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage became increasingly close on the issue of the Prayer Book and they amalgamated in May 1927 in order better to pursue their common objective.³ Hughes thus went to Lambeth Palace on July 11, 1927, with

1. Ibid., Davidson to Garbett, February 26, 1927.

2. Ibid., Garbett to Davidson, February 28, 1927.

3. The Record, May 12, 1927, p. 367, an account of the Annual Meeting of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen.

the Reverend George Denyer and Mr. E. A. Denyer, a member of the House of Laity, and the Reverend F. A. Roughton, Vicar of Galleywood, Chelmsford. The Reverend F. D. V. Narborough, Chaplain to Davidson, wrote a memorandum of this deputation. Hughes played only a slight role in it; indeed, little was discussed that was novel, apart from an extraordinary suggestion by Denyer that the Archbishop should create 'a special set of Bishops with a roving commission to enter any Diocese and conduct Services strictly and exclusively along the lines of the present Prayer Book'. The Archbishop found this suggestion 'new and surprising' and felt its implementation extremely unlikely, due to the divisive effect that it would inevitably carry.¹ Subsequent correspondence between the Archbishop and Denyer, on behalf of the delegates, failed to get very far and its main interest lies in Denyer's assertion of an Evangelical secession in the event of the Book's passage.

The role of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society receives little mention among the main accounts of the controversy, but both the Annual Reports of the Society and the monthly journal, The Bible Churchmen's Missionary Messenger, suggest that its role was one of significance in the spirited Evangelical struggle against the Book and all for which it was believed to stand.

The Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society had started in

1. Davidson Papers, Box 8, Memorandum by Narborough, July 11, 1927.

October 1922 as an offshoot of the Church Missionary Society, whose views at that time were held by the secessionists to be inadequately grounded in biblical truth. Dean Wace, on becoming its Vice President a year later, stated the need to distinguish between 'a vague Christianity and a Bible Christianity' for which he believed the new Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society stood. The Honorary Secretary since its foundation was the Reverend D. H. C. Bartlett and it was he who led and stimulated opposition from the Society to the Book, the course of which is reflected in the monthly issues of the Missionary Messenger. On the Executive Committee of the Society there served a number of Evangelicals prominent in other societies: thus Barraclough of the Church Association, Denyer and Martyn Cundy of the Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage, Hughes of the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen all served upon it, affording further evidence of the unity of purpose that the Evangelical opponents possessed, even when not involved in organisations that were specifically directed at creating unity of approach.

The approach of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society differed from the approaches of the other societies, in that its objectives were thought out against a background of missionary work, the primary object of the Society. The opposition that it almost at once gave to the proposals of February 1927 further reflected the circumstances of its origins and the Society held that 'In the proposed new book the governing principle seemed to be the conciliation of

Liberal Thought concerning the Bible, and of Anglo-Catholic Thought concerning Doctrine'.¹ Opposition continued throughout to be focused more clearly on the twin objections of Modernism and Anglo-Catholicism than it was by the other societies. The Society is noteworthy also for the manner in which it held secession of Evangelicals to be a real threat. At the Annual Meeting on May 2, 1927, it was resolved that 'If the twentieth century Church of England were to secede from a wholly Biblical foundation, B.C.M.S. would not follow her in that secession. She would remain with the Church of England as restored to Apostolic simplicity at the Reformation,' thus implying a secession by B.C.M.S. members from the Church of England.²

It is clear that the Society asserted some position of leadership in the controversy and that this was recognised by other opponents; thus, reference is made to the admission of new members in the National Assembly, people who had earlier held aloof but who were now 'convicted of the righteousness of the stand which has been taken'.³ Comment is made later of the numerous conferences that had been held 'but it has been left to the Society not yet five years old to take definite action'.⁴ What was this 'definite action'?

-
1. Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society: Record of a Fifth Year, 1927, p. 41.
 2. Missionary Messenger, June 1927, p. 71.
 3. Ibid., August 1927, p. 99.
 4. Ibid., November 1927, p. 141.

It is impossible to be precise in answer to this important question. The written records of the Society were destroyed by war-time bombing and the printed sources which have survived contain comparatively slight reference to positive action, a feature untypical of the journals of other Protestant societies. Among the few examples of practical action that are recorded was the sending out of 192 personal cards to selected Members of Parliament, principally in the House of Lords, three days before the parliamentary debates of December 1927 and the assertion that Lord Carson brought his speech in the House of Lords to 'a convincing climax by reading the letter he had received'.¹ The official life of Bartlett states that 'at least ten Members were known to have changed their minds from mild approval to definite opposition through the influence which the Society was able to exert',² but the basis of this contention is obscure. It is unfortunate that clearer evidence of the Society's work in opposition to the Book is lacking, but there is reason to believe that its own estimate of the importance of its work, in contrast to that of the other Protestant organisations, lacks a real sense of proportion, when the tremendous activity elsewhere is recalled.

Amongst the Evangelical groups, the Anglican Evangelical

-
1. Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society: Record of a Fifth Year, 1927, p. 42.
 2. G.W. Bromiley: Daniel Henry Charles Bartlett, A memoir, Burnham-on-Sea, 1959, p. 69.

Group Movement adopted a unique position: the Movement had reservations about the scope and nature of the revision, but its addiction to Liberal Evangelicalism caused it to adopt a policy of conciliation and cautious welcome to the 1927 proposals. The Movement's origins lay in the 'Group Brotherhood' of pre-1914 days, in which the leading thinkers were men such as the Reverend J.E. Watts-Ditchfield, later first Bishop of Chelmsford, and the Reverend F.S. Guy Warman, who followed him to the same position, and the Reverend J.C. Wright, then Canon of Manchester and later Archbishop of Sydney. The group was conscious of the negative character of much Evangelicalism at that time and of its failure to keep abreast with recent scholarship. The 'Group Brotherhood' gathered strength after the War, stimulated by the publication of the journal Liberal Evangelicalism, and finding in the issue of Prayer Book revision a focal point of unity. A Conference at Birmingham Diocesan House in 1923 led to a pronouncement in favour of the recently published N.A. 84 and to the formation of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement, with the Reverend V.F. Storr, Canon of Westminster, as the Honorary Organising Secretary, and after 1930, President. Throughout the inter-war years the Movement proved itself to be one of the most forward looking, scholarly and thoughtful groups within the Church of England, owing much to the work of Storr. Davidson is said to have felt that its ideals best represented what was required in the Church of England in the future and there is no doubt that

Storr's approach coincided very much with that of Davidson; their correspondence reveals an uncommon harmony of thought.¹ The Movement was fostered by the publication of a series of Blue Pamphlets, by the formation of a number of local groups consisting mainly of clerical members and by the holding of an annual convention at Cromer in and after 1928, designed to be 'more evangelistic in its message than Swanwick and more intellectual in its outlook than Keswick'.² Clearly an organisation that placed such emphasis upon intellectual activity drew very near to the modernism that the Conservative Evangelicals regarded with horror; Storr himself acknowledged that the two had much in common³ and it was perhaps this factor that led to somewhat of a weakly defined approach to issues by the movement. The A.E.G.M. had much in common with Liberal Catholicism as represented by such men as the Dean of King's College, Cambridge, the Very Reverend Eric Milner-White; that was a school of thought which Storr saw as 'also a movement of mediation and conciliation'.⁴ Thus the 'liberal' wings of both major schools of thought within the Church of England felt able to accept the proposed revision of the Prayer Book.

1. Davidson Papers, passim.

2. G.H. Harris: Vernon Faithfull Storr, A Memoir, London, 1943, p. 54.

3. Ibid., p. 61.

4. V.F. Storr: Spiritual Liberty, quoted in G.H. Harris, Storr, p. 72.

In the mid-1920s, whilst putting forward a conciliatory attitude, the Movement was able to act in closer harmony with the other Evangelical societies than was to be possible at a later stage. Storr felt able to assist in the composition of 'A Call to Action' in the Summer of 1925, the product of joint work by representatives of the Churchmen's Union, the Liberal Evangelicals, the A.E.G.M., the National Church League and the Fellowship of Evangelical Churchmen, though those who signed the document did so as private individuals and Storr was joined by such fellow-thinkers as Guy Rogers, Wilson and the Very Reverend W. R. Inge, Dean of St Paul's. Though 'A Call to Action' contained some specific objections, caused especially by the recent debates in the House of Clergy, the burden of its message was the need for Englishmen to 'maintain in her integrity the Church of their fathers' and that if they were to do this 'They must awake from their torpor; they must care more for truth than for peace; they must waive lesser differences and unite in defence of basic principles'. There was in addition need to define more clearly what was implied by the term 'Catholic Church' which, it was asserted, was employed by Anglo-Catholics as 'a nebulous something which is not represented by any actual community'.¹ But even at that stage, in a private letter to Davidson, subsequent upon a conversation between the two, Storr made clear that he could not agree

1. Davidson Papers, Bx 14, A Call to Action.

entirely with the approach of the National Church League and that he would not object to Reservation for the sick provided there were adequate safeguards against its misuse.¹ In a subsequent letter, asking Davidson to receive a deputation from the Council that drafted 'A Call to Action', Storr stated that 'Our real purpose would be to emphasise the dangers which exist that the traditional character of the Church of England shall be lost'.²

Storr had implied in his correspondence with Davidson that the links between the Movement and the other Evangelical societies might not last long,³ and by February 1927 the Movement had parted company with them. After the publication of the Book, a letter was sent by Storr and the Reverend H. Montague Dale, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Tulse Hill, to local groups, both to request their views on the Book and to suggest that the Movement ought to be able to see its way to an acceptance of it. The letter took a strictly practical and sensible view of the situation. The plea was made that nothing ought to be rejected that might be capable of use in an Evangelical way: it would, for example, be a mistake to regard the Canon as essentially Anglo-Catholic, as Evangelicals ought to be able to use it. The division of the Measure - the Pollock scheme - was not practical politics,

1. Ibid., Storr to Davidson, May 5, 1925.

2. Ibid., Storr to Davidson, May 21, 1925.

3. Ibid., Storr to Davidson, May 5, 1925.

as without revision of the Communion Service order could not be restored and 'what guarantee have we that a subsequent revision of the Communion Office (which must come) will not be more Anglo-Catholic?' It was unrealistic to expect that order could be restored on the basis of the 1662 Book but it was realistic to expect that order might be restored with the new Book if the bishops exercised the discipline that they promised. Vestments were placed in the category of comparatively unimportant matters: 'To fight this is useless. They are here. We must face facts'. As for the more important issue of Reservation, this need not necessarily imply a doctrine of Presence and the novel suggestion was made that Evangelicals might reserve the Sacrament 'merely for practical utility'; by so doing they would be able to teach that Reservation by itself 'implies no doctrine of the Presence'.¹ A covering, private, note to these suggestions stated that 'We believe that the great majority of the eight hundred clerical members of the A.E.G.M. will sympathise with the views set out in this letter' and reiterated the points of acceptability, giving first attention to 'the relief of conscience given in the question about Scripture asked of the deacon at his ordination', a point of importance to the Movement that sharply differentiated it from other Evangelical societies. In addition, features of 'enrichment' were welcomed, as were the beauty of the alternative Communion service and 'the broad attempt to reach an honourable settlement which shall be in keeping with the historic

1. . CSA, FCTF, Suggestions to local A.E.G.M. groups.

comprehensiveness of the Church of England'. Nevertheless, grave concern about Reservation was expressed and the need stressed to secure further safeguards. It is a matter of considerable interest and a further suggestion of the importance attached to the Movement that this one key demand - safeguards on Reservation - was later in the year to be the one key concession that the bishops made to Evangelical opinion. Even before the publication of the Book, Storr and other leaders of the Movement wrote to Davidson on January 14, 1927, as individuals but expressing the feelings of the Movement, to emphasise the need for close rules if Reservation was allowed and for a statement that Reservation implied no change in the Church's doctrine.¹

The spirit of compromise that the Movement showed was much commended by The Guardian and on March 4, 1927, specific reference was made to the Movement's demands on Reservation and the Communion of the Sick and that 'As emphasis was laid on both these points in the recent debates in Convocation, we feel sure that the bishops will give them their fullest consideration during their deliberations at Lambeth this week'.² In the same issue, Wilson contributed an article in a series in which churchmen were commending the Book from different party standpoints and put forward the essential views of the Movement: if it were a real settlement and not a point d'appui,

1. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Storr and others to Davidson, January 14, 1927.

2. The Guardian, March 4, 1927, p. 167.

the Evangelicals would accept it; in order to be certain that it was a real settlement, the rules for Reservation ought to be made clearer and some minor points adjusted, such as the danger of associating Corpus Christi and All Souls with their traditional days in the Church's calendar. He would welcome the use of vestments at Baptism as well as at the Eucharist, as they have 'no sacrificial or other doctrinal significance'.¹ Thus Wilson adopted an approach that was not untypical of the A.E.G.M and that was shown in the Movement's immediate reaction on the publication of the Book, of urging Evangelicals to adopt at least some features of Anglo-Catholicism in order to emphasise the fact that doctrinal significance was not necessarily linked to liturgical practice.

There is no evidence that the Movement made specific approaches to M.P.s or that as a Movement it encouraged members to do so. Neither is there evidence of public meetings organised by the Movement to foster support for the Book. As is to be expected of a Movement of this kind, support for the Book was expressed strongly through the established ecclesiastical machinery: Convocation and the National Assembly. In both bodies the Movement was ably represented by men such as Guy Rogers and Wilson, who put forward the Movement's acceptance of the Book and their continuing concern about Reservation. Some other of the

1. Ibid., March 4, 1927, p. 178.

Book's supporters were inclined to take a similar view, not least Warman, also a supporter of the Movement.

In the Autumn of 1927 the issue of discipline became a focal point of concern among opponents and supporters. Davidson's only firm statement on this increasingly significant and dangerous issue was made in a letter to Storr on October 27, 1927, made public in The Times two days later. The immediate origin of that important public letter by Davidson on the issue of discipline appears to lie in a joint meeting of the leaders of the Movement and of the Churchmen's Union and the sending of a circular letter to the diocesan bishops on October 10, 1927, pledging their known general support for the Book but stating that there was 'much anxiety among us, as among other members of the Church, as to whether the provisions of the Book, assuming that it is accepted by Parliament, will be strictly administered by the Bishops'.¹ This letter was signed by Inge and Douglas-White of the Churchmen's Union and by Montague Dale and Storr of the Movement. But it was to Storr personally that Davidson replied and made the statement which thereafter attracted attention, even though it lacked the firmness for which many hoped.

1. Davidson Papers, Box 13, Circular letter to diocesan bishops, October 10, 1927.

CHAPTER 5.

THE LAITY AND THE 1927 BOOK.

The final stage for approval of the Book was at the session of the National Assembly on July 5 and 6, 1927. It was not possible for further changes to be made at that stage and the Book was to be accepted or rejected in its entirety; the process was governed by Standing Order XXXII. Much of the detailed arrangement was in the hands of the secretary to the National Assembly, Sir Philip W. Baker-Wilbraham and the assistant secretary, Guy H. Guillum Scott.

The first morning was taken up by speeches from those members of the Assembly who were most closely concerned with the Measure. Davidson opened the debate and appealed, in his usual manner, for the acceptance of the Book. A particular point that he clarified at this time was that the Book was now a composite and not an alternative Book; in this it was different to the proposals in N.A. 84, but the request for a composite rather than an alternative Book had come from the House of Laity itself. Thereafter it would be known as the 'Deposited' Book, in the sense of having been 'deposited' with parliament for consideration. Amongst other major speeches in the morning were those from opponents such as Darwell Stone, Joynson-Hicks, Mitchell, Hinde and Pollock and supporters such as Henson, Selborne, Phillimore and Hugh Cecil. One of the finest speeches of the morning came from Phillimore: '.....in the history of England there had been squares of which they could never read or think without

a shake in their voice - the British square which stood against the French at Waterloo, and the British square which stood against the hordes of the Mahdi in the Sudan. The present was a matter in which the Church of England stood square and the new Prayer Book stood square'. In thus standing, it combatted opposition from Anglo-Catholics (and though Phillimore was an Anglo-Catholic, he dissociated himself from those Anglo-Catholics who were opposed), from 'the irregular troops led by the Bishop of Norwich', from 'that which was pressed on legal grounds' and from those Evangelicals who 'seemed to him to treat the Church of England as a peculiar possession of the Evangelical Party in which all others were just tolerated'.¹

On the afternoon of the second day, Davidson employed the powers given him under Standing Order XXIV to require members to limit their speeches to five minutes each. If the debate were to end that day, recourse to this standing order was necessary, but there is reason to believe that its employment was unwise. The editor of Crockford's later commented 'This undoubtedly saved the Assembly some tedious hours. In the opinion of some it destroyed the last chance which the Measure had ever had of getting through the House of Commons'.² Irritation can be detected in a number of the speeches that then followed and one speech, from C.F. Rawson

1. Church Assembly, Report of Proceedings, vol. viii, no. 2, Summer Session, 1927, pp. 136-138.

2. Crockford's Clerical Directory, 1929, O.U.P., p. x.

(Southwark), concentrated entirely on this limitation and on the comparative shortness of a two-day debate: 'the House of Laity during the last two years had had no opportunity of considering it or any amendment whatever, and now the debate was being brought within the compass of two days and unduly closed. There were perfectly evident signs of pressure being brought to bear upon the Assembly in order that the debate might be brought to an end that afternoon'.¹

Inskip and Lang, who gave the final speeches, were excluded from the five-minute ruling. Inskip made much of the lack of say that the House of Laity was given, doubtless sensing the mood of the House on the matter. 'It is two years since the House of Laity debated these great questions. The House of Laity has never had before it as a House until yesterday the final proposals of the Bishops' and he spoke on behalf of those members of the House of Laity who had 'been prevented or dissuaded from speaking'.² Most of Inskip's speech focused on this lack of consultation with the Laity and the fact that in the final Book provision for lay participation in decisions about its use was slight.

Lang in the final speech endeavoured to deal with this issue, but in so doing could only resort to the standing

1. Church Assembly, Report of Proceedings, vol. viii, no. 2, Summer Session, 1927, p. 169.

2. Ibid., p. 181.

orders themselves and to the Enabling Act of which they were a part. He steered his speech to more familiar territory, justifying the Book from Anglo-Catholic and Evangelical views and ending his speech with the type of appeal of which he was a master, referring in so doing to the recent celebrations at York:

'I have just come from most memorable services in the great Minster of York. I have seen during the last six days vast congregations assembling three times a day, numbering from two to six thousand. I have seen them swayed by a spirit of reverence as the corn is swayed by the wind, and I have had a vision of what the Church of England when she can rise to her best can do in the way of appealing to and touching the hearts of the people. I have seen the hearts of the people in the most marvellous way turn to their Mother. I confess that it was somewhat of a descent from the mountain of vision to the plain of confusion when I came from that great experience to this debate. But in the vote that is now to be taken let us rise once again to the higher ground. Let it be so clear and decisive that it will liberate the Church to address itself with fresh faith and hope and courage to its great task of winning the people of this land to Our Lord and to His Kingdom.'¹

1. Ibid., pp. 195-196.

The final result of the voting was:

	For	Against
House of Bishops	34	4
House of Clergy	253	37
House of Laity	230	92
	517	133

1

It is important to note in these figures that there were proportionally more members of the House of Laity opposed than in either of the other two houses. This showed further the comparative lack of enthusiasm felt by the laity for the Book. It may have been partly attributable to Davidson's recourse to Standing Order XXIV, but is probably more attributable to general considerations of opposition among the laity. The debate in the Church Assembly had given further point to the label 'the bishops' Book'.

Voting by the laity also took place in the various diocesan conferences in the early Summer of 1927. In all cases, there resulted substantial majorities in favour of the Book. The League of Loyalty and Order gathered this information together and was responsible for an analysis of

1. Ibid., p. 196.

the voting at diocesan conferences, published in The Times on June 30, 1927. The members of the National Assembly would therefore be aware of the situation in the dioceses. The majorities were impressive: the highest was 95% in the Coventry diocese; in nine dioceses the voting was over 90% in favour of the Book; the lowest was 55%, in the London diocese.¹

Critics of the Measure suggested that the majorities in the House of Laity and in the diocesan conferences were illusory. So far as the National Assembly was concerned, its comparative youth was considered the major disadvantage, from which others stemmed. The issue was a lively one in the debates in the House of Lords in December 1927. The representative nature of the National Assembly was called in question by many opponents: Lord Hanworth, suggested that the method of electing representatives in the National Assembly was too involved and resulted in few people knowing who their representative was and an absence of any real link between the representative and those whom he represented.² The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord Cushendun, complained that the Enabling Act had been passed at a time when public opinion in the country was occupied by other matters; many people did not then realise the significance of the National Assembly. He made strong criticism of the

1. The Times, June 30, 1927, p. 19.

2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, column 803.

lack of real representation in the National Assembly, quoting as evidence a London incumbent's recent letter to The Times in which the value of the electoral rolls was questioned; in a further extravagant protest he suggested that the National Assembly is 'about as representative as were the Cornish boroughs before 1832'.¹

Supporters of the Measure could not evade these criticisms and their attitudes towards them varied considerably. Lord Daryngton, the Vice-Chairman of the House of Laity, felt that the 'election of the Church Assembly is just as businesslike as the election of any other assembly in the world', but his subsequent description of the stages through which the elections passed, i.e. the sending of representatives by the parochial church councils to the ruridecanal councils, the appointment of members of these councils to the diocesan conferences and the election there of representatives for the National Assembly, tended to belie his words and his conclusion that he failed to see 'how it would be possible in any circumstances to find a more representative assembly anywhere' placed too high a value on the electoral procedures as they then existed.² Lord Parmoor, who had played a significant part in the creation and passage of the Enabling Act, suggested that the main reason for the weaknesses that existed was that parishioners had not taken up their rights

1. Ibid., columns 939-940.

2. Ibid., columns 881-882.

by signing the electoral rolls. But Lord Parmoor nevertheless displayed a sanguine view of the Enabling Act: he referred to it as the 'Magna Charta of the Church layman' and suggested that so far as the Church layman was concerned 'It has given him a recognised position for the first time.and it has to a very large extent indeed created an interest which he never before felt in Church matters.'¹ Lord Danesfort, in what is possibly the clearest and most comprehensive of all the opposition speeches in the House of Lords, made reference to the fact that 'the laity has had little voice in framing or in approving this Measure' and spoke of the poor quality of the representational system in the National Assembly.² Henson made no suggestion that the representational system was perfect - indeed, he spoke with warmth on the fact that an unrepresentative chamber is sometimes 'more truly an exponent of the National mind than even a representative Chamber', but the National Assembly represented the Church on what was essentially a Church matter; he felt it appropriate that the communicants of the Church of England are able to give expression to their views on a matter in which the Communion service is central.³ The Lord Chancellor, Viscount Cave, in a supporting speech made the point that though there should be more names on the electoral rolls, those

1. Ibid., column 849.

2. Ibid., columns 895-896.

3. Ibid., columns 931-932.

that were there represented 'the most earnest and most active members of the Church';¹ the Archbishop of York, in the closing speech, took a similar view and said that the National Assembly represented 'those who care most',² a statement which it would have been difficult to deny.

Allegations were made that the large majorities that were obtained in the diocesan conferences were less evidence of a lay welcome for the Measure, as further evidence of episcopal influence. Joynson-Hicks wrote after quoting impressive figures of support that 'the strongest episcopal pressure was exerted to secure this result'.³ Though this is a sweeping statement, the influence of the bishops on the Anglican laity was a crucial factor.

Supporters of the Measure pointed to the fact that if there was episcopal influence, it certainly failed in the Worcester and Norwich dioceses, where the vote was against the dissident bishops. The Bishop of Norwich said that he, unlike some other bishops, refrained from speaking at his diocesan conference but, as the Archbishop of York pointed out, his views were well known by the laity of his diocese at that time, as were those of the Bishop of Worcester in his. Lang felt that archepiscopal influence in his diocese could not have been the crucial factor in the vote, as it was by

1. Ibid., Column 952.

2. Ibid., Column 972.

3. W. Joynson-Hicks: The Prayer Book Crisis, London, 1928, p. 123.

secret ballot. Lang's own calculations showed that the aggregate of the clergy and laity voting in diocesan conferences revealed 8,141 in favour and 1,890 against.¹

The general ignorance of the laity and the people of England on the Prayer Book Measure was referred to by some. The Duke of Buccleuch referred to this matter and suggested that 'it is only just dawning on the people of this country what is in this Measure'; he hoped that the House of Lords would adopt the traditional role of protecting the people from 'rash and sudden legislation' such as this.² The Duke's suggestion is an extraordinary one in view of the vast amount of polemical literature, meetings, petitions and correspondence that the issue raised in 1927 and the fact that discussions had taken place over a period of 20 years. It appears that he was speaking more for the people of England in a general sense than for the laity of the Church of England, and he proceeded to the wild accusation that the matter was being rushed through at this stage as 'those who are responsible for it were afraid to let the people of the country know what it means'.³ Lord Gorell had formed quite the contrary opinion about the state of knowledge of the Measure that existed in the country⁴ and from the evidence

-
1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s., column 971.
 2. Ibid., column 886.
 3. Ibid., column 887.
 4. Ibid., column 890.

his would seem to be the more reasonable view. In the House of Commons the Countess of Iveagh, who had recently fought in a by-election, said that she had found most moderate opinion in favour of the Book.¹

The idea of a referendum, within the Church of England, received little support. The Archbishop of York suggested that a sacred topic of that kind was not suited to a referendum and that in any case its value would depend much on the form of question that was put.² Two attempts were made in connection with the 1927 and the 1928 book, though both received the disapproval of the bishops.

A curious attempt was made in March 1927 by the Reverend W. J. Dennis, Vicar of St Simon's, Southsea, to elicit lay opinion. He placed a 2½ inch advertisement in the Personal Column of The Times under the title 'Prayer Book Revision - Lay Opinion' in which, due to the fact that lay opinion at the moment 'is not vocal' he was 'taking the daring step of suggesting a voluntary plebiscite from adult lay members of the Church of England'. He asked for opinions on four propositions:

-
1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 211 H.C. Deb. 5 s, column 2569.
 2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, column 972.

1. That the revision is unnecessary.
2. That the bishops' proposals are just what is needed.
3. That the approach of the Bishop of Norwich - i.e. the welcoming of some changes but the rejection of those connected with the Holy Communion - is the best approach.
4. That the proposals should go further.¹

Dennis sent the carefully tabulated results of this little referendum to Davidson on March 24, 1927, saying that from the point of view of the number of replies received the referendum was a failure; he suggested a delay of twelve months in which further lay opinion might be sought.² Davidson in a reply marked 'Private' on March 25, 1927, wrote that 'I am very grateful to you for your honest endeavours to elicit opinion, and I am sorry it did not meet with wider response'.³ Davidson ignored the suggestion that Dennis made and he can hardly have been fully sincere in his expression of sorrow. Dennis repeated the suggestion in a more forceful letter of March 28, referring to the fact that 'the lay voice is practically inarticulate' as a 'calamity' and repeating his suggestion of a twelve month

-
1. The Times, March 1, 1927, p. 1.
 2. Davidson Papers, Box 8, Dennis to Davidson, March 24, 1927.
 3. Ibid., Davidson to Dennis, March 25, 1927.

delay.¹ The correspondence does not proceed beyond this point; it is an isolated affair, but one which further illustrates the fact that lay opinion was not given a thorough regard.

In March 1928, in connection with the second **Book**, the Daily Telegraph published its plan for a referendum to be held among clergy, churchwardens and members of the electoral rolls. Lang, Bell and the League of Loyalty and Order all wrote to Davidson at the end of March 1928 expressing dislike of the Daily Telegraph project, which Davidson effectively squashed by an open letter of March 31, 1928, to the Reverend Canon E. S. Woods, Vicar of Croydon, in which he expressed confidence that the poll's originators were acting 'in what they conceive to be the public interest and in the hope of securing a fair expression of opinion' but, though he did not wish to give an absolute prohibition, if he himself were an incumbent he would not cooperate as a referendum on such a scale was inevitably a difficult matter and if it were undertaken it should be organised by church authorities.² On April 2, 1928, the Right Reverend G. H. Fredsham, Vicar of Halifax, wrote a similar but stronger letter in the Yorkshire Post and sent a copy to Davidson with a covering letter in which he said that the matter may be more than the 'newspaper stunt' which the public generally

1. Ibid., Dennis to Davidson, March 28, 1927.

2. Ibid., Box 6, Davidson to Woods, March 31, 1928.

consider it to be. 'I cannot help feeling that the Liberals and indeed the Conservatives still more would welcome a plebiscite that divided the voice of the Church.'¹

Davidson viewed the Daily Telegraph referendum as a challenge to the governmental machinery of the Church and as such he regarded it as unhelpful; but the fact that the Daily Telegraph was prepared to plan such a referendum gives further support to the view that the voice of the laity in the church had not been fully expressed through the more orthodox channels.

The signing of petitions and memorials was a common means by which lay people gave expression to their views. Many items of this kind were received at Lambeth Palace and were usually courteously acknowledged by Davidson or one of his chaplains. It seems probable that many laity considered the signing of a petition to be a more positive form of participation in Church government than was involvement in the electoral procedures for the National Assembly: it was, after all, a well-established practice, whereas the National Assembly presented comparatively novel features for those who participated in its elections.

The matter of the petitions was raised by some members of the House of Lords and the suggestion was made by opponents of the Measure that the petitions were virtually ignored; some went so far as to imply that the petitions

1. Ibid., Frodsham to Davidson, April 2, 1928.

were of greater worth as means of expressing opinion within the church than were the debates and votes in the National Assembly. Thus Lord Carson, speaking largely for the Irish Church, made reference to a large petition by the Protestant Alliance (with a total of 303,673 signatures, including 2,638 clergy) and asked of it: 'Is that true? Why was not that told us? Are the 600 members of the Church who met together, of whose discussions and divisions we have heard, are they to be taken as absolutely representative against 303,673 who, as communicants, have actually signed a petition against the Book? What was done with that petition? Was it considered? Were the petitioners communicated with?'¹ No immediate answer was given by the supporters of the Measure in the Lords' debate and the point was taken up again by the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Lord Cushendun, in an opposition speech, in which he remarked that the number of petitioners was larger than the aggregate vote in favour in the diocesan conferences 'about which we have heard so much'.² In the concluding speech in the House of Lords, Lang stated that he at any rate placed little value in petitions and dismissed the idea with the acid remark 'We all know how the signatures can be obtained'.³

-
1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, column 872.
 2. Ibid., column 941.
 3. Ibid., column 972.

Apart from the National Assembly, diocesan conferences, referenda and petitions, opportunity was taken by individuals and groups to write directly to Davidson to convey their feelings on the matter. The Lambeth post-bag became extremely full throughout 1927 and 1928 as messages of support for or hostility towards the Book were received. The most usual form that such communications took was for the annual parochial meeting at Easter 1927 (or some other time after the Book was made public) to pass a resolution on the matter and to convey this to the Archbishop. Such communications were acknowledged, usually by Haigh, and if there existed vagueness as to who summoned the meeting, whom it represented and what were the total numbers present, then this information was specifically elicited. But for all this careful acknowledgement there is no evidence that any analysis was made of them; the votes in the diocesan conferences and the National Assembly were apparently regarded as a more definite and certainly a more easily ascertainable index of opinion. The sending of these parish resolutions appears not to have been a process which the bishops positively encouraged but was one which they felt might possibly aid the Measure. The reply of Haigh on October 24, 1927, to the Reverend W. P. Dott, Rector of Barnes, who suggested the P.C.C.s might be encouraged to record their approval and send it to the Archbishop and to their M.P., is revealing in this respect. Haigh wrote that Davidson 'does not think that he has publicly expressed the

wish that P.C.C.s should pass resolutions of the kind to which you refer, though he may have said something of that kind in his own diocese. His Grace, however, is of opinion that seeing that P.C.C.s on which there is a majority in opposition to the Measure are constantly passing resolutions hostile to the Prayer Book Measure and sending them to M.P.s it would be a pity if P.C.C.s which felt strongly in support of the Measure should not likewise convey their opinions to M.P.s if they are willing thus to express them'.¹

1. Davidson Papers, Box 8, Haigh to Dott, October 24, 1927.

CHAPTER 6.ROMAN CATHOLIC AND NONCONFORMISTOPINION OF THE 1927 BOOK

Other churches in England showed in Prayer Book revision varying degrees of interest, sometimes not easily defined and sometimes contradictory.

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church in England possessed, as would be expected, the greatest degree of unanimity and a strong wish to have nothing whatsoever to do with the issue. Though the 1920s were the early years of the Liturgical Movement, which has by the 1970s virtually revolutionised the modes of worship within the Roman Catholic Church, the liturgical experimentation at such places as Maria Laach in Germany had then no impact on the Roman Catholic Church in England and there is no evidence of its having had impact either upon the Anglican discussions on the Prayer Book at that time; the issue belongs, for both churches, to the post-1945 period. The Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Bourne, had been at Westminster for almost as long as Davidson had been at Canterbury and though there existed between the two prelates an amicable relationship,¹ it was by no means close and there is no evidence among the Davidson papers of any contact with Bourne on the issues surrounding the Prayer Book controversy; neither is there evidence of Bourne having

1. E. Oldmeadow: Francis, Cardinal Bourne, volumes 1 & 2, 1940, 1944, passim.

made public reference to the issue, though from time to time he was capable of launching vigorous assault upon the historic continuity of the Church of England with the pre-Reformation Church, assaults that did not pass unanswered by Anglican spokesmen; Henson especially relished the opportunity of entering controversy of this kind.¹

Both in the controversy itself and in the debates in parliament, Roman Catholics attempted - with success - to preserve their neutrality. The Earl of Denbigh in a brief speech on the first day of the debate in the House of Lords in December 1927 spoke on behalf of forty Roman Catholic peers and gave notice of abstention, though he also spoke of the unsuitability of discussion of matters of this kind in parliament.² There was no similar speech in the Commons, Roman Catholic members there abstained in December 1927, though not all did so in June 1928; The Universe reported that in June 'Two Catholic members voted.....for the bishops' measure and four against.....they did so merely to give effect to the ascertained wishes of their constituents and not to express any view of their own'.³ But the general abstention by Roman Catholics in the debates was understood by Anglicans and was appreciated as the best

1. H. H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, pp. 132-136.

2. Parliamentary Debates, (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, columns 817-818.

3. The Universe, June 22, 1928, p. 12.

policy the Roman Catholic members of both houses might adopt; and it was contrasted with the hostile part played in the debates by members of other denominations or of no denomination. Lord Birkenhead wrote vigorously to Davidson on this issue and asked why Irish, Scottish and Welsh M.P.s in particular had not followed 'the course which with great decency was pursued by Roman Catholic peers and Roman Catholic M.P.s'.¹ Among the many letters of sympathy that Davidson received after the rejection in December 1927 was one from a Roman Catholic Priest, Father Valentine, who hoped that one positive result might be 'the realisation on the part of Members [of parliament] of the utter impropriety of non-Anglicans deciding grave issues relating to your Church'.²

The Roman Catholic neutrality, though understandable, is in some ways remarkable as much of the passion engendered by the controversy was closely concerned with the alleged Romeward drift of a significant part of the Church of England, and uncharitable things were said about accepted practices of the Roman Catholic Church. Further, the controversy surrounding Prayer Book revision had been preceded by the controversial Malines conversations (1922-26), which had heightened suspicion of Roman influence in the Church of England; the two issues virtually overlapped in time, as

1. Davidson Papers, Box 13, Birkenhead to Davidson, December 20, 1927.

2. Ibid., Box 9, Valentine to Davidson, December 19, 1927.

the report of the Malines conversations was published in January 1928, an instance of disastrous though unavoidable timing by the Anglican authorities so far as ecclesiastical politics were concerned.¹ Joynson-Hicks, in his speech in the House of Commons in December 1927, made plain that his words ought not to be interpreted as criticism of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as they were not in dispute, but he made plain that those doctrines were not the doctrines of the Church of England. Nevertheless, the words of Joynson-Hicks and of some other M.P.s hostile to the Book - particularly the extravagant anti-papal rhetoric of Rosslyn Mitchell - must have been a cause of pain to many Roman Catholics.

The idea of there being close links between Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics was not seriously considered, though myths on that score were current in some circles. There was suggestion, even at that time, that Anglo-Catholic thinking was more 'advanced' than Roman Catholic thinking: thus, the well-informed Macassey assured Bell that a friend of the Pope's most trusted adviser had said that the Vatican considered Anglo-Catholics to be 'too materialistic even for Rome in their view as to the Real Presence'.²

Despite the anti-papal undertones that the controversy revealed, The Universe felt able to find encouragement so

1. The matter is considered in ~~detail~~ below, pp. 262-264.

2. Bell Papers, Pink File, Macassey to Bell, January 6, 1928.

far as the position of Roman Catholicism within England was concerned: '.....we have found the most complete avoidance of anything like polemic against the Catholic Church. It is true that there were occasional phrases and allusions that were regrettable, but in almost every instance they were the result of ignorance, and were devoid of any intention to offend. The difference between this debate and that upon the Public Worship Regulation Act of the days of Disraeli and Gladstone is the measure of the difference in the attitude of this country towards the Catholic Church within a couple of generations'.¹

Nonconformist opinion on the Prayer Book is not as easily described or explained as is Roman Catholic opinion. Many Nonconformists held that the doctrine and worship of the Established Church was a concern of theirs, by reason of the fact that the Church of England was the Church of the English people and thus as citizens of England revision of the Prayer Book was also their concern. They naturally did not adopt the exclusive attitude towards their churches as Roman Catholics did towards theirs and the links between Nonconformists and Anglicans were in some cases quite close and had been encouraged by such recent pronouncements on unity between Anglicans and Nonconformists as the 'Appeal to all Christian People' of the 1920 Lambeth Conference. Many

1. The Universe, December 23, 1927, p. 12. It is, however, far from easy to agree with the opening statement in this extract.

of the Evangelical societies that were exclusively Anglican in composition made no secret of their gathering of Nonconformist opposition to the Book and interdenominational societies, such as the Protestant Truth Society, naturally relied upon Nonconformist hostility to it. Within the different Nonconformist churches, opinion was unlikely to be united, but the leadership of many of these churches in fact showed a guarded welcome for some of the features of the revision.

One of the most significant public pronouncements was that made by the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council, the Reverend Professor P. Carnegie Simpson, in his opening address to the Council on September 19, 1927, a copy of which was sent to Davidson. Carnegie Simpson felt it inappropriate to concentrate too much on the issue of Prayer Book revision but it was 'a matter of national importance and it raises issues both public and religious, with which we alike as citizens in the nation and, also, as trustees - ofcourse, not sole trustees - for the evangelical cause in the land have a real and responsible concern'. Much in the Book was to be welcomed, but there were items within it 'which cannot but call for anxious scrutiny from all who care about reformed doctrine and evangelical religion'. Carnegie Simpson held that the bishops' advocacy of the Book was not itself an unassailable reason for Nonconformist acceptance of it: the bishops had in 1874 supported the Public Worship Regulation Act and now put forward this

concession, a change of attitude on their part which 'may shew a progressive mind, but it shews also an authority too mutable to command an uncritical obedience'. On the Book's content he concluded that 'it cannot in fairness be said that here is such a specific denial of reformed doctrine and evangelical religion, as would demand uncompromising opposition'. But it was the situation that had particularly to be examined, rather than the Book's content and in this connection Carnegie Simpson focused sharply on the Book's value as a means of restoring order, an issue which was becoming increasingly significant in the Autumn of 1927. He viewed with pessimism the recent statements in the National Assembly by Davidson and Lang on this issue and felt that 'the bishops are simply hoping and praying that disobedience will not be extensive or infectious, and that, as a matter of fact, they have no immediate settled policy about maintaining the new order'. Every M.P. must make it his task to secure the necessary safeguards.¹ The Council responded to the Moderator's words and on the next day passed a resolution that virtually reflected what Carnegie Simpson had said, and this resolution was sent to the Ecclesiastical Committee in response to the Committee's request for observations by the Council. The resolution of September 20, 1927, made clear that the Council could not speak

1. Davidson Papers, Box 13, P. Carnegie Simpson: The Free Churches and the New Prayer Book, Being the Moderator's Opening Address to the Free Church Federal Council Meeting in London, September 19, 1927.

authoritatively for the constituent denominations and that though it was able to accept the Book as satisfactory so far as doctrine was concerned 'The Council is of opinion that the final attitude of large sections of the Free Churches will be determined by the adequacy of the guarantees which it is requisite should be specifically given by the authorities of the Church of England prior to the discussion of the Measure in parliament, to insure that the Book, should it be allowed to pass, will fix the limits not only of what is permissible, but of what is actually permitted in the Church of England'.¹ No resolution could have reflected more clearly the Moderator's views.

Davidson realised the importance of this matter so far as the Book's success was concerned. He invited Carnegie Simpson to a discussion with him at Lambeth Palace on October 6, 1927, to find out more precisely the nature of the guarantees for which Carnegie Simpson pressed. They consisted of three main items: firstly, the bishops should act as a united body in the matter and thus overcome the problem of dioceses where the particular bishop was notoriously slack; secondly, the clergy should not be ordained or inducted if they made it clear they were unlikely to adhere to the Book; thirdly, in cases of flagrant and

1. Ibid., Motion passed by the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches of England in reply to the Secretary of the Ecclesiastical Committee, September 20, 1927.

continuing disobedience, the Bishop ought to declare that such 'recalcitrants' are no longer in communion with the Bishop.¹

This conversation was very probably one of the most important considerations prompting Davidson's letter to Storr on the issue of discipline at the end of the month. But Carnegie Simpson's response to that letter was not entirely favourable, both for reasons of the letter's content and for its mode of address. Canon Guy Rogers revealed Carnegie Simpson's thinking in a letter to Haigh in which he recounted confidentially the substance of a weekend conversation with Carnegie Simpson and in which he said that Carnegie Simpson 'might possibly feel a little piqued or disappointed that the Archbishop's declaration of assurances is made simply to a Group of Anglican Clergy. I imagine that he feels that the Free Church conscience needs to be conciliated on this matter. His point, I think, would be that assurances should be given to the Nation rather than to a Group of clergy'.² This matter was evidently brought to Davidson's attention, as on November 1, 1927, he wrote to Carnegie Simpson to explain that he felt his letter to Storr had been the most appropriate means ~~of~~ giving the

-
1. Ibid., Carnegie Simpson's memorandum of a conversation with Davidson at Lambeth Palace on October 6, 1927, accepted by Davidson as 'entirely fair', October 7, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Guy Rogers to Haigh, October 31, 1927.

'assurances' urged by Carnegie Simpson and others.¹ Carnegie Simpson's reply showed more directly a sense of irritation at the manner in which the assurances were given: 'the question is not one merely of satisfying domestic anxieties among Evangelical clergy of the Church of England, but it is essentially one between the Church and the nation'.² Both this letter and a subsequent one hinted at another problem with which Carnegie Simpson had to wrestle and that was the very strong influence of Anglican Evangelicals upon the Free Churches, which was undermining Carnegie Simpson's own support of the Book: 'there is going on a very keen propaganda emanating largely from your church to get the local Free Church Councils to turn against the findings of the Federal Council and (if I may say so) against my line of not opposing the Prayer Book'.³ Carnegie Simpson thus put his finger upon a particular problem in the Free Churches: the fact that considerable sections had no mind to follow the lead that he was giving and that there were links with Evangelical Anglicans that spelt disaster for the Book's chances of acceptance.

A leading High Wesleyan Methodist, the Reverend Dr. J. Scott Lidgett, held views very similar to those of Carnegie Simpson and he put them forward shortly after the Book's

-
1. Ibid., Davidson to Carnegie Simpson, November 1, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Carnegie Simpson to Davidson, November 4, 1927.
 3. Ibid., Carnegie Simpson to Davidson, November 8, 1927.

publication in the April issue of The Review of the Churches: he could see no doctrinal change implicit in the Book, he in fact had a preference for the new consecration prayer and though he saw the problems that might stem from Reservation, he could not object to the practice per se. Even at that early stage, before the Book had received the final approval of the Church's own legislative machinery, Scott Lidgett urged parliament to present no opposition to the Book's passage, as such would be an interference in the spiritual liberties of the Church of England and ought only to be undertaken in cases of real danger; he did not conceive the revision of the Prayer Book to be in that category.¹

Many Anglican supporters of the Book were aware of the support they were receiving from these two important and respected leaders. The Guardian warmly welcomed Scott Lidgett's views and, in its ever-optimistic manner, projected its hope for the Prayer Book as a vehicle for unity wider than the Church of England itself. 'The publication of the final form of the revised Prayer-book has already done much for unity within the Church of England. If the spirit of Dr. Scott Lidgett's utterance prevails among Free Churchmen, the book may promote an even wider unity.'² Later in the year, The Guardian showed a similar attitude, though it was critical of Carnegie Simpson's demand for 'assurances',

1. Review of the Churches, April 1927, pp. 154-159.

2. The Guardian, April 14, 1927, p. 287.

comparing his support for the Book as 'more grudging' than that of Scott Lidgett, and attributing it partly to his position as Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council 'a body that, in the past, has spent much energy in fighting fellow Christians'. The Guardian considered that the doctrinal acceptability of the Book by Nonconformists was unlikely to be a major factor in the parliamentary debates, but that the issue of discipline was.¹

Much Nonconformist opinion, some of it from less sympathetic quarters than these two leaders represented, focused very sharply upon the disciplinary issue. The National Church League had many contacts with Nonconformists and evidently made specific approaches to them on the issue of Prayer Book revision. At its Executive Committee meeting on October 26, 1927, C. J. Rawson reported on visits he had made 'to leading representatives of the Free Churches' and he had discovered 'that it was generally felt by them that before the Measure came before Parliament the Bishops should give guarantees that the directions laid down in the New Book would be enforced, and that their policy would be determined by the adequacy of such guarantees'.² In view of Carnegie Simpson's attitude, it seems unlikely that Davidson's letter to Storr, made public a few days later, in fact gave them the assurances they desired. In subsequent

1. Ibid., October 7, 1927, p. 736.

2. CSA, National Church League, Executive Committee Minutes, October 26, 1927, p. 192.

weeks the issue of discipline rumbled on and was by no means dead at the time of the parliamentary debates in December 1927.

Important opposition came from the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland, influenced very largely by the Reverend M. E. Aubrey, General Secretary to the Union, who in the Autumn of 1927 appears virtually as the leader of hostile Nonconformist opinion; more letters in ecclesiastical and secular journals at that time concentrated upon his opinions among opponents than upon those of any other leader of Nonconformist thought. Aubrey's main onslaught was given in a submission to the Ecclesiastical Committee, a copy of which he sent to Davidson on September 15, 1927. Aubrey explained the Union's earlier lack of involvement as due to the understanding that until the Measure and Book had passed the National Assembly in July 1927, both were exclusively the concern of the Church of England. Thereafter, that was no longer so. 'The claim is constantly made for the Church of England that it "represents the nation on its religious side". That is indeed the basis of its claim to be established. As citizens of the State, and members of the Nation, we therefore have a real interest in the character and doctrine of the Church which claims to represent it.'¹ The Union's hostility is then spelt out

1. Davidson Papers, Box 12, Statement submitted by the Baptist Union of Great Britain and Ireland to the Secretary of the Ecclesiastical Committee, September 15, 1927.

in unequivocal terms. Changes were detected that disturbed the Reformation settlement and moved in the direction of Roman Catholicism. There was no guarantee that this was the final step in that direction: 'we have no assurance that the Deposited Prayer Book represents any finality of settlement. During the discussions in the Church Assembly expression was given to the contrary opinion'. The rights of parliament were diminished by the Measure as 'the option given to Bishops to lay down regulations for Reservation gives freedom to them to act in matters which heretofore have been within the competence of Parliament alone'. Doubt was also expressed whether parliament had in fact 'any sort of authority from the nation to deal with a question of far-reaching importance'. The report concluded with a recommendation that the Measure be divided into two and if that were not done, the entire Measure should be rejected. The position that Aubrey adopted became a focal point of discussion and showed to the Church of England the danger that came from possible opposition from Free Church thought. The Times gave prominence to Aubrey's contentions in a leading article, entitled 'Parliament and the Prayer Book' shortly afterwards. It contrasted the views of Aubrey and other Protestant opponents with those of Carnegie Simpson and placed what was perhaps an exaggerated interpretation on the motives of Aubrey and his fellow-thinkers in the Free Churches. The Times held that opposition in this respect came only 'from a section of Nonconformists who seem to

fear for the safety of Protestantism so much that in its interests they are ready to deny Churchmen the right to worship in ways which obviously have their approval. It is difficult to believe that Parliament will allow itself to be the agent of such a policy'.¹

The correspondence columns of The Times, never lacking in controversial letters about Prayer Book revision in the Autumn of 1927, contained many letters occasioned by Aubrey's views. Amongst them was a letter from Wolmer on September 28, 1927, urging that rejection of the Book by parliament though legally permissible would be morally inappropriate and repeating Davidson's assurance that Anglican doctrine was in no way changed by the Book.² Aubrey replied specifically to this letter in another strongly worded composition on October 6, 1927, in which he held more closely to the legal necessity and reality of parliamentary approval and in which he reiterated his fear of the changed position of the Church of England and of the rights of British citizens to a say in its formularies. He contrasted the Anglican position with that of his own church. 'Baptists do not seek on occasions of State, or in Parliament, a place which.....inevitably makes on the plain man the impression that she does claim to be the national church, and is so understood abroad. The character

1. The Times, September 24, 1927, p. 11.

2. Ibid., September 28, 1927, p. 10.

of such a Church is necessarily the concern of all Christian citizens.' There followed comment that the bishops were in fact by no means unanimous on the issue and a refutation of any desire on the part of Nonconformists to 'render Establishment intolerable and to blackmail the Church into disestablishment', which had formed a part of Wolmer's earlier suggestions.¹ That not all Baptist ministers agreed with Aubrey is witnessed by a letter to The Times from a Baptist minister, the Reverend W. H. Haden who questioned Aubrey's approach, who certainly wanted to see Protestant principles prevail, but only 'by the power of persuasion producing conviction'.²

Thus by the late Autumn of 1927, unity of approach among the Free Churches towards the issue of Prayer Book revision was totally lacking. The most vigorous and the most important opposition came from Aubrey; the moderate support, linked with concern about ecclesiastical discipline was put forward by Carnegie Simpson; and the warmest support for the venture came from Scott Lidgett. As the parliamentary debates drew near, a further step against the Book was taken by the Free Church Council which reversed its earlier decision and voted against the Book. Davidson was concerned at this step and in reply to a letter of sympathy about it from the Reverend A. E. Garvie of Hackney and New College, he stated that 'We owe genuine gratitude to Scott Lidgett

1. Ibid., October 6, 1927, p. 10.

2. Ibid., October 11, 1927, p. 10.

and yourself for your endeavours,' but that 'The vote ultimately reached is a depressing one in my view, as evidence of the sort of spirit which makes the drawing together of our different denominations increasingly difficult. I am not ofcourse able to judge what influence the decision will have on Free Church M.P.s. They would not like, I imagine, to be told that they are under clerical domination; but perhaps they are. I wonder whether it will be widely known that men like Scott Lidgett and yourself, and to a large degree Carnegie Simpson, are dead against the action taken in the Free Church Council? I hope so.'¹

The factors contributing to this gradual increase in Nonconformist opposition to the Book are not easily assessed. Statements of leading Nonconformists, such as Aubrey, would not have been without their effect, neither would the continual pressure from the various Protestant bodies. The role of the World's Evangelical Alliance may perhaps possess considerable significance. A letter sent by Knox to Hinde after the rejection of December 1927 makes clear that Knox considered its role and the work of its secretary, Mr. Gooch, to have been crucial and that in the new situation the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith ought to work in association with the Alliance. Knox wrote that 'in a sense Gooch's action with the local Free Church

1. Davidson Papers, Box 12, Davidson to Garvie, December 5, 1927.

Councils turned the scale - reversed the unfavourable decision and brought the bulk of the Free Churchmen to our side. We cannot afford to ignore him, nor will it be wise to do so, as we shall need the same help again'.¹ It is not easy to ascertain the precise nature of Gooch's work, but the warm commendation of it by Knox is itself significant testimony to its importance.

The Nonconformist hostility to the Book was bravely tackled by Lang in the parliamentary debates in December 1927 and he attempted to put as good a face as he could on a difficult situation. He acknowledged the Nonconformist right to be concerned in the affairs of the Anglican Church, but he suggested that there was significant support for the Prayer Book among Nonconformists. Only the Baptists and the United Methodist Church had advised rejection and 'The other great bodies, the Wesleyans, the Presbyterian Church, the Primitive Methodists and the great Congregational Union, have refrained from taking that course'. He also stressed that the three 'conspicuous leaders of Nonconformity', Carnegie Simpson, Garvie and Scott Lidgett, all of whom wanted the Measure passed, 'are the three men who, more than any others, are identified at the present time with the desire to promote reunion with the Church of England.'²

1. CSA, FCTF, Knox to Hinde, December 28, 1927.

2. Parliamentary Debates, (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, columns 972-973.

Nonconformists contributed to the debate in both houses, though there was nothing in their utterances in December that had not earlier been put forth in one quarter or another. Lord Haytor spoke as a Nonconformist against the Book and in the Commons it had the warm support of Mr. Dunnico, a Baptist minister. Positive conclusion about the significance of Nonconformist opinion in the rejection of the Book by parliament is impossible, but the strength of Nonconformist opposition by December seems to have outweighed support and it cannot have been a negligible factor in the minds of M.P.s anxious not to alienate large numbers of their constituents who were members of the Free Churches.

CHAPTER 7.

OPPOSITION IN THE SCHOLARLY PRESS,
IN PARLIAMENT AND IN THE COURTS

The Reverend Dr. F. E. Brightman, Fellow of Magdalen College, was one of the leading liturgical scholars of the 1920s and a High Churchman. He had a preference for the Book of 1549 and had been partly responsible in October 1925 for encouraging Lang's earlier advocacy of the 1549 Book.¹ There exists among the Lang papers at Lambeth Palace Library a copy of the 1549 Book with suggested amendments in Brightman's hand. At the same time, Brightman revealed to Lang his concern at the literary quality of the proposals at that stage and he found in them 'so little that is large and masculine or even expressed with literary force and definiteness'.² There is no evidence of Brightman - or any other liturgical scholar outside the House of Bishops - having been closely consulted during the episcopal discussions between 1925 and 1927, though Brightman, at Lang's invitation, did compose a gloss to a copy of the quarto book and the bishops had access to his opinions.³ When the Book was published in February 1927, Brightman was able to find very little in it of which he could approve and he expressed his opinions in an article in the Church

-
1. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Brightman to Lang, October 19, 1925.
 2. Ibid.
 3. See above, p. 37.

Quarterly Review in July 1927, entitled 'The New Prayer Book Examined'. This article was by far the most scholarly critical assault the Book ever encountered and criticism from a man of Brightman's standing was a matter that could have serious effect upon its fortunes. His criticism of the literary quality of the Book in general took up a large part of his article and showed a similar approach to that found in the quarto book which he glossed. But a major part of his article was devoted to a criticism of the use of the Epiiclesis in the Holy Communion service. He could 'see no sufficient reason for orientalizing at the cost of abandoning what has been our tradition ever since the days of S. Augustine,' and he continued to press for the restoration of the 1549 Book.¹

Headlam had particular cause of annoyance at this article by Brightman, as he also contributed an article to the same issue of the Church Quarterly Review, entitled 'A Defence of the New Prayer Book'. Headlam wrote to Brightman about the matter and Brightman's reply gives further evidence both of his strong dislike of the Book and of the unpleasant situation in which he felt placed by his condemnation of it. He countered Headlam's charge that he had given advice to the bishops and therefore had had opportunity of improving the Book, by saying that his advice to the bishops had been

1. F. E. Brightman: 'The New Prayer Book Examined' in Church Quarterly Review, July 1927, pp. 219-252.

virtually ignored. In particular disregard had been shown to his gloss of the quarto book and 'a good deal of what my article contains simply reproduces what I said there and was made no use of'.¹ He further deplored, to Headlam, the termination of the Advisory Committee ('how, when, or why it came to an end I don't know') on which he had made many of his present criticisms 'some fifteen years or more ago'.²

Brightman's criticisms, though representing a serious blow, were probably most effective in ecclesiastical circles. There is little evidence of their employment by societies that opposed the Book and the comparatively sophisticated form and the sharp wit of the article render its appeal to the majority of the population slight. But of the scholarly opposition to the Book - never a major feature in the controversy at all - a significant place must be accorded to Brightman's article.

Brightman touched upon a weakness that might have affected others not fully committed by any means to the Church of England. There was an initial reaction in February 1927 to the abandonment of the traditional, archaic wording of the 1662 Book. Winston Churchill was among those who much regretted this feature of the revision and contemplated moving the rejection of the Book. Hugh Cecil wrote to Davidson in February 1927 that he had 'dined with Lord

1. Headlam Papers, Brightman to Headlam, June 23, 1927. Also quoted in R.C.D. Jasper: Headlam, pp. 186-187.

2. Ibid.

Oxford last night and found him vehement almost to tears about the iniquity of touching the glorious diction of the Prayer Book, this unique masterpiece of literature.

"Winston is so angry," he said, "that he says he will move the rejection." Ofcourse this is the exaggeration of after-dinner talk; but it is not without importance.....¹

In the event, Churchill supported the Book by a very strong speech in the debates of June 1928.

In June and July 1927 an extraordinary minor controversy flourished on the allegation that the new Book made inadequate provision for prayers for the King. These accusations were convincingly answered by Davidson and others, but the matter continued to agitate some minds and it was mentioned, though with no very great emphasis, in the parliamentary debates of December 1927. It was first brought to public attention by a letter to The Times from the Reverend Dr. F. R. M. Hitchcock, on June 17, 1927.² Criticism of this kind was especially dangerous as it would link with the other ill-founded criticism of the Book's Romanising tendencies; Davidson and Lang were well aware of the potential danger that this criticism held. The issue was spelt out very clearly to Lang by a Member of

1. Davidson Papers, Box 5, Hugh Cecil to Davidson, February 27, 1927.

2. The issue of prayers for the King was not the only issue on which Hitchcock opposed the Book. See for example, his article 'The Greek Sources of the New Consecration Prayer', in The Churchman, October 1927, pp. 262-268.

Parliament, Waldron Smithers, in a letter on July 12, 1927, in which he warned Lang that the issue was being taken up in the House of Commons by Colonel Applin, 'a soldier and a keen churchman and a licensed lay reader,' who 'is going to move the rejection of the Bill on this score and is getting increasing support. Some think this relegation is deliberate and that when we split from Rome the King was definitely made head of the Church of England to make it quite clear that the Pope was not. If this lobbying catches on it will turn many people in the House against the Bill and will be, and indeed is, a serious opposition'. His letter concluded, prophetically, that 'if an anti-Roman campaign is started, however unwarranted it may be, it will in my opinion gather strength'.¹ Lang sent this correspondence to Davidson, pressing on him the urgency of the matter, urging him to see Applin, and 'that possibly the Archbishops and Bishops might at some appropriate time issue a request that one or other of the prayers for the king should be used at least once every Sunday'.²

The matter evoked an immediate response from Queen Mary. On June 17, 1927, the day on which Hitchcock's letter on the subject appeared in The Times, Sir Harry Verney, private secretary to the Queen, addressed a memorandum to Lord Stamfordham, the King's private secretary, in which

-
1. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Smithers to Lang, July 12, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Lang to Davidson, July 15, 1927.

he wrote that the Queen wished him to draw Stamfordham's attention to the letter in The Times on that day. Stamfordham approached Davidson, asking the Archbishop to help him in his reply to Verney. 'Personally I have always thought there were too many prayers for the King! and His Majesty cut out the prayers for the King and Royal Family in the morning service at Buckingham Palace and there we have only the versicle "O Lord Save the King".'¹

Davidson's reply to Stamfordham is perhaps the best reply ever given to this ridiculous issue; its publication could have helped towards the abating of the issue, though other able and public rejoinders were made. Davidson wrote that there was ofcourse no intention whatsoever to diminish the standing of the monarch. 'It is really a ludicrous travesty of the facts to make out that we are showing disloyalty to His Majesty by his Prayer Book. On the contrary, the utmost care has been taken to secure that no prayer for the King shall lose its character and that it shall be natural for the clergy to use one of the several prayers which stand at the very head of the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings with which group have now been moved all the prayers which used to stand as obligatory in various Services hitherto.' He pointed out some of the arrangements in the 1662 Book which, if the strict letter of the Book were followed, allowed for a very considerable amount of prayer

1. Ibid., Stamfordham to Davidson, June 17, 1927.

for the King in a short space, 'the thing was really almost indecorous'. In the new Book compulsory provision was made for prayer for the King at the start of the Holy Communion and in the Prayer for the Church Militant in the course of it; such prayer formed a part of the Litany; there was the versicle and response in Morning and Evening Prayer; in addition there was ample provision among the Occasional Prayers and it was expected that ready use would be made of them.¹ Though this was a convincing answer to the matter, Hitchcock's original criticism focused on the absence of obligatory prayer - with the exception of the versicle and response - at Morning and Evening Prayer; underlying his criticism was another, that Morning and Evening Prayer were being diminished as the main Sunday services.

Davidson added in his letter to Stamfordham that 'this argument is being used simply by those who will use any stick in order to attack the Prayer Book which they dislike. You will see in today's Morning Post the account of my presence at a meeting yesterday at which Dr. Hitchcock, who started this ridiculous scare, shouted vituperative criticism of the Bishops and other for active and flagrant disloyalty'.²

The matter was not easily dismissed. It rumbled on for the summer months and some wild accusations were made against the bishops and their alleged intentions in this respect.

1. Ibid., Davidson to Stamfordham, June 18, 1927.

2. Ibid.

Rumour held that a prayer for the bishops was to replace the prayer for the King. Some capital was made out of the fact that the Prayer for the Church Militant was preceded by the rubric enjoining the priest to 'begin the intercession' with no guarantee that he would continue or conclude it; he may therefore not reach the part in which the King was prayed for. There was much grasping at straws of this kind.

A public letter of Davidson to Lord Daryngton in The Times on July 25, 1927, is virtually the end of the main part of this controversy. Davidson rehearsed once more the importance given to prayer for the King in the Book as a whole and revealed something of the concern of the bishops by explaining that he proposed 'to invite the Bishops, if and when the new Prayer Book becomes operative, to issue some public counsel to the clergy as to the best manner of its use. The opportunity can well be taken for making clear the obligation which rests upon us all to make regular use of the prayers for the Sovereign'.¹

At the end of October 1927 another unforeseen assault against the Prayer Book was launched, when attempts were made to prohibit the Measure in the High Court. The action was taken in the name of the King by Sir William Frederick Haynes-Smith against the Legislative Committee of the National Assembly and the National Assembly itself. It fell therefore to the National Assembly to deal with this

1. Ibid., Davidson to Daryngton, July 23, 1927.

particular onslaught and the action they took was controlled by Wilbraham.

The ground for this legal action was shown in an affidavit dated October 27, 1927, in which it was suggested that the Measure and Book then to be presented to parliament were not the same as the Measure approved in 1923; the points made by White, of the Church Association, in his speech in the National Assembly in July 1927 were seized upon. The grounds for objection give further reflection to the feeling among the Laity that they had been inadequately consulted.

Wilbraham took the threat seriously. Not only was it an assault upon the Prayer Book, but also upon the legal standing of the National Assembly. Sir John Simon was briefed to represent the National Assembly. He was a leading barrister and his employment in this connection gives further evidence of Wilbraham's view of the seriousness of the situation; 'I did not know that you were going to call up such a heavy piece of artillery as Simon,' commented Sir Hugh Godley, the secretary of the Sub-Committee of the Ecclesiastical Committee.¹ Wilbraham wrote to Davidson just before the case was heard and revealed his firm confidence in Simon and his conviction that the case was of considerable importance for the National Assembly: 'I sat next to Simon at dinner on All Souls night and had

1. GSA, Prayer Book Measure: High Court File, Godley to Wilbraham, November 2, 1927.

a good deal of talk with him. I think he is becoming keenly interested in the matter and his position is now so outstanding that his mere presence in Court is helpful. The arrangements made for defending the proceedings may seem at first sight on the extravagant side, but I do feel that the case raises questions of great general importance, and that we should be much to blame if we left any stone unturned to defeat them. The proceedings affect not only the fate of the Prayer Book Measure but the constitutional position of the Assembly. Moreover, although I feel that the prosecution is really entirely wrong and that the proceedings are misconceived I do also feel that it is not so easy to make either of these points quite clear to Judges who start with complete ignorance of the subject'.¹

In the event, the legal prohibition was dismissed and Wilbraham reported again to the Archbishop. 'I am thankful to be able to report that the Rules were discharged with costs today. Whether there will be any question of an appeal I don't know for the present. Judgment proceeded on one ground only, namely that neither the Assembly nor its Legislative Committee were bodies exercising judicial or quasi-judicial functions.....Behind this, however, there was a fairly strongly expressed opinion of the Court that the matter was a question of internal procedure as to which it would be very difficult to go behind the Chairman's ruling.

1. Ibid., Wilbraham to Davidson, November 4, 1927.

This view was expressed by the Judges in their interlocutory remarks yesterday. The question whether the Measure in its final form was the same Measure (legitimately amended) as the original N.A. 84 was not agreed or decided. I am rather sorry in a way that it could not be decided as I think we had a very fair answer on the merits and we might have been spared one or two sentences in the Lord Chief Justice's Judgment which I fear may be used against us by propagandists, but that cannot be helped.¹ Thus the attempted legal prohibition left scars upon the Prayer Book that were not wholly without significance in the December rejection.

The increasing concentration of hostile opinion on the matter of Reservation caused the bishops to make concessions on that point before the Book was debated in parliament. As early as March 1927, Wilson, writing in The Guardian what was in fact a welcome to the Book, said that Reservation could not be sanctioned 'while the "Rules"remain undetermined'.² Events in the Summer and Autumn compelled the bishops to realise that some concession was certainly needed on this matter. In early December 1927 the bishops produced some draft rules on a pink piece of paper that was private and confidential to the members of Convocation. It gave certain safeguards against misuse of Reservation, that were to be acted upon by the bishops in the event of

1. Ibid., Wilbraham to Davidson, November 9, 1927.

2. The Guardian, March 4, 1927, p. 178.

the Book becoming lawful. It was a concession that in some ways was paralleled **by** Davidson's letter to Storr on the issue of discipline. Like that letter, the proposed rules on Reservation were considered to lack firmness, and like that letter also, they did little to assist the Book's passage.

CHAPTER 8.ANGLICAN ATTEMPTS TO SECUREPARLIAMENTARY APPROVAL

The League of Loyalty and Order was an ad hoc organisation pledged simply to ensure the Book's passage through parliament. It came into being solely for that purpose, and it dissolved itself after the rejection of June 1928. The origins of this important organisation can be seen in a duplicated letter sent by Lieutenant Colonel J. H. Oldham in March 1927 and found among the Bell papers. Oldham referred to a meeting on March 9, 1927, and stated that 'it has been decided to form an organisation for the purpose of giving public expression to the opinions (held, it is believed, very generally though silently) that loyalty to the authorities of the National Church and to its traditions of reasonable comprehensiveness, and a strong desire for the restoration of orderliness within the Church, alike demand that the Prayer Book Revision Measure should be carried through the Church Assembly and through Parliament. It is assumed, for the time being, that the final deliberations of the Bishops have made no change which will affect the attitude of support. The organisation, to be called a League of Loyalty and Order, is for this purpose only and will be dissolved as soon as the purpose is achieved'. The structure of the organisation was then outlined: there was to be a Council, and an Executive Committee was 'to control the detailed work of the League'; Oldham was to be its chairman.

'after the unavoidable refusal of Sir Harry Verney'.¹

The Guardian strongly encouraged the League. Even before the League's creation, The Guardian advocated an organisation of this kind: 'some organization is needed to represent the mass of churchpeople who are favourably impressed by the Bishops' Book, and are not a little ashamed that its opponents have so far almost entirely monopolized public attention.....Certain informal "conversations" have, we understand, been held; and we hope sincerely that those engaged in them will get to work quickly and thoroughly'.²

After the League was in being, The Guardian stressed its all-party appeal and the general value that it possessed: 'it is interesting to note that a large number of Anglo-Catholics and Protestants, with a very definite loyalty to their own convictions, have yet written to express their support of the League. This is proof, if proof were needed, that it is by no means only "central churchmen" who are in favour of the Composite Book'.³ A couple of weeks later, The Guardian carried an advertisement for the League:

' "PASS THE PRAYER BOOK"

'If you wish to support the passage of the Revised Prayer Book through the Church Assembly and by Parliament

JOIN

-
1. Bell papers, Buff File, Prayer Book Revision, 1925-27, Duplicated letter Oldham to Bell (and others), referring to a meeting of March 9, 1927.
 2. The Guardian, February 25, 1927, p. 147.
 3. Ibid., March 25, 1927, p. 228.

THE LEAGUE OF LOYALTY AND ORDER

'This would not bind you to approval of all its details, nor to the adoption of any of the alternatives. There is no subscription, but donations will be welcome. When the Prayer Book passes, the League will come to an end.'¹

Protestant societies were highly critical of the League of Loyalty and Order; the Church Association dubbed it the 'Episcopal Admiration Society'.² But some Evangelicals were members of the League. The Guardian reported at the end of April that 'The postbag of the League of Loyalty and Order swelled to very large dimensions over the Easter holidays; a striking feature being the number of letters received from clergy and laity of the Evangelical school of thought'.³ The increasing support that it received in the Spring and Summer of 1927 made the League, under the leadership of two military M.P.s, Lieutenant Colonel J. H. Oldham and Major J. P. Birchall a formidable and an effective organisation for the propagation of the Book.

After the successful passage of the Book through the Church Assembly on July 6, 1927, it was incumbent upon the Church to ensure that there would be a successful passage also through Parliament. In a private memorandum of April

-
1. Ibid., April 8, 1927, p. 265.
 2. Church Association, 62nd Annual Report, 1926, (partly applicable to the early months of 1927), p. 8.
 3. The Guardian, April 22, 1927, p. 304.

1927, Davidson noted his wish that the Measure and Book should proceed to the parliamentary stage as swiftly as was possible; practical difficulties prevented this, and not all bishops shared his view on the need for a swift submission to parliament. Davidson wrote that 'On Friday March 11th I had a full talk with the Prime Minister in his room in the House of Commons about the parliamentary possibilities of the Prayer Book Measure as regards dates. He made it clear to me that it was hopeless to attempt to get it through Parliament during this summer, owing to the pressure of business in the House of Commons, and I was obliged to abandon the hope I had secretly entertained of being able to get the whole measure greatly expedited by summoning the Assembly and then immediately approaching Parliament. Ebor had never cared with me about this and wants the long delay. I believe it to be unfortunate, but inevitable'.¹

Davidson initially felt that the bishops ought not to occupy themselves in asserting pressure upon M.P.s. At the end of July 1927, on a day after he had had a series of interviews with leading protagonists (including the one with Lord Hanworth) in the course of which he found 'the atmosphere very electric', he wrote to Lang that 'I am eager that pressure should be brought to bear on M.P.s but

1. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, vol. xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-1930, Memorandum of April 23, 1927, p. 9.

not that the Bishops should be the people exercising the pressure' and he added - doubtless with the fact in mind that he and many others were on the point of beginning their August holidays - 'In any case I think you will agree that anything in an official way cannot now be done before October'.¹ Lang took a more vigorous view of the situation, and - contrary to the popular estimate of his attitudes - suggested a less exalted role for the episcopate. Lang agreed 'that it is difficult for the bishops themselves to be active protagonists, but the matter is too serious to expect us to stand too much upon our own dignity'. He suggested that bishops 'should do what they can to get their Churchpeople to let M.P.s know how strong the backing of the Book is throughout the country'. In practical terms he suggested that 'it is worth considering whether at the beginning of October you ought not to make some private communication to the Bishops' and he hoped there would still be opportunity for the two Archbishops to speak to members of both houses of parliament about the Book,² something which Lang had done with considerable success on more than one occasion earlier in the year.

In early August 1927 Davidson had a lengthy conversation about this and other issues with the Editor of The Times, Geoffrey Dawson. Both Dawson and his newspaper were

1. Davidson Papers, Box 12, Davidson to Lang, July 29, 1927

2. Ibid., Lang to Davidson, August 2, 1927.

sympathetic towards Prayer Book revision - to the point that The Times was later in the year accused of suppression of letters unfavourable to the Book - and Dawson and Davidson had frequently met and had a confidence in and respect for each other.¹ Davidson was impressed by the advice which he received and wrote afterwards to Hugh Cecil and to Lang, though at greater length and with greater frankness to Lang. So far as contact with M.P.s was concerned, Dawson advised that the present time was one widely used by M.P.s to get to know constituency opinion 'and that this is a time when it is most desirable that letters should be reaching them showing how overwhelmingly strong (and Dawson presses the strength of it) is the preponderance of all thoughtful opinion in favour of the Prayer Book'. Dawson also recommended the continuation of talks by Davidson and Lang to members of both houses and that talks to members by Pollock did the Book more good than harm. Dawson did not approve Hugh Cecil's idea of a pamphlet for M.P.s, as advantage would be taken of the omissions that a four-page pamphlet would inevitably contain. He felt that big demonstrations of support would come most usefully in October and he also considered that the League of Loyalty and Order had an important role to play in this. Davidson intended to write to Oldham, but to Lang he confided 'I shall not name Geoffrey Dawson, but

1. G. E. Wrench: Geoffrey Dawson and Our Times, London, 1955, passim.

say that I have got at the best advisers about propaganda.'¹ Lang agreed with much that was said and pressed further that the bishops should participate fully in persuading M.P.s and asked, again, that Davidson write to the Bishops on the matter.²

It was some three weeks later, on September 3, 1927, that Davidson sent a confidential circular letter to all the diocesan bishops, with the exception of the four opposing bishops, in which he said that there was 'feeling among supporters of the Prayer Book Measure and the Book, that the Diocesan Bishops are interesting themselves less actively than was expected in the endeavour to secure a satisfactory vote in the Houses of Parliament'. He made the suggestion that Bishops might arrange meetings with M.P.s or write letters to them. 'Anyhow, there ought to be no doubt as to the active interest which Bishops who have supported the Measure in the Assembly, take in securing its parliamentary success.'³ Davidson composed this letter while on his summer holiday in Scotland and sent it to Haigh, at Lambeth, revealing in a covering letter that he was himself not fully persuaded of its worth and that the idea was really Lang's: 'I am not, myself, convinced that

1. Davidson Papers, Box 12, Davidson to Lang, August 5, 1927.

2. Ibid., Lang to Davidson, August 10, 1927.

3. Ibid., Circular letter of Davidson to the diocesan bishops, September 3, 1927.

such a letter is wanted, but Ebor is eager that I should do it, and it can't do harm'.¹

Most of the bishops acted upon this request from Davidson. Personal contact and public utterances and writing were the main means by which they did so and examples of episcopal action in this way abound.

Some insight into the manner in which Davidson's injunction was supported by the administrative work of the League of Loyalty and Order and acted upon by the bishops is afforded by the Headlam papers. Headlam received information from the League about the views of the M.P.s in his diocese and he adjusted his letter to each of them according to their attitudes towards the Book. As is typical of Headlam's approach, he stressed the resounding success that the Book had in the Gloucester Diocesan Conference:

	For	Against	
Bishop	1	-	
Clergy	194	18	
Laity	228	33	

He then suggested to them that rejection 'will have a most disastrous effect both on the life of the Church and on the politics of the country. There will be undoubtedly

1. Ibid., Davidson to Haigh, September 3, 1927.

an agitation for Disestablishment, which I am sure at the present time will do immense harm'.¹ To M.P.s whom (from the League) he knew to be doubtful, he added somewhat of a veiled threat about the security of their seats in parliament. Thus to Lieutenant Colonel Horlick, M.P. for Gloucester City: 'I am sure that any vote against it would cause very great resentment to great bodies of Church people who are amongst your supporters in the city'.² Headlam also wrote to the prime minister, Stanley Baldwin, on the somewhat slender ground that 'there are one or two parishes in the Diocese which are in your constituency'. He adumbrated once more upon the dangers that rejection held and of his own knowledge of the situation of support in the diocese.³ A courteous and totally non-committal acknowledgement was received from Downing Street. Most of the M. P.s replied to Headlam and most promised their support, though some of them wrote of the awkward situation in which they felt themselves placed. The least helpful reply, but possibly the most revealing in illustrating the situation of many M.P.s was that of Sir Frank Nelson, M.P. for Stroud, who ultimately voted against the Book on both

-
1. Headlam Papers, 2624, Papers concerning revision of the Book of Common Prayer, 1926-7, Headlam to M.P.s in his Diocese, October 21, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Headlam to Horlick, October 21, 1927.
 3. Ibid., Headlam to Baldwin, October 21, 1927.

occasions, and who said that 'the prospect of this controversy being brought into the realm of politics is most repugnant to me' and that his vote would reflect the majority of his informed Church of England constituents.¹ What exactly did Nelson mean by this? Clearly he disregarded the diocesan conference vote and was exclusively concerned with his own constituency, where the only barometer of opinion on the subject would be the highly unreliable one of opinion expressed by those constituents who felt moved to write to him on the subject.

Henson also made efforts to secure the support of M.P.s and Peers. His 'private correspondence with hesitating politicians and ecclesiastics,' by his own admission, 'was considerable'.² In addition Henson published an article that was specifically concerned with the parliamentary issue, though exclusively directed towards members of his own House, and entitled 'An Open Letter to a Peer Perplexed as to his vote on the revised Prayer Book', issued in The Bishoprick in November 1927, in which he generally commended the Book, explaining its origins, the nature of its 'enrichment' and the fact that it was better suited to the needs of the age. Henson was popular among the peers, his speech later in the House of Lords was well received and his words may well have been influential.

1. Ibid., Nelson to Headlam, October 22, 1927.

2. H. H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 163.

In the last months of 1927 the bishops found much assistance from the work of the League of Loyalty and Order. There was close contact between Lambeth Palace and the League, whose secretary, Miss E. Monroe, was frequently in communication with Haigh. The League's methods appear to have been the encouragement of contact between supporters of the Book and their M.P.s and an illustration of this is afforded by a copy of a circular letter that was sent to known supporters of the Book:

'Dear Sir,

CONFIDENTIAL

'An energetic supporter of this League who is giving me his help in your diocese has told me that your member ----- has not finally made up his mind on the subject of the Prayer Book Measure, and that his vote will be influenced very considerably by the views of his constituents.

'I hear from many sympathetic members of parliament that while they are receiving quantities of letters asking them to oppose the new Prayer Book, they hear little or nothing on the other side.

'It will be of enormous assistance to the cause if you can personally approach your member, either by letter or by interview (as on your own initiative and not as the representative of any League) and secure from him a promise to vote in favour of the Measure.

'I should be most grateful if, should he express a definite opinion for or against the Book, you could let me have a copy or an extract from his reply.

'Without local effort there is no certainty that the Measure will become law. I ask you most earnestly, therefore, to do all that you can in your own district.

Yours faithfully,

E. Monroe
Secretary.' 1

-
1. Davidson Papers, Box 12, circular letter of the League of Loyalty and Order.

Throughout October 1927 a series of lists of the positions of M.P.s on the matter were sent to Haigh and an interim analysis was composed on October 18, 1927, and also sent to Haigh. It contained quotations from remarks that M.P.s had made to those who had approached them and though it was of little lasting value in the controversy, it nevertheless afforded the most efficient type of record of the situation as it then existed.

In October and November 1927 there was a continuing correspondence between Oldham and Davidson, covering many aspects of the parliamentary situation. Davidson showed a disinclination towards too vigorous a prosecution of episcopal propaganda on the Book's behalf: he disapproved of the idea that bishops should bring pressure to bear on M.P.s whose loyalty to the Church was slender¹ and he felt that the project for a large meeting in the Albert Hall, which might be viewed as some kind of response to the large meetings that opponents had held there, was unwise.² In early November Oldham conveyed to Davidson his fears - shortly to be proved well founded - that opposition might be strongest in Wales, Scotland and Ulster and that the '120 non-English members of the House of Commons form a formidable phalanx'. He suggested that Davidson might assist by contacting the three primates and by urging them to assert influence on

1. Ibid., Davidson to Oldham, October 4, 1927.

2. Ibid., October 14, 1927.

M.P.s and Peers; Davidson and Lang might employ their Scottish connections to the Book's advantage and 'might feel able to get prominent Presbyterians, members of another Established Church, to give a lead which might be helpful to us'.¹ Davidson acted substantially upon this advice and made contact at least with the Primate of Wales and the Primus of Scotland, though there is no evidence of his having made contact with the Church of Scotland. The Primate of Wales and the Primus of Scotland both agreed to do what they could to aid the Book's passage, though the Primus felt that caution should be their watchword and that 'in view of our position in Scotland, this would be a very delicate matter, and that unless very careful about whom we approached, we might easily do more harm than good'.² There is no evidence of Davidson contacting the Primate of Ulster; he may very well have agreed with an earlier opinion of Oldham on the situation there as 'hopeless' and that 'the best we can do is to get some of them to remain away'.³

So far as the secular press was concerned, although reference to the controversy could be found in all newspapers, it was The Times that contained most of the important letters and formed in many ways a platform on which the controversy could develop. The Times was throughout distinctly in

-
1. Ibid., Oldham to Davidson, November 3, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Primus to Davidson, November 16, 1927.
 3. Ibid., Oldham to Davidson, October 2, 1927.

favour of the Book, so much so that it was accused by some Protestants as showing too strong a bias. Albert Mitchell sent a lengthy historical disquisition to Bell in September 1927, with a covering letter of complaint that it had been rejected by The Times and that this was 'the third letter of mine within the last six months.....that has been so treated. Rumour is strong that this unworthy action of The Times is under episcopal influence.....'¹ Knox also wrote to Bell in complaint of the rejection of Mitchell's letter, but Bell was able to point out that in fact a letter of Knox had got into The Times that day.² The favour that The Times showed to the Book was a matter constantly complained of by Protestants, but the reason is possibly not that suggested by Hinde in a letter to the Reverend C.F. Nolloth in April 1928: 'I understand that The Times is governed by a Trust on which the Archbishop serves, if so that may account for some of the unfair treatment we believe we receive'.³ There certainly was a situation of friendship between Dawson and Davidson, but there is no reference in the History of The Times to any particular policy decision on the matter and it may very well have been a sense of loyalty to Davidson that caused The Times to adopt the

-
1. Bell Papers, Buff File, Prayer Book Revision, 1925-27, Mitchell to Bell, September 1927.
 2. Ibid., Bell to Knox, October 11, 1927.
 3. CSA, FCTF, Hinde to Nolloth, April 10, 1928.

approach it did. In any case, The Times was not uncritical in its approach and in early 1928 made suggestions for concessions on Reservation which the bishops were unable to accept. Nevertheless, the general advocacy that The Times gave was something for which the bishops were glad and which was held to assist the Book's chances of success.

The 1927 Book received powerful advocacy from a number of important churchmen and theologians, who wrote in its support. Extremely useful support came from a group of eight distinguished representatives of different schools of thought, who gave a series of public lectures about the Book in the Autumn of 1927 at King's College, London. The eight lectures were subsequently edited by the Reverend Professor H. Maurice Relton and Davidson wrote a Foreword to the book, stating that the lectures were 'exactly what English churchmen ought just now to have in their hands,' as they would correct 'an erring vision' about party feeling and are 'helpfully untechnical'.¹ The contributors were certainly varied and included moderate High churchmen such as Duncan-Jones, Francis Underhill and Miss Evelyn Underhill; Evangelicals such as Storr; more centrally-minded churchmen such as Relton himself, the Reverend Professor F. R. Barry and the Reverend Canon E. S. Woods; there was somewhat of a Modernist contribution by the Reverend Professor W. R. Matthews. The volume of lectures covered 158 pages and made

1. H.M. Relton: The New Prayer Book, London, 1927, p. 11.

a strong plea for acceptance of the Prayer Book and by its very nature was an attempt to minimise the friction that existed between different parties in the Church.

The Bishop of Winchester wrote at the same time another book of similar size. His book was of a more devotional type than Relton's collection of lectures, but it was designed to avoid too technical an approach. 'This book is not written by an expert,' Woods stated boldly at the start of his Preface, '.....It is written by an average man for average men who, with no special knowledge of matters of worship except their own experience in church, desire to understand this fresh revision of the Prayer Book both in regard to the facts of the past and the needs of the present'.¹ Woods also endeavoured to minimise party strife: 'I have found that Evangelicalism and Anglo-Catholicism, in their true interpretation, are not incompatible but complementary'.²

Headlam was another bishop who produced a book on the subject, based on his second Visitation Charge of April 1927.³ Headlam developed an interest in Prayer Book revision in the late 1920s and was one of its strongest supporters, even though in the early 1920s he had been opposed; his change of view was sometimes seized upon by his opponents as an

-
1. F.T. Woods: The Prayer Book Revised, London, 1927, p. vii.
 2. Ibid., p. viii.
 3. A.C. Headlam: The New Prayer Book, London 1927.

instance of his inconsistency. His interest in the Eastern Church led him to a warmer appreciation of the Epi-
clesis than was shown by other supporters and his Book
commended this feature especially. Another literary
contribution by Headlam was an article, 'A Defence of the
New Prayer Book', in the Church Quarterly Review.¹

Measures that had passed the National Assembly and
that were to proceed for parliamentary approval had first
to be considered by the parliamentary Ecclesiastical
Committee, which consisted of fifteen representatives of
the House of Commons and fifteen representatives of the
House of Lords. In considering the Measure for presentation
to parliament, the Ecclesiastical Committee was able to
consult with the Legislative Committee of the National
Assembly and it also invited objections to the passage of
the Measure. It deliberated for some months over the
Prayer Book Measure in 1927 and its report was not finally
published until November 24, 1927. The chairman of the
Committee was Sir Edward Vigors and the delay in the report's
publication may in part be attributable to his absence
during the Summer and Autumn months on his estates in Ireland.
In the Summer of 1927, Davidson was a little hazy about the
functions of the Committee and wrote (from Scotland) to
Vigors to ask 'if I may be informed as to what sort of
evidence is being taken by the Ecclesiastical Committee and

1. Church Quarterly Review, April 1927, pp. 200-218.

when. If it is desired that an English Diocesan Bishop should give evidence or answer questions, the Archbishop of York would be ready if invited to attend for the purpose if it be in October.....The Bishop of Chelmsford would be an excellent exponent if desired.....ofcourse if evidence or representation adverse to the Measure or Book are sent to you in writing, we should be quite ready to furnish a reply'.¹ A useful reply, in staccato style, was sent by Vigors to explain that 'A sub-committee of the Ecclesiastical Committee is now engaged in collecting the various objections which are urged against the Measure. These objections have been in every case submitted in writing, and at present no oral evidence is contemplated. It is hoped that the written statements may be summarised and considered by the Sub-Committee in October. When a summary is ready I believe it is intended to invite the observations upon it of the Bishops specially responsible for the Measure. After the indication given by Your Grace I have no doubt the Bishop of Chelmsford would be approached for this purpose'.²

Correspondence also took place between Wilbraham and Vigors. On July 21, 1927, Wilbraham sent to Vigors a large package of National Assembly documentation going back over the 1920s³ and there was a fairly constant correspondence

-
1. Davidson Papers, Box 12, Davidson to Vigors, August 17, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Vigors to Davidson, August 26, 1927.
 3. GSA, The Prayer Book Correspondence File: May 28, 1927 - December 19, 1927, Wilbraham to Vigors, July 21, 1927.

between the two thereafter. Wilbraham himself felt privately that the Ecclesiastical Committee was possibly going out of its way in gathering objections to the Measure and the Book. At the end of a letter to Vigors in September 1927, Wilbraham wrote 'Quite privately. I rather wonder whether your Committee is not going rather far in the way of encouraging objections to the Measure, sometimes from bodies who would never have thought of objecting at all if they had not been specially asked to do so'.¹

The various objections having been gathered, the Ecclesiastical Committee then turned to Warman to furnish a reply. Warman did this with the assistance of Wilbraham, who was conscious of the position of the Legislative Committee of the National Assembly, and the draft was sent by Warman to Davidson to request Davidson's opinion.² Davidson appreciated it highly: 'I doubt whether anyone else would have done it so well' and his suggestions for amendment were slight. Davidson preferred there to be no reference to Wilbraham, as it was important to retain the appearance of a private letter, and it would be robbed of this if the reference to Wilbraham remained.

The report that was eventually published gave no reason why the Prayer Book Measure ought not to proceed to parliament and it was favourable to the venture. It

-
1. Ibid., Wilbraham to Vigors, September 28, 1927.
 2. Davidson Papers, Box 12, Warman to Davidson, October 14, 1927.

consisted of three parts: the Report and two Appendices.¹

The Report traced the history of the Measure and the Book and of the work of the sub-committee of four in collecting and reporting on the objections. Central to the Report was clause 12: '.....the Committee takes 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'.² The committee also tackled the contention that the Measure was not the same as had been earlier presented by the House of Bishops and was therefore ultra vires and concluded that 'all the amendments made by the House of Bishops were "relevant to the general purport of the Measure" as provided by the standing orders of the Church Assembly and are not such as to make the Measure a new one'.³

Appendix I consisted of a historical survey by the Legislative Committee of the National Assembly, dated July 12, 1927, Appendix II was the report of the sub-committee on the objections to the Measure. Distinction was drawn

-
1. Ecclesiastical Committee: 13th Report. Report by the Ecclesiastical Committee upon the Prayer Book Measure 192-, laid before both Houses of Parliament in pursuance of the provision of the Church of England (Assembly) Powers Act, 1919 (9 and 10 Geo. 5, c. 76, ss. 3(4) and 4) the Legislative Committee having signified a desire accordingly. A copy of this document is among the Davidson Papers, Box 13.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.

between those from whom objections were invited and those who sent objections without invitation to do so. Joynson-Hicks, Inskip, Darwell Stone and Carnegie Simpson 'submitted statements at the request of the sub-committee'. The Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches and the Congregational Union of Great Britain and Wales were also asked to send statements, but all others came without invitation. The objections were then summarised and Warman's able letter of reply was also printed. In the plethora of printed material produced on the 1927 Prayer Book Measure, the Report of the Ecclesiastical Committee is possibly the clearest and the most useful analysis that can be found of the objections to the Book and replies to those objections. Warman was very largely responsible for this being so and the fortunes of the Book appeared to be advanced by the Report.

CHAPTER 9.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, DECEMBER 1927.

The debates in the House of Lords lasted for three days, Monday 12, Tuesday 13 and Wednesday 14 December, 1927. There is no doubt that it attracted considerable attention among peers; the New Statesman commented on the size of the attendance and described it as 'the largest that has ever assembled since the days of the rejection of Mr. Lloyd George's land-taxing Budget'.¹ Throughout the debates in the Lords, the presence of the revered figure of the Archbishop of Canterbury was constantly felt and frequently mentioned, not least by those who were opposed to the Measure. His opening speech touched upon all the issues and urged their Lordships to pass the Measure, as by so doing they would 'promote the strength and good order of the Church of England, and that in itself will be for the good of the English people'.² He broadly tackled three main contentions. Firstly, he urged that the Book was certainly needed to restore discipline in the Church and in this connection it was the ultimate product of the recommendations of the Royal Commission twenty-one years earlier. Secondly, he suggested there was no fundamental change in the doctrinal position of the Church of England and he justified many of the important changes and innovations

1. New Statesman, December 17, 1927, p. 313.

2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5s, column 771.

strictly by that test; on the alternative order for Holy Communion he held that the office was 're-arranged rather than re-written' and that two offices were better able to express the breadth of the Church of England on this matter; he justified Reservation in particular by the increased frequency with which the Holy Communion was being received. Thirdly, the passage of the Book would greatly assist the bishops in overcoming strife within the Church and would enable the Church to proceed to the more important tasks with which it was confronted. The concluding point was typical of Davidson's approach, and also of Lang's and that of many other bishops: the Church needed to dismiss this comparatively minor matter and proceed to larger issues.¹

The Earl of Beauchamp spoke next in support of the Book and countered the opposition of Lord Hanworth, whose speech had followed that of Davidson. Beauchamp stressed that discipline in this matter would be best achieved by persuasion and that the Book would ease the restoration of discipline. He made much of the acceptability of the Book in Convocation and the National Assembly and amongst some Nonconformists.² On the second day of the debate, Lord Parmoor spoke in support, on the grounds that the Book would lead to peace and unity within the Church. Parmoor spoke as an ecclesiastical lawyer and as a man of considerable

1. Ibid., columns 771-793.

2. Ibid., column 813.

ecclesiastical experience, on which he drew in the course of his speech. Both he and Lord Daryngton, the Vice-Chairman of the House of Laity, made much of the contention that the rights of the laity were given adequate expression in the National Assembly.¹ Lord Gorell also focused upon this issue, though he adopted a less legalistic stance and wanted to put forward the view of 'the ordinary man and woman who attend our Church of England services' and by implication such persons were not automatically on the electoral rolls.² Gorell gave particular attention to the acceptability of the Book to the Ecclesiastical Committee of parliament, on which he had served. Later on the second day, support came from Lord Dawson of Penn, who felt that opponents of the Measure were not giving 'sufficient weight to the result of its rejection' and he hinted at the problems of disestablishment.³ He spoke warmly of the work of Anglo-Catholics and that the new Book provided the degree of flexibility needed at that stage in the Church's development. Lord Sandhurst followed up many of these observations and though he was no real enthusiast for the Book, he nevertheless supported it and felt that the controversy should now be settled, if only for the sake of the bishops: 'they tell us confidently that without this Measure they cannot guarantee either peace or

1. *See above, pp. 137-138.*

2. Ibid., column 890.

3. Ibid., column 904.

discipline, and therefore in the interests of peace I dare not vote against it'.¹

On the third day the Lord Chancellor, Viscount Cave, felt he had little to add to what he described as a 'debate worthy in all respects of the traditions of this House'.² Like so many of the lay supporters in the House of Lords, Cave had no intention of speaking as a theologian: 'I am just the average Englishman, neither a High Churchman nor, I think, a Low Churchman, but one who throughout his life has held the central way, who is fond of the orderly conduct of our Protestant services and profoundly convinced that the connection of Church and State, which has lasted through good times and bad, is of untold value of our people'.³

The speeches from episcopal supporters in the Lords tackled more boldly the doctrinal issues from which the lay supporters tended to shy away. The only other bishops who spoke in the Book's support were Warman, Henson and Lang. Each produced sound speeches, that supported the more general opening that Davidson had provided. Warman, on the second day, was well known as the author of the bishops' reply to the Ecclesiastical Committee. His speech followed that of Pearce and he countered many of the suggestions that there was doctrinal change in the Book; his position in much the

1. Ibid., column 916.

2. Ibid., column 951.

3. Ibid., column 953.

same theological school of thought as Pearce gave strength to his views on this matter. On discipline, he confessed that the bishops had in the past failed, but he was not anxious for the creation of forbidding disciplinary machinery; 'the best legislation does not very often need to be enforced at all'.¹

On the final day, the opening speech came from Henson and was generally received as a fine piece of oratory for which he received much praise; the Westminster Gazette considered it to be the 'apex of the debate'.² Others, such as Dean Inge, felt that the speech was in bad taste,³ and Davidson, while acknowledging that Henson 'spoke with brilliant oratorical power and effectiveness' nevertheless felt the content of his speech to consist of 'not exactly the kind of arguments which I like best as coming from a Bishop on a very solemn issue'.⁴ Henson started by launching a further assault upon the 'Protestant Underworld' and defined the term more closely than he had done earlier. The 'Underworld' should be understood as 'that stratum of society in which the conventions on which society itself is built are not respected' and he produced a tract,

1. Ibid., column 864.

2. Quoted in H.H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, pp. 165-166

3. A. Fox: Dean Inge, London, 1960, p. 216.

4. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, vol xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927 - 1930, Memorandum of January 15, 1928, pp. 7-8.

containing uncharitable remarks about the two Archbishops, to illustrate such disregard of accepted convention. His attack was carried further to include 'eminent lawyers and ecclesiastics' who can be found 'to avail themselves of its assistance and to accept its dishonouring homage'.¹

Henson felt that the revision paid keen regard to changes that had much affected national life since the time of the Royal Commission of 1906: the changed social situation typified by 'the new dominance of labour', the influence of the War and of Modernism which the Book did much to meet; it was 'a modernised Book in the best sense of the word'. He tackled many of the objections. The Black Rubric's omission would be considered later by Lang, the possibility of omission of prayers for the king was slight, on Reservation no change of doctrine was implied. The National Assembly had approved and that was certainly representative of 'the masses of the people'. Relations with non-episcopal churches might be harmed by the Book's rejection and Anglican acquiescence in that rejection. The Book would provide at least a basis for the restoration of discipline, and the rights of those who did not wish to use the Book were safeguarded.

Henson concluded this lengthy, and at times witty, speech, with a hint at the prospect of Disestablishment if the Book were rejected. Establishment can only proceed on 'the assumption that it expresses the good will of the

1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, columns 925-926.

nation towards the Church, the fact that the nation, the State, really believes that the Christian Church is a valuable element in the State and that it is an assistance to the work of the State itself.....How can it be supposed, if you reject this appeal, that the great governing assumption of the Established Church can any longer be postulated?'¹

Lang's final speech showed again his brilliance in bringing inspiration to a cause he held to be important. Possibly his speech was a little too long, at least so Henson thought.² At the end of an exhaustive three-day debate there was little that Lang could say that was really new. He rehearsed again the extent of the approval that the Book had received from the Church of England itself; the ecclesiastical machinery by which the majorities had been obtained may not have been perfect, but he did 'not quite know in what other way you could obtain the opinion of the Church'.³ He gave a favourable interpretation on Nonconformist sentiment on the subject. He dealt with a good many other issues, and concluded with a broad consideration of what he called the two main issues. Firstly, that there was no change in doctrine; in making this assertion he particularly attacked the views of men such as

1. Ibid., column 936.

2. H.H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 165.

3. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, column 972.

Lord Carson and other Irish representatives who stressed the importance of Protestantism; the Church of England was Catholic as well as Protestant. Secondly, he tackled more decisively than had others - and he made this the final point of the entire debate in the House of Lords - the question of whether the Book would bring peace and order to the Church of England. He acknowledged that some blame attached to the bishops in this respect, but he made an implied reference to the good work of many Anglo-Catholic priests, of their value to the Church of England and of how inappropriate it would be to assert rigid discipline upon them: 'It is a very difficult thing.....to deal drastically with men before whose self-sacrificing work, often among the poor, one wishes to stand hat in hand with respect'.¹ The opposition from Anglo-Catholics, he held, had been exaggerated, and the Book itself would 'restore the sense of loyalty' to the Church and that already many Evangelicals and Anglo-Catholics were eager to give their support to it. In a powerful conclusion, Lang asserted that the Book possessed a much higher role than that alone: 'this Book is not to secure better provision for the discipline of the clergy. It is to secure better provision for the worship of God' and he asked for their Lordships' vote 'in order that you may liberate the Church from this besetting discussion for the main work to which it is called among the people

1. Ibid., column 980.

of this country'.¹

An interesting, unique position was adopted by Lord Halifax, who attended and spoke in the debate, a frail and aged figure, the leading Anglo-Catholic layman. The main burden of his speech was a plea for conciliation and he did not consider it appropriate to discuss the particular provisions of the Book in the House of Lords. His contribution to the debate was regarded as important,² though there may have been disappointment at the lack of coherence that the speech showed. He advocated his own wellknown preference for the Book of 1549, but was surely on uncertain ground in suggesting that 'If that proposal had been agreed to I believe it would have brought us all together'. As for the 1927 Book he forecast 'that it will not bring peace and that it will not bring order', but he would abstain and would do so as he had 'too great a personal affection for the Archbishop of Canterbury to vote against this Measure'. It was a moving, but not a strong speech, and it belongs to a category of its own.³

The opposition in the House of Lords was represented by the bishops of Norwich and Worcester and by a number of lay peers. Lord Hanworth, brother of the Bishop of Norwich,

1. Ibid., column 984.

2. J.G. Lockhart: Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax, part two, 1885-1934, London, 1936, p. 346.

3. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, column 846.

gave the opening speech in reply to Davidson. As with all opponents, he made a respectful reference to Davidson at the start of his speech. He then shifted his emphasis to the doctrinal changes that he could observe in the Book and made much of such well-worn issues as Reservation, the Black Rubric's omission and the changed provision for prayers for the King. The Measure itself he criticised on a number of grounds. Appeal to the diocesan bishop might have very little effect if the bishop were himself sympathetic to the Book; he disliked the rule-making powers given to the bishops. He also cast doubt on the representative nature of the National Assembly and the diocesan conferences, over which he felt that the bishops had very considerable influence and many of which had been 'charmed' by the personal advocacy of Hugh Cecil. Finally, he could see no great prospect that discipline would be restored by the Book and he cited the opposition of the 1,400 Anglo-Catholics. Altogether, the speech was a heavy and comprehensive assault upon the Measure and the Book.¹

Earl Stanhope opened the debate for the opposition on the second day with a speech that focused on the need to restore discipline within the Church of England and he gave notice of changing the motion to the effect that the House refuse to proceed with the Prayer Book Measure 192- 'until it is accompanied by a Measure to ensure order and discipline

1. Ibid., columns 793-807.

in the public worship of the Church of England'. He made much in his speech of the disciplinary recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1906 and the fact that these had not been carried forward to the same extent as had the recommendations on revision of the Prayer Book. For all his opposition, Stanhope's speech was characterised by moderation. He accepted that the bishops would certainly endeavour to do what they could about discipline, but 'the most they can do under present conditions is and must remain inadequate'. He in fact declined to put the motion formally, as to do so would involve two divisions, but he was opposed on those grounds.¹

Lord Carson rejoiced in the disestablishment of the Irish Church, as the present proceedings in parliament, which he judged to be quite unsuited to parliamentary discussion, would have no applicability within that Church. His opposition was based on Protestant grounds and on the clear opposition of many Protestants to the Book. It was a speech that attracted much attention at the time, and many of its points were supported or refuted in later speeches, but it conveys the impression of an emotional content and it was not well-ordered.² Henson felt that the majority of the speeches on the second day 'were intolerably boring'

1. Ibid., columns 831-841.

2. Ibid., columns 866-880.

and he included under that umbrella 'a desolating hour from Lord Carson'.¹

A somewhat meandering speech from the Duke of Buccleuch suggested that the people of the country did not know about the Book's content.² Lord Danesfort's speech, following upon Gorell's references to the Ecclesiastical Committee, attempted to place the role of the Committee in what he felt to be its correct perspective. It was not the Committee's function to say whether the Measure was good or bad. 'their duty is simply to say whether there is such an invasion in the Measure of the constitutional rights of the people of this country as would justify them in refusing to send up this Measure to Parliament.'³ He followed this important constitutional point with a detailed analysis - involving facts and figures - of Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic opposition to the Book and drew especially upon Halifax's doubts about the matter. His speech, lengthy, detailed and factual, was one of the most valuable and certainly one of the clearest from the opposition.⁴ Lord Hayter gave the final speech on the second day and spoke as Nonconformist who held that most Nonconformists agreed with

1. H.H. Henson, Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 164.

2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, columns 885-889.

3. Ibid., column 897.

4. Ibid., columns 895-903.

him in opposing the Book.¹

On the final day, Lord Cushenden, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, gave a speech somewhat in the same vein as that of Lord Carson earlier. He was doubtful of the representative nature of the National Assembly, he felt that the Laity were unlikely to be consulted about the Book's employment and he had specific doctrinal objections to the new Communion service and to Reservation. He felt himself unable to 'trust the bishops', whose record in the last twenty years had made such action impossible.²

The Bishop of Worcester, the Right Reverend E. H. Pearce, was by contrast with the other episcopal opponents the last vocal, and his speech in the House of Lords was one of his few utterances on the subject. Henson made no comment on Pearce's speech, at least in the published parts of his Journal, though Inge noted that Pearce did 'better than I thought he could do'.³ But the main episcopal opposition came from Pollock, whose speech formed the penultimate of the whole debate, immediately before that of Lang. He was at the time suffering from rheumatism, and so was seated while he delivered his speech. He opened by referring to Henson's well-known description of him as 'a sparrow sitting alone upon the house-top' and he did not

1. Ibid., columns 916-918.

2. Ibid., columns 937-951.

3. A. Fox: Inge, p. 216.

dislike the comparison: it gave him opportunity for a wider view. Pollock, as the 'historic churchman' which he considered himself to be, welcomed the fact that the Book was being discussed in the House of Lords. He held that the Book did not fulfil completely the requirements of the Royal Commission of 1906, he was doubtful of the majorities in the National Assembly and the diocesan conferences and felt that the laity had been inadequately consulted. He advanced, again, his scheme for a division of the Measure, but he felt that at that stage there was no alternative to rejection.¹ The speech touched upon many areas of opposition, but opinion of its effectiveness varied. Henson stated boldly in his Journal that 'The Bishop of Norwich was not effective',² but there is some doubt whether Henson was in the Chamber for Pollock's speech: in the course of his speech Pollock, when alluding to the Bishop of Durham, commented that 'I see he is not in his place'.³

The Measure passed the House of Lords with a comfortable majority:

Contents:	241	
Not-Contents:	88	4

-
1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, columns 957-968.
 2. H.H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 165.
 3. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 69 H.L. Deb., 5 s, column 961.
 4. Ibid., column 986.

Most observers were surprised at the largeness of the majority that was obtained. The result was attributed to the quality of many of the speeches of support and the conclusion was widely drawn that this success would influence opinion in the House of Commons. The Times was lavish in its praise of the House of Lords debate and described it as 'one of the most impressive series of speeches that have ever been heard in the whole history of the House of Lords'.¹ A number of letters of congratulation were sent, prematurely, to Davidson, on the assumption that as all had been well in the House of Lords, there could be no problem in the House of Commons. One such letter came from Lord Stamfordham who wrote to Davidson that 'The King wishes me to offer you his congratulations on the very large majority by which the House of Lords approved of the presentation of the Prayer Book Measure.....As I write the debate is going on in the House of Commons, but the King assumes that there also the Measure will be passed by a good majority'.² Further light is thrown on this interim situation by the leading article in The Guardian for December 16, 1927, which affords rare insight into the problems that the Church would face in the event of the Book's passage through the Commons which, at that stage, The Guardian considered to be virtually certain. 'By some

1. The Times, December 16, 1927, p. 15.

2. Davidson Papers, Box 9, Stamfordham to Davidson, December 15, 1927.

strange oversight there is no mention in the Measure of any "appointed day," and apparently there will be no legal obstacle to the use of any parts of the book the Sunday after the Royal Assent is given.....But it is to be hoped that nothing will be done without due warning and consultation, and that it will be made clear that at first any changes that are introduced are really of an experimental character. It is very hard to understand what a liturgical form is like by merely reading it, and congregations will want to know what the proposed alternatives are like in action.¹ Thus the matter of congregational experiment, which was held by a later generation in the 1960s to be a matter of cardinal importance, was introduced, almost for the first time, as a virtual afterthought. The experimental use of the 1927 Holy Communion at St Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate, in February 1927 by the Reverend W. F. Geikie-Cobb, is the only example of experiment that has been found and in that instance it resulted in brawling.² The fact that the episcopate forbade experiment, further enhanced the role that the Book possessed as an instrument of discipline.

Davidson had taken it upon himself to approach certain members of the House of Commons to request their speaking for the Book in the debate. He was naturally in almost constant communication with Hugh Cecil, Daryngton and Selborne

1. The Guardian, December 16, 1927, p. 947.

2. Davidson Papers, Box 5, press cutting from The Daily News, February 18, 1927.

and he knew that they would contribute to the debate. He made a particular approach to W. C. Bridgeman, First Lord of the Admiralty, to ask him to introduce the Measure in the Commons. 'One man after another has told me how satisfactory it would be were you to do so,' Davidson wrote, 'Lord Hugh Cecil is markedly of that opinion.....'¹

Bridgeman agreed to take on this task, though his letter of acceptance to Davidson reveals an approach to the task which was in fact to prove a distinct disadvantage to the Book's passage. 'I have not followed the course of events,' he confessed, 'and I am no Theologian.....I understand it is to be first introduced in the Lords, and so I shall have an opportunity of selecting my points from the anthology produced there. But even so, I hope you will not expect me to speak except on very general lines, or to enter into controversy on such matters as "Real Presence".'² In the event, it was Bridgeman's inability to tackle such issues and the general weakness of a speech which was designed to appeal to the 'man-in-the-pew', with no technical theological knowledge, that gave an uncertain start to the Commons debate and set the tone for many poor speeches in the Book's favour.

The Davidson papers suggest that the Archbishop did indeed receive much advice in favour of Bridgeman as the opening spokesman in the Commons. As far back as August,

1. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Davidson to Bridgeman, November 16, 1927.

2. Ibid., Bridgeman to Davidson, November 17, 1927.

in conversation with Dawson, he had been advised that Bridgeman would be the best man to approach, though at that time Davidson was surprised to know this. Davidson wrote to Lang that Dawson had informed him 'Everyone listens to Hugh Cecil as a witty performer, but not as a person whom they wish to follow. Bridgeman, strange to say, would be much more potent. Wolmer is not popular in the Commons, and Selborne is supposed to be too much in with ecclesiastics'.¹ Macassey, in a letter to Bell, had also urged that Bridgeman should be the man to move the Measure in the Commons.² Apart from Davidson's approach to Bridgeman, there is no further evidence of approaches to other M.P.s to urge their participation in the debate. In all probability the speakers were agreed upon ⁱⁿ informal discussions by the various groupings in the Commons.

December 15, 1927, was the one and only day provided for the debate in the House of Commons. From the start it was apparent that its advocacy there was weak and that the opposition to the Book had considerable strength. Bridgeman introduced the motion in a very general way, making clear both formally and in the general tenor of his speech that he represented the 'man-in-the-pew', that he was not a member of the National Assembly and that he had 'no claim whatever to speak as a theologian, or as an authority on doctrines

1. Ibid., Davidson to Lang, August 5, 1927.

2. Bell Papers, Buff File, Prayer Book Revision 1925-27, Macassey to Bell, October 11, 1927.

or on liturgies'.¹ His bluff approach failed. The mood of the Commons required more than Bridgeman could or did give. His speech was interrupted, occasioning an unfortunate outburst from him that 'I can imagine that those who dislike the Church of England may wish to reject this measure'.²

This accusation was unjust, and created confusion and bad atmosphere in the House, prompting J. H. Thomas, who took no real part in the controversy, to state his resentment at 'the suggestion that anyone who takes an opposite view has either disregard of or an enmity towards the Church'.³

Davidson was disappointed at this inauspicious start to the debate and noted in a private memorandum that 'Bridgeman, it is fair to say, had never claimed to understand the subject, but I supposed he would get it up, knowing, as I supposed he did, that all sorts of those who were in favour of the Measure trusted him to be its interpreter owing to his personal popularity. Somehow he absolutely muffed it. It was a poor speech with no knowledge and no fire, and one or other of these was in my judgment essential'.⁴ Altogether the speech was a disastrous opening and no favourable comment about it can be found. The Times recorded that at the end

1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 211 H.C. Deb. 5 s, column 2531.

2. Ibid., column 2539.

3. Ibid.

4. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, vol. xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927 - 1930, Memorandum of January 15, 1928, pp. 11-12.

of Bridgeman's speech 'a plaintive voice was heard asking, "Is that all?"',¹ though the Official Report makes no mention of this. It was in many ways the most significant comment that could be made on the speech.

Joynson-Hicks followed with a brilliant piece of oratory that steered the debate on to the doctrinal issues. Mr. Ammon then took up the cause and spoke as a Nonconformist supporter and as a member of the Ecclesiastical Committee. He made much of the Nonconformist support for the Book and of his own view, quite contrary to that of the previous speaker, that there was no doctrinal change.² The Countess of Iveagh spoke generally in support. Her experiences in a recent by-election had caused her to feel that the laity welcomed the Book and she wished, like Bridgeman, to avoid the doctrinal issues, and this in spite of the skilful use of these issues by Joynson-Hicks and Mitchell. She concluded by asking 'What is the real underlying principle of the Reformation?.....It is while there should be order and there should be unity, there must still be some scope for liberty of opinion'.³

Much was expected of Lord Hugh Cecil's speech. His close involvement in the whole process of revision was well known and the Book's advocates in the Commons looked to him

1. The Times, December 16, 1927, p. 14.

2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 211 H.C. Deb. 5 s, columns 2550-2560.

3. Ibid., column 2571.

as the man who might retrieve a disintegrating cause. But Hugh Cecil lost his nerve on this occasion and his speech failed totally to live up to expectations. He was unwise enough, as the fourth speaker in the Book's favour, to ignore the demand that the Commons was clearly showing for doctrinal justification for the Book's alleged innovations and his speech covered familiar points about the limited nature of the bishops' rule-making powers, the need for persuasion rather than coercion in the administration of discipline and only slight reference - and that stimulated by interjections from Joynson-Hicks and MacLaghten - on doctrinal matters.¹

The Times was critical of both the manner and the content of Hugh Cecil's speech. He 'attempted detailed argument with a nervousness that destroyed his usual incisiveness' and 'At the close of this complete, though disjointed, defence the House was nearly empty, members persisting in their appetite for doctrinal discussion and nothing else'.² Hugh Cecil, a well-regarded parliamentary debater, must have been further unnerved by the emptying of the House in the course of his speech. In the postscript to a letter sent to Davidson after the rejection, he wrote 'I wish I hadn't made such a bad speech; but as a maid servant in some novel says after smashing the crockery "I feels as how it was to be".'³

1. Ibid., columns 2578-2592.

2. The Times, December 16, 1927, p. 14.

3. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Hugh Cecil to Davidson, December 17, 1927.

Other speeches of support followed. Sir Henry Slesser spoke as an Anglo-Catholic supporter, countering Joynson-Hicks' strict Protestant interpretation of Anglicanism, and suggesting that the revival of Catholic tradition within the Church of England was in no sense 'Romish'.¹ Major Hills focused his speech of support on the provision made by the Enabling Act and that the security of doctrine was the specific concern of the Church, which held that in this respect there was no change. The doctrinal issues were not suitable as a matter of discussion in the Commons and he specifically asked Joynson-Hicks and his fellow-travellers 'whether they are prepared to stand for ever in the metaphysics, the philosophy, and the theology of the 17th century'. Hills concluded that the Book was a 'progression' and he welcomed it. His speech was sensibly argued and powerfully put; and it was valuable as one of the few that came from Labour members.² Mr. Buchan was a member of the Church of Scotland but supported the Book and asked whether the opponents were not by 'a narrow view of the Reformation tradition.....being false to that essential Reformation principle to which we are alike devoted'.³ Mr. Dunnico was a Baptist and a Labour member. To go against a Book which had the approval of the Church of England 'would be a

-
1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Record), 211 H.C. Deb., 5 s, columns 2597-2603.
 2. Ibid., columns 2607-2611.
 3. Ibid., column 2620.

violation of the principles upon which the Free Churches are based';¹ in any case he found the new Book much less sacerdotal in tone than that of 1662 and in this issue at least the bishops ought to be supported, even though he had no particular liking for them; he made the somewhat equivocal remark that 'I have never felt disposed to defend Bishops, or to say good things about them generally, but I do say that, the Bishops are no worse than other men'.²

The Prime Minister's speech was considered in prospect to be a most valuable aid to the Book's passage. Baldwin's willingness to speak in support of the Measure was ascertained only in November 1927, though both Archbishops had been anxious earlier in the year to secure his vocal support. Davidson and Baldwin had discussed the matter at Hatfield House on November 20, 1927, and in a letter to Bridgeman, who had been anxious that Davidson should secure Baldwin's support, Davidson explained that he 'spent yesterday at Hatfield. The Prime Minister was there and I learnt from him about his intended speech. I am very thankful to know that he is going to support you by voice as well as by vote'.³

His speech struck a basic and simple line and he had clearly felt no need to enter into detailed defence of the

1. Ibid., columns 2625-2626.

2. Ibid., column 2628.

3. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Davidson to Bridgeman, November 21, 1927.

Book: six months later he spoke on the same subject with greater conviction. He asked basically 'which course taken by the House of Commons will serve best the religious life of our nation?'¹ He urged acceptance of the Book on the ground that it was required by the Church of England. His speech had stronger political undertones than had most speeches and he warned especially of the dangers of rejection, which would result in rejoicing among the rebel Anglo-Catholics and would bring the issue of disestablishment to the fore; the attendant political problems were hinted at.² Baldwin's speech was regarded by observers as an adequate but not a really impressive speech of support. Inge wrote 'he could only do his best without enthusiasm'³ and Henson, though not present in the House, wrote that Baldwin 'seems to have spoken well, but was unable to stem the tide of anti-episcopal feeling'.⁴ Davidson had been informed earlier on excellent authority that Baldwin's speaking for the Book 'would ensure the passage of the Measure',⁵ but in the event, for circumstances stemming both from the limitations of what Baldwin said and from the atmosphere in the Commons, this proved to be far from the case.

-
1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 211 H.C. Deb., 5s, column 2633.
 2. Ibid., columns 2632-2637.
 3. A. Fox: Inge, p. 216.
 4. H. H. Henson, Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 166.
 5. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Memorandum of conversation with Lord Salisbury, October 19, 1927.

The final speech in support of the motion came from Viscount Wolmer, who detected more clearly than any other supporters the fact that the Commons was interested in the doctrinal issues. Much of his speech focused on these issues and on the logic of the church's proposals as the fulfilment of the earlier Royal Commission.¹

The opponents of the Book produced abler speakers and caught more effectively the mood of the House. The opening opposition speech by Joynson-Hicks set the tone virtually for all that followed and steered the debate on to the doctrinal issues that the House appeared to cherish. The whole ethos of the Church of England, he held, was being changed for the advantage solely of the Anglo-Catholic section and he condemned especially the permission for Reservation. He felt that it was not possible to 'trust the Bishops' as they were being asked to do, as the bishops had shown themselves to be weak in imposing discipline and were now wishing to introduce these changes to placate those whom they were unable to control. He concluded with strong assertion that members of the House of Commons should employ their right to vote on this issue which 'is not entirely a matter for the Church of England. As long as the Church is established, the final right lies with Parliament. Today, the final right lies with the Commons

1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 211 H.C. Deb.,
5 s. columns 2648-2652.

of England'.¹ All observers considered the speech effective. Henson wrote that 'Joynson-Hicks made the speech of his life'² and Inge wrote that he 'spoke with great earnestness and better than he had ever spoken before',³ whilst The Times reported that 'The impression of this speech was so profound that members did not stay to listen to Mr. Ammon's',⁴ that followed.

Subsequent comment on the debate usually linked Joynson-Hicks' speech with that of the second opponent of the Measure, Mr. Rosslyn Mitchell, Member for Paisley, a Presbyterian who, though not much in evidence in the controversy up to that point, gave a rousing speech based firmly on Protestant convictions and a burning fear that the Book would lead the Church of England to Rome. Davidson himself felt that Mitchell's speech was the crucial one for securing votes for the opposition: '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'.⁵ The Times reported that Mitchell 'loosed

-
1. Ibid., columns 2540-2550
 2. H.H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 166.
 3. A. Fox: Inge, p. 216.
 4. The Times, December 16, 1927, p. 14.
 5. Quoted in G.K.N. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1346.

Cromwellian thunders upon the Measure',¹ and Inge wrote that Mitchell 'fulminated like an old Covenanter' and concluded that his speech together with that of Joynson-Hicks 'did most to determine the result'.²

Other speeches of opposition were apparently less effective than the first two, but consolidated the hold that opposition sentiment had established upon the House. Sir John Simon posed two questions in his speech: firstly, he considered the effect that the changes might have outside the Church of England and he held that they would be disadvantageous to Protestantism; secondly, he asked if the Book would end the Anglo-Catholic opposition and he felt that there was no evidence to suggest that it would.³ Other speeches of opposition came from Sir Martin Conway and Mr. Walsh. Colonel Applin deplored the fact that the old Book in all its fulness would no longer exist (though the changes in the 1662 Book as such were very slight and purely literary) and he deplored the omission of some of the prayers for the King, an omission which he considered to be one of the first steps to Rome.⁴ Sir Douglas Hogg was opposed to the Book on doctrinal grounds and felt that the approval of the National Assembly should be considered by

1. The Times, December 16, 1927, p. 14.

2. A. Fox: Inge, p. 216.

3. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 211 H.C. Deb., 5 s, columns 2571-2578.

4. Ibid., column 2613.

no means the final word on the matter.¹ Sir Malcolm Macnaghten held that the destruction of the Church of England as it was then understood was highly probable if the Book were passed and that considerable difficulty would be made with other Protestant bodies.²

Sir Thomas Inskip, the acknowledged lieutenant of Joynson-Hicks, concluded for the opposition in the penultimate speech of the whole debate. The Commons, he urged, had a perfect right to vote as it felt best, quite apart from the earlier decisions by Convocation and the National Assembly. 'We cannot be the microphone for another assembly.' Certain aspects of the Book were acceptable, but the changes in the Holy Communion service and the permission for Reservation were not. He could place little trust in the bishops, who had shown their mutability in the last two decades and there was in prospect, if the Book be passed, 'more bitterness and possibility of strife than in anything contained in the old Book'.³

The Commons debate resulted in the rejection of the Measure and the Book, though by no great majority:

-
1. Ibid., column 2620.
 2. Ibid., columns 2629-2632.
 3. Ibid., columns 2637-2648.

Ayes: 205

No: 238 1

A close reading of the debates in both the House of Lords and the House of Commons conveys an impression of a high standard of debating, a fact to which many of the speakers themselves alluded in the course of the debates. It has subsequently even been suggested that the debates on the Prayer Book 'produced as fine a display of oratory as any which parliament has heard this century'.² The Times felt that the debating in the Lords had been superior to that in the Commons,³ but the paper's irritation at the unquenchable desire for doctrinal discussion in the Commons may have been a factor in this view. A contrary view of at least the House of Commons debate was expressed by the editor of Crockford's: 'The debate will not, we think, rank as one of the most memorable in the long annals of the House'.⁴

Two useful analyses of the voting in the Commons were made in The Times, showing the voting by party and the voting

-
1. Ibid., column 2652, gives the number of 'noes' as 230, but addition of the names of those voting 'no', columns 2653-2656, reveals a total of 238. The matter of the voting figures was therefore a matter of minor dispute, but was clarified in G.K.N. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1346, footnote 1.
 2. A.J.P. Taylor: English History 1914-1945, O.U.P., 1965, p. 259.
 3. The Times, December 16, 1927, p. 15.
 4. Crockford's Clerical Directory, 1929, O.U.P., p. xi.

by national region. The analyses were based upon the voting or abstention of 610 members. Provision existed in 1927 for 615 members, but 5 were excluded: the Speaker, the Chairman of Committees and the Deputy Chirman by tradition did not vote, and there had recently been two deaths among M.P.s.

	For	Against	Paired	Absent Un-paired	Total
Unionists	167	160	23	57	407
Labour	35	54	1	65	155
Liberals	2	23	2	14	41
Independents	3	3	0	1	7
	207	240	26	137	610

	For	Against	Paired for	Paired against	Absent unpaired	Total
England	199	175	12	6	95	487
Scotland	6	36	1	5	26	74
Ireland	-	11	-	2	-	13
Wales	2	18	-	-	16	36
	207	240	13	13	137	610

1

In attempting to assess the reasons for the rejection of the Book by the Commons, important regard should be paid

1. The Times, December 17, 1927, p. 12.

to the debate itself and to the superior quality of the speeches of the opposition members. The manner in which their speeches caught the mood of the house has already been observed, but Birchall noted the professional background of many of these men as a significant factor in their success: 'Out of nine speeches against the Measure no less than six were [from] very astute lawyers or barristers. On our side was one legal speaker [Slessor]: and he had discounted any benefit he might have been by publicly associating himself with lawbreakers on a recent occasion'.¹ A similar point was made by an apparently well-informed correspondent of the Bishop of Winchester, Aubrey Manning, whose letter of December 24, 1927, was sent to Davidson, and in which he urged the use of lawyers as spokesmen in the next Commons debate: 'I do hope the Bishops have learnt the lesson that it is par excellence the lawyer's job to put his case in the most favourable way'.²

Birchall's letter pointed out some other ways in which the members of the House of Commons may have been influenced by the form that the debate took. The supporters in the Commons had earlier arranged for Bridgeman to open and for Baldwin to conclude their case, but 'When this arrangement was published I am told Douglas Hogg went to the Prime Minister and protested against his winding up. His protest

1. Davidson Papers, Box 9, Birchall to Davidson, December 18, 1927.

2. Ibid., Box 6, Manning to Woods, December 24, 1927.

was effective and we were definitely told that the Prime Minister would not wind up or be the last speaker on our side. It was under these circumstances (for which we were in no wise responsible) that Wolmer wound up - much against his will'.¹ Given the circumstances in which Baldwin's speech was in any case delivered, this alteration of the speaking order very probably made little difference.

More interesting is the honest and disappointing report that Birchall gave of the final results of the immense efforts of the League of Loyalty and Order. 'Our return shows that 43 members who had given satisfactory replies to our enquiries actually voted against the Measure. This meant a change over of 86 votes! On the other hand 9 men voted for us who had been entered as opponents: this resulted in a net loss of 68 votes!'² The conclusion may be drawn from this evidence that these M.P.s were persuaded to go against their earlier commitment by reason of the persuasive case put by the Book's opponents in the Commons.

Much was subsequently made of the fact that the Book had secured a majority vote from at least the English M.P.s and only in their constituencies would the Book have been used. Lord Birkenhead, Secretary for India, in a forceful letter to The Times, was especially critical of the opposition that came from Scottish, Welsh and Irish members

1. Ibid., Box 9, Birchall to Davidson, December 18, 1927.

2. Ibid.

and wished that they would have followed the path of neutrality set by Roman Catholic members; he directed much venom against Mr. Saklatvala, a Parsee M.P. who had voted against the Book.¹ This issue aroused a good deal of passion and the case for these M.P.s was put by the Archbishop of Wales in a letter to The Times. 'We talk of the British, not of the English, Empire, and to circumscribe the National Church ~~to~~ the English counties is a curtailed estimate of her influence and power.'² Undoubtedly the rejection by M.P.s from these areas was caused by the strong Protestant feeling that existed in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales; they were well aware of the feeling of many of their constituents on these matters and they had no wish to alienate themselves by voting for the Book.

The analysis of voting by political groupings shows, proportionately, a stronger opposition from Labour and Liberal members to the Book than it does from Conservative members. The Prayer Book was not an issue in the Labour Party and members were left 'free to act according to their individual discretion'³ on the matter. The Labour party leader, James Ramsay MacDonald, appears at no time to have made any statement on the subject and there seems reason to believe that Labour M.P.s looked very much to C.G. Ammon on

1. The Times, December 20, 1927, pp. 15-16.

2. Ibid., January 17, 1928, p. 15.

3. Labour Party Annual Conference Report, 1928, Parliamentary Report, p. 71.

this issue. Ammon was a Methodist who had sought the advice of Scott Lidgett in July 1927 and Scott Lidgett explained the matter to Davidson. 'Yesterday C. G. Ammon, M.P., who is a member of the Executive of the Labour Party and represents it on the Ecclesiastical Committee of Parliament, sought my advice on the course he should take on the Committee and the line he should recommend to the Party in regard to Prayer Book revision. I understand that they depend somewhat upon his judgement in regard to religious and ecclesiastical matters. Ofcourse, I strongly advised him that he and his Party should support the Prayer Book Measure'.¹ But in the event, Ammon's support of the Book seems to have had little effect on his party. Similar advice was given to Labour M.P.s by Anglican clergy who had Socialist sympathies. Such a person was the Reverend F. L. Donaldson, Canon of Westminster, who composed a short printed tract dated December 12, 1927, urging Labour M.P.s to accept the Book; 'my association over many years with the Labour and Socialist Movement must be my apology for addressing you upon the subject'.²

But in spite of this encouragement from among their own members and from political supporters, the majority of Labour members who voted, did so against the Book. It is not easy to be positive about their reasons. They would

1. Davidson Papers, Box 13, Scott Lidgett to Davidson, July 11, 1927.

2. A copy is among the Davidson Papers, Box 6.

like all M.P.s, have been subject to Protestant pressure and influenced by the strong case put by the opposition in the Commons. Other reasons can only be tentatively suggested. Birchall suggested that the chance of "downing the Lords" appealed to some Labour members'.¹ The final remarks in the Commons debate were made by a Labour member, J. Jones, who wanted to say 'on behalf of the great mass of the workers of this country, that they are more interested in the rent book than they are in the Prayer Book'.² Did this represent a feeling of unreality in the debates by many Labour M.P.s and those whom they represented? Did it betray a sense of hostility to the Church of England and its know links with the Conservative party which then held office? It seems reasonable to conclude that at least a significant number of Labour M.P.s voted against the Book for these rather ill-defined reasons.

The Liberal members also showed hostility. Evidence suggests that Liberal M.P.s were anxious to evade the issue if it were possible. Lloyd George succeeded in having very little to do with a controversy that might herald further confusion within the divided and diminished Liberal Party: he abstained from voting in both debates and he made no important public pronouncements on the matter. His nervousness on the issue a month before the December debates

-
1. Davidson Papers, Box 9, Birchall to Davidson, December 18, 1927.
 2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 211H.C. Deb., 5 s, column 2652.

is shown in a letter from Lord Beauchamp to Davidson, reporting very favourably on a speech by Lang to the Liberal members of the House of Lords and assuring the Archbishop that Lloyd George 'is most anxious to find good excuses to keep out of this controversy'.¹ There is no evidence of any concerted action between Nonconformist opponents and Liberal M.P.s; indeed, there is some evidence that links of this kind did not exist. In early December 1927 The Guardian reported that 'The meetings of Liberal members have shewn that there will be no organized Liberal or Nonconformist opposition in the Commons'.² But with the Liberal Party comparatively depleted in membership of the House of Commons in the late 1920s, Liberal M.P.s must have been conscious of the danger of alienating those supporters who had continued to show by their votes their loyalty to the Liberal cause.

The safety of seats in a General Election was obviously a factor of considerable importance to all M.P.s. This matter had been advanced earlier by the Book's supporters as a reason for M.P.s to support the Book, though the result of the debate suggests that it was a factor causing M.P.s to vote against it. The last General Election had taken place in October 1924 and the next could at the most be only eighteen months away. Letters from politicians just

1. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Beauchamp to Davidson, November 23, 1927.

2. The Guardian, December 2, 1927, p. 907.

after the debate suggest that this was an important factor and that many M.P.s might feel ashamed of their abstention or opposition. Hugh Cecil in an important memorandum to Davidson after the December rejection wrote that M.P.s 'have loathed the position in which they have been placed; they dread the conflicting religious convictions of their constituents; they know they don't understand the questions involved, and when they are cool most of them will be much ashamed of what has happened'.¹ A similar view was advanced by John Buchan who wrote of the large number of M.P.s 'who were intimidated by propaganda and the fear of their constituents and refrained from voting' and who 'are now heartily ashamed of themselves'.²

Many supporters of the Book, and certainly many of the bishops, felt that the result in the Commons had been due to ignorance. Davidson quite definitely felt this to have been the case. In his reply to Buchan after the rejection he stated that he 'was not impressed by the attitude of the House especially in those quarters where ignorance of the facts was most obvious'.³ Lansbury also in a letter of sympathy to Davidson wrote that he was 'sure the vote of the House of Commons was based on ignorance and prejudice, not more than a dozen men on either side really understood

1. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Hugh Cecil's memorandum to Davidson, December 17, 1927.

2. Ibid., Box 9, Buchan to Davidson, December 16, 1927.

3. Ibid., Davidson to Buchan, December 22, 1927.

the new book and clever legal speeches did the rest'.¹ Most of the bishops - many of whom were present in the gallery of the House of Commons throughout the debate - would certainly have taken a similar view; the standard of the debating may have been high, but opponents and their followers too often showed a minimal grasp of what the purpose and scope of the revision was.

The intensity of the Protestant fury that had been successfully fanned by some M.P.s, such as Rosslyn Mitchell, came as a surprise to the bishops. The work of the organisations that were opposed to the Book on Protestant grounds was fundamental in this, and the House of Commons gave clear indication of it. Davidson was impressed by this matter. In a reply to the Earl of Rosebery he stated that 'the Vote in the Commons, though quite unintelligent, was a useful reminder to some of my friends as to the underlying Protestantism of the English people, and of our duty to remember it in any policy which we adopt'.² The New Statesman, which gave little attention to the controversy and which had little interest in it, also commented on the strength of the Protestant opposition: 'The really interesting thing about the whole affair is its revelation of the latent strength of Protestantism in England'.³ On all sides, this

-
1. Ibid., Lansbury to Davidson, December 16, 1927.
 2. Ibid., Davidson to Rosebery, December 16, 1927.
 3. New Statesman, December 24, 1927, p. 345.

fact was acknowledged. The roots of that Protestant feeling were strong; their nature lies outside this particular study, but it is worth observing that the Prayer Book controversy represents the last important occasion on which expression was given to it on a national level.

CHAPTER 10.

THE AMENDED MEASURE AND BOOK, JANUARY 1928

The immediate reaction of the Protestant opponents of the Book was an outburst of strongly-felt though soberly-expressed rejoicing. The leading article in The Record, just after the rejection, was entitled 'A Great Responsibility' and pleaded for unity among Evangelicals. 'We are not a majority of Churchmen. We never were, but we have by the grace of God been enabled to grow from a persecuted and feeble group into a large leaven of the whole body'. Evangelicals bore the main responsibility for the rejection; they must now act with responsibility for the future well-being of the Church of England.¹ The Church Intelligencer wrote of the rejection as 'Marvellous in Our Eyes', and called upon members of the Church Association to give thanks to God for it; the fact that the House of Commons debate had concentrated upon the doctrinal issues was strongly applauded.² The Church Gazette contained a special message from Joynson-Hicks, thankful for the rejection, but warning that the battle 'is hardly more than begun'.³ The Churchman's Magazine was more lavish in its approach. 'Victory! Doxology at Midnight. "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."' Davidson's defeat was

1. The Record, December 22, 1927, p. 916.

2. Church Intelligencer, January 1928, pp. 1-2.

3. Church Gazette, January 1928, p. 1.

'a tragedy brought on his own head':¹ he should resign and either the Bishop of Norwich or the Bishop of Worcester should be appointed to Canterbury and 'be given an opportunity to plan a remedy and restore discipline'.² The Missionary Messenger gave an extensive report of the debate and held that 'The British House of Commons has added yet another page to a glorious history, recalling its wonderful achievements in Reformation days'.³

Not all Protestant opponents wished to associate themselves with the full cry of triumph that came from these journals. Some felt that the moment was best suited to quiet reflection and were quite strongly opposed to demonstrations of rejoicing. A letter of Sir Arthur Hazlerigg to Hinde just after the December rejection shows both his attitude and that of Inskip; 'I have consulted with Tom Inskip, who is staying here, and we have agreed that at present the less said the better.....I am very grateful and thankful for the result, but my sense of responsibility is far greater than any sense of elation'.⁴ Further correspondence with Hinde reveals that Hazlerigg stood by this approach. A letter was sent by him to Hinde in connection with proposals for a special meeting, to be organised by the

1. Churchman's Magazine, January 1928, p. 13.

2. Ibid., January 1928, p. 16.

3. Missionary Messenger, January 1928, p. 1.

4. CSA, FCTF, Hazlerigg to Hinde, December 17, 1927.

Protestant Truth Society, at the Albert Hall on January 10, 1928: 'I absolutely disagree with the idea of this meeting,' wrote Hazlerigg, 'and quite refuse to have my name mentioned in connection with it'.¹

No one journal fully expressed the feeling of Anglo-Catholic opponents on the Book's rejection in December 1927. The Church Times had never enthused over the Book and it felt that the whole issue had shown the need for Catholics to defend their position; in spite of the mixed feelings that the Book had shown to exist among them, 'Almost all will regret that such a set-back should have been received at the hands of Parliament'.² But Darwell Stone's pleasure at the rejection of the Book was such that he was able at least to countenance the means by which its destruction had been wrought. 'While we could have wished that there might have been some other agency, our sense of the mischief which would have resulted from the Measure if it had become law is so great that we welcome the overthrow of it even by Parliament.'³

The leading article in The Guardian just after the rejection was an attempt to remove some of the intensity of feeling from the situation. Optimistic even with its policy in defeat, The Guardian felt that 'a Measure slightly

1. Ibid., December 22, 1927.

2. Church Times, December 23, 1927, p. 752.

3. Letter of Darwell Stone to the Church Times, December 23, 1927, p. 747.

modified so as to remove genuine misunderstandings would, if it were introduced, find a very different reception', but 'The one thing that the Church cannot do is to change the substance, or alter the balance, of a book so weightily endorsed both by the competent ecclesiastical bodies, and by the secular authorities that have given adequate time to its consideration'.¹ It is interesting to see how The Guardian sometimes dubbed 'The bishops' paper' by its Protestant opponents, followed in the period after the December rejection a line of policy that was virtually identical to that followed by the bishops; and the same can be said for the comparison after the rejection of June 1928.

The immediate responsibility for the next move lay with the bishops, and with Davidson in particular. Even strong opponents of the Book expressed their unhappiness in causing pain to Davidson by their advocacy of rejection and he was supported by much sympathy expressed in letters and public comment at that time. Throughout the controversy Davidson was an exceptionally popular Archbishop. He was conscious of this, and puzzled by it. 'One thing which honestly and without humbug puzzles me is the amazing flair of popularity, real or manufactured, which is current with regard to myself. The big cartoon in Punch in December² represents honestly I think the quite strange

1. The Guardian, December 23, 1927, p. 967.

2. Punch, December 21, 1927, p. 687. The cartoon is reproduced after this page.

PUNCH, OR THE LONDON CHARIVARI.—DECEMBER 21, 1927.



INTO HAVEN; A HOPE THAT FAILED.

MR. PUNCH IS CONFIDENT THAT, WHATEVER MAY HAVE BEEN THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE PRESENT CONTROVERSY, HE REFLECTS THE GENERAL SENSE OF HIS READERS IN OFFERING AN EXPRESSION OF RESPECTFUL SYMPATHY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY ON THE FAILURE OF A TASK WHOSE ACHIEVEMENT WOULD HAVE CROWNED A LONG LIFE OF FAITHFUL DEVOTION TO THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH.

popular acclamation which goes on from week to week and quite honestly I find it hard to state in plain prose what it is due to. For even if my prosaic and plodding work has been, as I think it has, persistent and rather indomitable, that is not what generally catches the popular eye or ear'.¹ But he felt a keen sense of disappointment at the rejection and he found the strain intense. He planned to get away to Canterbury on December 23, 1927, for ten days over Christmas, and commented in a letter to Gibbs, written from Lambeth Palace, 'It will not be rest, but it will be a change, and the stress in this house is insupportable'.² Nevertheless, despite worry and disappointment, Davidson concerted policy among the bishops before he departed for his Canterbury Christmas, and the bishops were not without advice from every interested party and from every angle. Davidson received hundreds of letters and telegrams, almost all of them sympathetic and a number giving views on the best course then to be pursued. The majority of these communications came from people who were quite unknown to him.

The projected meeting of Convocation, which was to have given final ecclesiastical approval to the Book, was cancelled. Instead a further meeting of bishops took place

-
1. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury 1903-28, vol. xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-1930, Memorandum of January 15, 1928, pp. 49-50.
 2. Davidson Papers, Box 9, Davidson to Gibbs, December 22, 1927.

at Lambeth Palace in order to decide on future policy. A statement was issued on December 23, 1927 by the two Archbishops, acting on behalf of the bishops gathered at London. It was characteristically moderate and endeavoured to minimise the issue of Disestablishment, which had been aroused after the December rejection. The right of the Commons to reject the Measure was acknowledged but so also was the right of the Church to assert its spiritual authority: 'We realize this duty, and are ready, if need be to fulfil it'. But the Commons vote was not to be accepted by the bishops as a final rejection, as it was influenced by 'certain avoidable misunderstandings'. The bishops therefore proposed to reintroduce the Measure into the National Assembly 'with such changes, and such changes only, as may tend to remove misapprehensions and to make clearer and more explicit its intentions and limitations'.¹ This policy was carried out during the next six months, resulting in further disarray within the Church and receiving the humiliation of the second rejection in the House of Commons in June 1928.

The compromise that the bishops proposed was inevitably subject to criticism. Many loyal supporters felt that it was not firm enough and that its production from a meeting of bishops was a basic flaw. Had not the recent debate shown concern at the manner in which the whole issue had

1. Statement of the two Archbishops, December 23, 1927, quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1347.

been dominated by the episcopate? Aubrey Manning, in his long letter to Woods on Christmas Eve made this his first and most important point. 'I don't know what laymen the bishops did consult before their pronouncement, but I know it can only have been one or two. Assuming it was, e.g. Dibdin, Hugh Cecil, Selborne and Wilbraham, I can assure you that this is not enough'. A 'sketch of the gist of the declaration' had evidently been sent to an Executive Meeting of the League of Loyalty and Order who were 'so alarmed at the sketch of the wording in one particular, the indirect reference to an official movement from within for disestablishment, that we unanimously resolved to go at once to Lambeth en masse. We saw both Archbishops, and as a result of our representation the wording was modified into its present form'. He concluded with a strong plea for further consultation with the laity as the bishops proceeded with their policy: 'I do entreat you that you make sure you have a sufficient number of laymen behind you: say a score or so, and including all views and parties; not only Dibdin and Cecil, not only Loyalty and Order, but also Anglo-Catholics like Shaftesbury and Phillimore.....and Evangelicals like Robert Williams and Lalham Pound'.¹

Such evidence that exists, suggests that Davidson consulted comparatively few laymen at that stage and those whom he did consult wanted a greatly enhanced role as the

1. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Manning to Woods, December 24, 1927.

most appropriate for the bishops to adopt. Hugh Cecil in a memorandum of December 18, 1927, following upon a personal discussion with Davidson, held the rejection to be 'a clear attack on the spiritual character and independence of the church' and this 'must be quite uncompromisingly met'. The Book must be in no ways modified as to do so 'would be to allow parliament to use its negative voice for the positive purpose of imposing its doctrinal views on the Church'. The language of Hugh Cecil's memorandum reveals that he was over-wrought by the situation and his positive proposals were high-flown. The bishops should carry out the policy and principles of the Book and the National Assembly should frame a new Measure 'providing that these doctrinal and liturgical questions should be withdrawn from Parliament altogether and dealt with (so far as the State is concerned) by the King in Council.....By this means we should avoid going to Parliament and should have only the control of the government of the day which would be intelligent and careful, instead of the ignorant and fanatical influence which we have to meet in the House of Commons'. He felt that there was good chance the Commons would agree to such a proposal, as M.P.s 'have loathed the position in which they have been placed' due to the importance of constituency opinion.¹ This memorandum was considered by the bishops, as Davidson made clear in a subsequent letter to Hugh Cecil, but he had

1. Ibid., Memorandum of Hugh Cecil to Davidson, December 17, 1927.

found 'no support in any weighty quarter for the suggestion that we should now try to amend or supplement the Enabling Act'. Davidson's own enquiries had led him to find 'no encouragement for the idea that the House would be willing to remove more from its control than has already been removed'. He feared that Hugh Cecil might not fully approve the bishops' statement of December 23, 1927, but that nevertheless he would be grateful, as always, for his help in procedural matters.¹ A further letter from Hugh Cecil shows that he did not approve of what the bishops proposed, that he would have preferred a stronger policy, but that nevertheless he would assist, provided the programme was confined 'to clearing up small misunderstandings and not making any substantial change'; he at once plunged into the procedure for the introduction of the amended measure as Davidson conceived it.²

An even stronger view about future policy which was stirred by the December rejection was Disestablishment. The matter secured the support of Henson, and though he remained the solitary episcopal supporter of Disestablishment, his words carried weight. Ultimately nothing came of this further issue that the Prayer Book controversy engendered, but it diverted much attention and was a focus of much discussion in the months after the December rejection.

1. Ibid., Davidson to Hugh Cecil, December 22, 1927.

2. Ibid., Hugh Cecil to Davidson, December 30, 1927.

Henson noted in his Journal on the day after the December rejection that 'this humiliating defeat may turn out to be a blessing in disguise for it has brought Disestablishment into prominence on a clear-cut and adequate issue'.¹ For Henson it was not a question of a sudden change of attitude; though earlier in his life and earlier in his Durham episcopate he had been a strong supporter of Establishment, he had felt the rise of 'Labour' had rendered insupportable the system of the Establishment as earlier understood. At Lambeth on December 20, 1927, he broached the matter with Temple, who felt the ramifications of Disestablishment to be so great as to make it best to see if it were not possible for the Church to have freedom of worship under the existing system.² His Journal contains many references to his thinking on the subject,³ until he made an important pronouncement in the form of a sermon under the text 'Shall two walk together, except they have agreed' (Amos iii, 3), delivered at Great St Mary's, Cambridge, on January 29, 1928.⁴ but Henson's lead in this matter gathered few followers and none of any real importance. He composed, in January 1928, a book entitled The Book and the Vote, which consisted of a collection of his sermons, writings and speeches on the

1. H.H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 166.

2. Ibid., p. 170.

3. Ibid., pp. 171-182, passim.

4. The sermon is reprinted in H.H.Henson: The Book and the Vote, London, 1928, pp. 1-22.

subject and in which he adumbrated his views on Disestablishment and made clear his dislike of the 'morally indifensible' action of the House of Commons.¹ He continued to press the issue in the 1930s, but with no positive result.

Disestablishment was by no means an inevitable consequence of the December rejection and Henson's advocacy of it was in any case the advocacy of an idea that had germinated for some time in his own mind. Many felt that the rejection was an affront to the Church, but that resort to Disestablishment was unnecessary. Relton in a letter to The Times on February 15, 1928, pleaded for conciliation and postponement of a crisis of this kind: 'A clash then between Church and State may be inevitable, but need we now invite it?'² Quick felt that Disestablishment may be necessary eventually but he saw 'the great desirability of avoiding an immediate raising of this issue'.³ It may have been the practical and legal upheavals that Disestablishment would inevitably involve that prevented even those who felt it desirable from giving firm support to Henson's initiatives.

On the day of the Commons debate, Pollock had written to Hinde expressing no regrets at the consistent line he had taken. 'I could not know whether I was working for now or

1. H.H. Henson: The Book and the Vote, p. xii.

2. The Times, February 15, 1928, p. 10.

3. Bell Papers, Pink File, Quick to Bell, December 31, 1927.

for the future.....The Reformers' work bore fruit after their death.'¹ At the Lambeth meetings after the rejection, Pollock maintained his opposition to the proposals and to the 'controversial' elements that they contained. Throughout the controversy, Pollock wrote occasionally in the Sunday Times whose editor he knew,² and in the edition of January 8, 1928, he put forward his views on the situation as it then was under the title 'The New Prayer Book: Way of Progressive Settlement' and argued, much as he had done earlier, for work on non-controversial points, 'First Points for Revision' as he called them. Thereafter 'obsolete rubrics' and more contentious matter should be attended to.³ But his programme won no acceptance among his fellow-bishops.

If some compromise was to be made, it seemed essential to many that at some point the compromise should cover the question of Reservation. A number of keen supporters of the Measure felt that in the amended Book there should be no permission whatsoever for Reservation. Dawson held that perpetual Reservation might be dropped, and advanced the suggestion - highly unacceptable to Anglo-Catholic opinion - that it should be in the vestry. Warman saw the issue as falling between Reservation and Disestablishment: 'A liberal Evangelical myself and desiring the same freedom for others,

1. CSA, FCTF, Pollock to Hinde, December 15, 1927.

2. I am indebted to Mrs. Pollock for this information.

3. The Sunday Times, January 8, 1928.

within limits, that I desiderate for myself, I may presently be asked to choose between permanent reservation and disestablishment. I value the establishment immensely; I value permanent reservation not at all'.¹ This was expressed in a private letter, but Warman's view of the matter must have approximated to that of many other Anglicans. Stamfordham also felt strongly on this issue and in a letter to Lang he wrote **that** 'unless the changes in the Prayer Book can guarantee Reservation without adoration it will be courting disaster to reintroduce the Measure into the House of Commons'.²

Davidson took positive steps to find out about the number of churches in which perpetual Reservation was practised. A circular letter was sent to all the diocesan bishops, on January 28, 1928, to ask in how many of their churches perpetual Reservation was sanctioned. An analysis of the returns was made at Lambeth Palace and it was found that perpetual Reservation was practised in rather less than seven hundred churches, a figure which represented 4-5% of all the churches in England; most churches in which Reservation was practised were in the province of Canterbury.³

But many supporters of the Book held that Reservation was a matter on which it was quite impossible to make any

-
1. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Warman to Lang, January 28, 1928.
 2. Ibid., Stamfordham to Lang, January 22, 1928.
 3. Davidson Papers, Box 6, Continuous Reservation Enquiry, January 1928.

substantial concession. Garbett tackled the practical problems in a letter to The Times on January 30, 1928, when he pointed to the plain fact that perpetual Reservation was practised, with episcopal permission, in six hundred churches and asked whether it was realised 'what great difficulty would be caused if the Bishops had to order at least 600 incumbents to abandon a practice which in most cases had been sanctioned either by themselves or their predecessors?' If such were to happen he foretold that 'Before us would lie years of intense and bitter controversy, which might possibly end in the withdrawal from our Church of some whom we cannot afford to lose'. He further argued that Reservation was not contrary to Anglican doctrine or to the custom of the primitive Church, that the vestry was an unsuitable place for Reservation and that irregularities were not frequent.¹ A similar view was held by Parsons: abandonment of Reservation would make it appear that the bishops had 'sold just those Anglo-Catholics who have shown themselves ready for the sake of loyalty to make "sacrifices". They are the very best of that school and to lose their loyalty would be to deprive the Book of half its value as an instrument of concord'.² The views of Garbett and of Parsons on the matter were practical ones to which there were no easy answers. Hugh Cecil also held that Reservation must remain

1. The Times, January 30, 1928, p. 8.

2. Bell Papers, Pink File, Parsons to Bell, January 1, 1928.

a part of the amended Book, though for reasons that were characteristic of his approach to the issues at that time. He saw the dropping of Reservation as a 'surrender' to the House of Commons and such an approach would be 'degrading and futile'.¹ Hugh Cecil's reasons for support of Reservation seem therefore to be less the intrinsic value of Reservation, as the value of standing for what the Church had agreed upon before the rejection by the House of Commons. Quick held a similar view that the Reservation rubrics could not be 'substantially altered at the behest of Parliament without a very serious surrender of spiritual claims on the part of the Church'.² Thus Reservation tended to become in the eyes of many the symbol of the struggle between Church and parliament.

Davidson had no liking for Reservation and was conscious of what he considered to be the dangers that underlay the practice. Early in 1927 he noted privately 'My own conviction is that on that subject we are on the verge of a doctrine of a materialistic kind, and that hundreds, perhaps thousands, of younger clergy, and a few of the older, are liable to drift into a position towards the Reserved Elements which is, as I think, fundamentally superstitious'.³

-
1. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Hugh Cecil to Lang, January 24, 1928.
 2. Bell Papers, Pink File, Quick to Bell, December 31, 1927.
 3. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1903-28, vol. xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-1930, Memorandum of February 13, 1927, p. 18.

But concession on Reservation was in Davidson's eyes essential: he had held this to be so in 1927 and he continued to hold firmly to this concession in the discussions surrounding the 1928 Book. His private memoranda suggest that he was conscious of what he considered to be a serious threat of secession by Anglo-Catholics if concessions to their thought and practice were not made. Thus in a lengthy memorandum written in mid-June, 1928, he noted that 'if the Bishops were now to introduce the Measure with provision for Continuous Reservation left out, the Anglo-Catholic party as a body would be deeply distressed and might conceivably say that they would withdraw support for the book'.¹ Later in the same memorandum he took a wider view of the subject and drew a historical parallel between the eighteenth-century Methodist secession and the prospect of a twentieth-century Anglo-Catholic secession. The Church of England has been criticised for not accommodating the Methodists 'a similar criticism might be current in the year 2000 if he [Inskip] and his friend can get the Church authorities today so to act as the 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'.² In considering further his forthcoming

1. Ibid., January 15, 1928, pp. 20-21.

2. Ibid., pp. 41-42.

interview with Inskip, he wished to pose the question '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?'¹

It is doubtful if Davidson's fears of an Anglo-Catholic secession had real foundation. There is evidence of discussion among Evangelicals of the prospect of secession; there is no evidence of similar discussion among Anglo-Catholics. Evangelicals could secede and link with the Nonconformist churches, but with which other church would seceding Anglo-Catholics link? The importance given to this matter by Davidson in his private memoranda at once emphasises the strength of Anglo-Catholicism in the 1920s and the wish of Davidson to make reasonable concessions towards the movement, and to keep to those concessions.

Inskip attempted to reach a settlement with Davidson on this crucial issue. He visited Lambeth Palace at Davidson's request on January 18, 1928, and Davidson noted that Inskip 'would be prepared to assent to a good deal that he dislikes in the new Book, provided we could get rid of the continuous Reservation'. It appears from the memorandum,

1. Ibid., pp. 42-43.

composed by Davidson, that Inskip would have been prepared to compromise on issues such as vestments, the Alternative Communion service and even temporary Reservation, but '....On the question of continuous Reservation he could not possibly give way'.¹

Inskip was the best peace maker from among the Evangelicals. Garbett regarded him as among the 'more reasonable of our leading opponents'.² A similar impression is conveyed - though from a different angle - in correspondence of the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith. Inskip's wish to reach a satisfactory compromise was known, as Hinde wrote to him on January 6, 1928, that 'I have had many letters the last week or two expressing fear at a compromise and I gather that there is some rumour going round about a compromise with the Bishops over the Prayer Book matter. Some of these letters quite clearly associate you in some way with the rumour....'.³ Inskip replied the same day '.....I can't say much about the rumours because I don't know what they are, or on what they are supposed to rest.....I have had no communication with the Bishops except a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury asking if he can see me when he returns to London.....There are plenty of people whose chief delight is to criticise and

-
1. Quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1348.
 2. Don Deposit, Lang Papers 5, Prayer Book Measure, Garbett to Lang, January 28, 1928.
 3. CSA, FCTF, Hinde to Inskip, January 6, 1928.

suspect those who do the work, of some defection and I daresay you have had this experience. The course I take is to ignore them'.¹ The particular correspondence ends with this letter from Inskip; indeed, the letter scarcely invited reply. But a couple of months later there is evidence of continuing concern among the members of the Committee about Inskip's attitude. The Reverend N. F. Duncan, Vicar of Crookes, Sheffield, wrote to Hinde that 'some of us feel very uneasy about Sir Th. Inskip's line and I have written to him very earnestly pleading that to confine our opposition to Reservation is a very dangerous policy'.² Hinde's reply suggested that as Reservation was very likely to be in the new Book, Inskip would still oppose the Book.³

Inskip was regarded as a leading opponent of the Book, yet his reasonable approaches in this way suggest that he was following an independent line and that he could have no certainty of where, if at all, his support lay. His approach was possibly less firm than that of Joynson-Hicks and a comparison of their speeches in the Commons gives further evidence of somewhat of a difference of emphasis by the two men.

The bishops worked at Lambeth Palace throughout much

-
1. Ibid., Inskip to Hinde, January 6, 1928.
 2. Ibid., Duncan to Hinde, March 12, 1928.
 3. Ibid., Hinde to Duncan, March 13, 1928.

of January 1928 on the form of the amended Book. The version that was made public on January 21, 1928 contained only a few changes, but by their nature they showed positive attempts to tackle the problem situations. On the issue of Reservation, the rules governing Reservation - which previously had been published on a separate, additional slip of paper - were incorporated in the Book itself in the Alternative Order for the Communion of the Sick, thus incorporating them among the rubrics of the Book and giving them thereby a greater firmness. The rubrics were hedged with conditions about Reservation: the bishop had to be satisfied of the practical need for Reservation before permission was granted, appeal could be made by the priest or the Parochial Church Council to the Archbishop and bishops of the province; a complete prohibition was placed on practices such as Benediction or corporate devotions and the aumbry was to be placed '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'.¹ The rubrics therefore left no doubt of the intentions of the bishops to provide for Reservation only for the Communion of the Sick.

Two other concessions on Eucharistic matters were made. The Black Rubric (on kneeling before the Sacrament) was

1. The Book of Common Prayer, With the Additions and Deviations Proposed in 1928, O.U.P., p. 317.

added at the end of the Alternative Order of Holy Communion, though with its reference to a local Heaven, it was not at all appropriate for reinsertion at the end of the revised service. It was a concession and nothing else; the editor of Crockford's noted that 'Dispassionate analysis of the contents of this document suggests that the doctrinal importance which appears to be attached to it is in some circles somewhat excessive'.¹ A declaration on Fasting Communion was inserted among the General Rubrics, to the effect that the custom was an ancient one but that 'such preparation may be used or not used, according to every man's conscience in the sight of God',² a pliable statement intended to give the least offence to those who held this matter to be of significance.

In addition to these changes concerning Eucharistic issues, the problem of prayers for the King - unlike the others, a problem never envisaged earlier in 1927 - was adjusted by making such prayers compulsory after the third collect, whereas before they had been optional.

It is not possible to be certain about the course of the discussions at Lambeth Palace in late December 1927 and January 1928 when the amended version of the Book was produced. It is surprising that the task was undertaken quite as quickly as it was. The bishops clearly had their

1. Crockford's Clerical Directory, 1929, O.U.P., p. xi.

2. 1928 Book, p. 223.

differences. Henson noted in the early stages that 'There is not much substance in this vaunted unity of the Episcopate': the bishops of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich and of Coventry were virtually joining 'the four rebels', the bishop of Chelmsford pleaded for conciliation and the bishop of Chester, St Albans and Southwark were 'almost bellicose'.¹ Even the confidentiality of the meetings was not observed by the rebel Barnes who openly declared on the day the amended Book was published that it was a grossly inadequate revision and that he would have favoured an open debate by the bishops.² The prospects of success were not strong.

1. H.H. Henson, Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 170.

2. The Times, January 21, 1928, p. 7.

CHAPTER 11.THE CONTROVERSY IN THE EARLY MONTHS OF 1928.

Two months elapsed after the publication of the amended Measure and Book before they were presented to a joint meeting of the two convocations on March 28 and 29, 1928 and a further month before they were presented to the National Assembly on April 27, 1928. At these debates and elsewhere controversy continued to rage. Much of it covered ground that was by then painfully familiar to all those who had been concerned with the controversy in 1927 and there is much reference to the weary nature of the whole process in these months. But the Book was slightly different, the circumstances certainly so, and some new features entered the controversy.

Protestant opinion was indignant right from the start of these new moves. Protestant agitation was held to have been the key factor in the December rejection and Protestant opponents held that the decision of the Commons should have been accepted by the bishops. The Church Association was angered: 'The justification for this high-handed action towards the proudest Legislature in the world is perhaps more offensive than the act itself. For it is assumed that the vote of the Commons was due to mere prejudice, or to a momentary wave of excitement,.....to anything and everything save its true cause - a sincere and intelligent conviction that the proposed Book is incompatible with the "Protestant Reformed Religion established by Law"'.¹ This

1. Church Association, 63rd Annual Report, 1927, pp. 7-8.

view would have had wide acceptance among Protestants.

Only two days before the publication of the amended Measure and Book, by a most unfortunate piece of timing, the report of the Malines Conversations ~~was~~ published, on January 19, 1928. These conversations had been undertaken by High Churchmen, under the leadership of Lord Halifax, with Cardinal Mercier of Malines, Belgium. The conversations were of considerable interest as forming the first part of any serious endeavour to resolve differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. But they never possessed Davidson's full confidence, as he was conscious of the comparatively partisan view of the Anglicans involved in the discussions and of the fact that Mercier did not possess full papal approval on the other side. Mercier's death, in January 1926, virtually signalled the end of the conversations and a report was composed in the Autumn of 1926, the publication of which was postponed for well over a year. Hugh Cecil saw the draft report and was at once conscious of the danger of publishing it at the time of the Prayer Book controversy: 'some Protestants will now certainly think and say that Malines and Prayer Book revision are two parts of the same conspiracy'.¹ Davidson agreed, as anti-Roman Catholic sentiment had been engendered not only by the publication of the Prayer Book in February 1927 but by one of Cardinal Bourne's periodic attacks on the historical

1. Quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1300, Hugh Cecil to Davidson, December 11, 1926.

continuity of the Church of England and he was conscious that 'A good deal of excitement or disquiet among unecclesiastical people turns on the Roman question'. He therefore felt that publication of the report should be postponed as it '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'.¹

This policy postponed any further crisis that might have been a hindrance to the Prayer Book, but the Book was rejected none-the-less in December 1927 and after that it was impossible to postpone any further the publication of the Malines report. The report was by no means an inflammatory document; it noted points of agreement and concluded that the position of the Papacy in relation to the Church was the essential point of difference. But the report was seized upon by Protestants as further evidence of Romeward tendency within the Church of England and the whole issue of the Malines conversations and all that they represented - in reality, not very much - was washed into the controversy surrounding the amended Book. The Church Association rated highly the significance of Malines and held that the report 'by itself furnishes sufficient ground for thoughtful men to hold that the whole question of Revision must be considered de novo'.² It also suspected - as can now be

1. Quoted ibid., p. 1301, Davidson to Frere, April 30, 1927.

2. Church Intelligencer, February 1928, p. 13.

seen, quite correctly - that the delay in the publication of the report had been intended to facilitate the passage of the Prayer Book and that it was in January 1928 only Halifax's strong concern that the report should be published that had forced Davidson's hand on the issue. The Church Association's views were widely shared by Protestants and the Malines conversations were a troublesome undercurrent throughout the ensuing months and played a part in the debate in the Commons in June 1928.

Though Malines was ofcourse an issue of importance, it was the Book itself, with its minimal emendation that attracted most of the Protestant wrath. It was the slight nature of these changes that caused the greatest anger. The Council of the Protestant Truth Society made this point in March 1928 and launched a 'Stand Fast' campaign, to preserve the victory of December 15 in parliament.¹ Some of the concessions were accepted as useful, but the bulk of the objectionable features were still a part of the Book, notably Reservation; the fact that the Reservation rules were now more firmly entered as rubrics appeared to help matters not at all.²

The proposals of the bishops were discussed in the National Assembly on February 7 and 8, 1928. The debates were tedious and tended to repeat statements already made in

1. Churchman's Magazine, March 1928, p. 70.

2. Ibid., March 1928, p. 64.

the previous year. Certain amendments were suggested and a number of these were accepted by the bishops. The most controversial of the proposals of the Houses of Clergy and Laity that were accepted by the House of Bishops were ones that were designed to enhance the importance of the Parochial Church Council to the disadvantage of the incumbent: thus the Parochial Church Council was empowered to insist upon at least a monthly celebration of the Holy Communion according to the rite of 1662 and the right of appeal to the Archbishops and bishops of the province in the case of objection to permission for Reservation. The rubric limiting the importance of the custom of Fasting Communion was also accepted.¹ The bishops further tightened the rubrics on Reservation, though the initiative in this case appears to have been their own.

These further changes were crucial for the development of a much stronger body of Anglo-Catholic opposition than had existed earlier and they led to the loss of the support of the one real liturgical expert among the bishops, Walter Frere, Bishop of Truro. Frere's opposition became known by his avoidance of the meeting of the House of Bishops on March 8, 1928.² His views were then given prominence in a public reply to the Reverend Canon S. Cooper, Chancellor of Truro Cathedral, who wrote - in fact at Frere's instigation - to

1. A summary of these changes is in R.C.D. Jasper: Walter Howard Frere, His Correspondence on Liturgical Revision and Construction, London, 1954, p. 147.

2. Ibid.

request advice on how to cast his vote in Convocation. The final version of Frere's letter shows the lack of enthusiasm that he felt for the first Book and pointed out four main grounds for his opposition to the new version, as amended by the National Assembly. Firstly, he considered 'revolutionary' the proposals for the new powers that the Parochial Church Councils were to receive; 'this new provision is an insult to the Clergy and a snub to the Bishop'. Secondly, though he himself was satisfied with the new Canon and the Eucharist, he felt that provision should be made for those who were not; 'Peace and contented worship can hardly be secured while the desire of so large a class of worshippers is ignored or refused'. Thirdly, he disliked the new rubric on fasting which he held to be too brief a statement on the matter and which said 'in effect that it is as good to break with Catholic custom as to observe it'. Fourthly, with regard to Reservation, he was critical of 'a mass of rigid restrictions' that had accumulated. These restrictions militated against two uses of the Sacrament which he considered justifiable: the communion of persons who were unable to come to church at usual times of services and 'advantages secondary and incidental' to Communion, but which he did not closely define.¹

Frere's opposition was a bitter blow to Davidson, though he took it with courage, as the letters that passed

1. Ibid., pp. 149-151 and 158-159.

between him and Frere show.¹ Frere's stance intensified the controversy in many ways, most crucially in focusing Anglo-Catholic opposition more clearly against the Book than thitherto.

Anglo-Catholics were placed in a difficult situation by the amended version of the Book. They could argue that it was needful to accept the Book and thus to assert the spiritual independence of the Church, a line of approach that accorded well with the Anglo-Catholic vision of the Church. On the other hand, they might argue that as all the amendments were in a Protestant direction and as a significant number of Anglo-Catholics had only just been able to accept the 1927 Book, it was their duty to oppose the Book. On balance, this latter course seems to have been the more popular and there was a significant increase in Anglo-Catholic opposition. The amended version of the Book was greeted with sterner Anglo-Catholic opposition than the 1927 Book had received. The Church Times, whilst applauding the bishops for having 'nailed their flag to the mast' regretted that they had hedged the Reservation issue with so many safeguards. Fundamentally the amended Book posed the question 'Are Anglo-Catholics to be expelled from the English Church?'² But the Church Times was not as outspoken in its opposition to the amended Book as has sometimes been

1. Ibid., pp. 153-158, passim.

2. Church Times, January 27, 1928, pp. 92-93.

held, and though it could not enthuse on the Book's content, it held that the bishops should be supported as the spiritual independence of the Church was much more important than the various points in the Book.¹ The Council of the English Church Union had again found it by no means easy to concert its attitude to the amended Book when it met on January 25, 1928, only two days after the publication of the amended version. The Council was able to accept a motion proposed by Stone that the Council affirmed its faith in the Real Presence, and thus focused its attention on the key issue.² A resolution was also passed urging the postponement of Prayer Book revision until after the 1930 Lambeth Conference.³

But Frere's letter of March 14, 1928, had considerable effect upon Anglo-Catholics. A meeting of the Council of the E.C.U. on March 21, 1928, adopted a stronger policy. The President opened the proceedings by commending 'a very courageous stand' by Frere and the Council passed unanimously a motion by which 'The President and Council earnestly hope that all Anglo-Catholic members of Convocation will support the Bishop of Truro against consent being given to sending the Measure on to the Church Assembly'.⁴ It was noted that

1. Ibid., February 3, 1928, pp. 120-121.

2. Acta of Council of the E.C.U., January 25, 1928.

3. F.L. Cross, Stone, p. 199.

4. Acta of Council of the E.C.U., March 21, 1928.

this policy had the approval of Halifax, N. P. Williams, Kidd and Francis Underhill, all very weighty members of the Anglo-Catholic party, and all either neutral towards, or supporters of, the 1927 Book.

The Anglo-Catholic Congress expressed in colourful language its unequivocal support of Frere's stand. 'There will now be few ready to exchange their Catholic heritage in the English Church for a pottage, however succulent'. The Congress also tackled the issue of the parliamentary over-ruling of the Church's decisions and considered this to be irrelevant. 'The cry of spiritual authority against temporal power has misled many; there is no authority so dangerous as ecclesiastical authority, if uncurbed and refusing to recognise anything superior to itself. So long as Catholic consent, tradition and custom are outraged by the proposals of the Bishops, the appeal to Anglo-Catholics for support has no more weight than if it came from the Imams of Arabia groaning under the domination of Ibn Saud'.¹ Other groups of Anglo-Catholics also united in opposition to the Book. The '1,300' Anglo-Catholic supporters - of whom much was heard in the Autumn of 1927 - were understood to have joined with the '1,400', the members of the Fellowship of Catholic Priests.²

The situation in late March 1928 was held by the Church

1. Quoted in The Times, March 20, 1928, p. 18.

2. Church Times, March 23, 1928, p. 335.

Times to show that 'the Anglo-Catholic party is again united in policy as it has always been united in faith.....only a fraction of the Anglo-Catholic clergy and laity who have voted for the Book will vote for it at the forthcoming meetings of the Convocations and the Church Assembly'. This change of approach is attributable not only to Frere's stance, but also to 'the new Reservation rubrics' that the bishops proposed.¹

Protestant opinion was also influenced by Frere's decision. In some respects his new position does appear to be open to criticism. Among many letters on his position to The Times and other newspapers in late March 1928 was one from the Reverend Canon R. W. Harris, Penrith, who pointed out that the 1928 version contained no real change in principle over Reservation and 'the limitation of the use of the Reserved Sacrament to the Communion of the Sick was emphatically asserted in the Measure of 1927'.² The Church Association held a more vigorous view based implicitly on that very ground. 'The belated defection of Dr. Frere from the ranks of the supporters of the Deposited Book, for which he is so largely responsible, should do much to discredit it.'³

Considerable opposition was brought to bear against

1. Ibid., March 23, 1928, p. 335.

2. Davidson Papers, Box 13, Letter of Harris. It is not clear to which newspaper this letter was sent.

3. Church Association, 63rd Annual Report, 1927, p. 10.

Frere's position. The Bishop of Winchester wrote to The Times on March 26, 1928, and the Bishop of London the next day. Winnington-Ingram made much of the gains that Anglo-Catholics were able to make even under the 1928 Book, particularly the dropping of the idea of using the vestry for Reservation.¹ A sterner letter came from Headlam, deploring Frere's attitude and urging that the new Book 'recognizes fully the Evangelical and the Catholic traditions of the Church of England'.² No bishop followed Frere's line of opposition, though Furze of St Albans very nearly did so.³ By late March 1928, when the Book was in its final amended form, it could be seen that the opposition to it was stronger than before and that its chances of success were declining. Henson noted 'It appeared that we had only lost the Anglo-Catholics without placating the Protestants'.⁴

The defection of the Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich, the Right Reverend W. G. Whittingham, was not unexpected and his changed position made a total of six bishops opposed to the 1928 Book, all of them on different grounds. Whittingham's enthusiasm for the 1927 Book had been slight and Henson noted in connection with the bishops' meeting after the December rejection that 'St Edmundsbury and

1. The Times, March 27, 1928, p. 17.

2. Ibid., March 27, 1928, p. 18.

3. R.C.D. Jasper: Frere, p. 160

4. H.H.Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 189.

Ipswich almost hung out the white flag'.¹ Whittingham explained his opposition in a pastoral letter in March 1928, and based it on his very high regard for the value of the Establishment and his corresponding uncertainty about the validity of Church representation expressed in the National Assembly which, he wrote, 'did not sufficiently consider what the rejection of the previous Measure by Parliament implied.....[The] creation of the Church Assembly has in fact given a good many Churchmen the feeling that agreement is not a matter of great importance, that the Church should insist upon a position of complete independence and the right to govern itself. It cannot have this if there is to be an Established Church.....The vote of the House of Commons was really the expression of the Christian conscience of the country. That, at least, is how I take it'.² But Whittingham was by no means the leader of a school of thought within the Church of England and he had no influence over any important section of the Church of England, as had Frere. His defection was unfortunate, as further evidence of episcopal disunity, but it had no real significance beyond that.

The Convocations met together on March 28 and 29, 1928. Little that was new was said in the debates and Davidson himself at the start pointed out the dangers held by the

1. Ibid., p. 170.

2. PHL, The Diocesan Magazine for the County of Suffolk, March 1928.

general sense of weariness, that it may 'tempt us into dealing with this solemn task unworthily' and he admitted that he was certainly conscious of that temptation.¹ An informal glimpse into Davidson's attitude toward the Prayer Book at this time is afforded by the diaries of Tom Jones who wrote of what Baldwin had told him of conversation with Davidson at a dinner on February 16, 1928: 'Canterbury confessed (after a glass of champagne) that he wished the Prayer Book at the bottom of the sea'.² At Convocation, Lang dealt more specifically with the points of difference between the two books and concluded with the assertion that 'We have to think of the effect of our action now, not primarily upon Parliament, but upon the Church itself. Rejection or even meagre support of the Book now would be a greater disaster than even a second rejection by Parliament.....'³

Speeches of opposition came from Kidd on Anglo-Catholic grounds, and from Guy Rogers on Evangelical grounds. On the second day a series of comparatively brief speeches were made by many of the leading controversialists. Perhaps one of the most interesting, sounding a note that was increasingly heard as the controversy wore on, was that put forward by Wilson, who asked 'What had all the controversy meant to

1. Chronicle of Convocation, March 28-29, 1928, p. 23.

2. K. Middlemas (editor): Thomas Jones: Whitehall Diary, vol. ii, 1926-1930, O.U.P., 1969, pp. 132-133.

3. Chronicle of Convocation, March 28, 1928, p. 30.

the Church today?' and he concluded that it had meant very little.¹

The Measure and the Book passed Convocation, but by unimpressive majorities:

	For	Against
Upper House of Canterbury	20	6
Upper House of York	9	0
Lower House of Canterbury	126	48
Lower House of York	50	19

2

Protestant agitation gathered momentum during the months before the new Measure went before parliament. The Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith stated its unequivocal opposition to the amended form in a communication to Davidson on February 6, 1928, and the subsequent further concessions did nothing to alter this view.

What appears to be a novel form of opposition to the Book was used by the Committee in May 1928, almost as a last ditch attempt to frustrate the Book's passage.

1. Ibid., pp. 110-111.

2. Crockford's Clerical Directory, 1929, O.U.P., p. xi.

Editorial Services Limited were employed by the Committee 'to organise and undertake a campaign of Press propaganda designed to bring about the rejection by Parliament of the Prayer Book Measure 1928'.¹ For their services they were paid a fee of two hundred guineas² and they deposited with the Committee a file of over 4,000 press cuttings, that were largely attributable to their work. The Company had virtually three weeks in which to organise this campaign, from May 18, 1928, and both the file of press cuttings and the report give evidence of intense activity of a highly professional kind. A fundamental method was to approach well-known opponents of the Book, whose names and addresses were obtained from the Committee, and to persuade them to write articles; in some cases Editorial Services themselves 'prepared and supplied suitable matter for publication over influential signatures'. Mr. Albert Mitchell 'most ably helped' Editorial Services in preparing such articles, some of which were published above the signatures of Inskip, Macnaghten and other M.P.s. Literary contributions were made by Pollock, Knox and Archdeacon Thorpe and Editorial Services 'persuaded' the Morning Post and the Sunday Times to publish these. Hostile letters

-
1. CSA, Editorial Services Limited: Confidential Report to the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith (Prayer Book Measure 1928), for the period May 18 to June 14, 1928.
 2. CSA, FCTF, Baxter (National Church League) to Hinde, July 12, 1928.

were countered in the press by the initiative of Editorial Services. Much effort was made to 'present the case against the new Book forcibly before the "plain man"' by dispatching articles by Pollock and Knox to the provincial press.

Reviews of Joynson-Hicks' book were also distributed to the Press. As a final effort, Editorial Services 'distributed certain literature among M.P.s at the House, which we have reason to believe secured the turn-over of a few votes'.¹

No other written evidence has been discovered for the employment of professional agencies such as this for the propagation of a campaign in the course of the controversy. It was thorough and cannot have been without its effect, even though it is not possible to gauge this very closely.

The Committee endeavoured also to secure support from organisations that had not cooperated with them in 1927. In March 1928 Hinde wrote to the Venerable J. W. Hunkin, Archdeacon of Coventry and a member of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement. 'Is it too much to hope,' he wrote, 'that you, and indeed the Group Movement as a whole, will now throw in your lot with us?.....We have, as I pointed out at Canon Storr's house, considerable divergencies of opinion working together and the Group Movement does not appear to be outside the limit but really within'.² But nothing came of this approach; the Anglican Evangelical

1. The report cited gives full detail of the Company's work.

2. CSA, FCTF, Hinde to Hunkin, March 19, 1928.

Group Movement continued to support the 1928 Book, though there were differences of opinion among them.¹ Activity seems at much the same level in 1928 as it was in 1927 and enthusiasm had not slackened. The Committee was also imbued with a feeling of certain success. The nervous Pulvertaft was able to write in April 1928 that 'everything seems in our favour as everything seemed against us last December'² and in March 1928, Archdeacon Thorpe wrote of his belief that 'the P.B.-Hindenburg line is breaking. Our arguments are, I believe, soaking in'.³ Optimism appeared everywhere in the Committee, but the continuing activity and the employment of Editorial Services shows that no changes were to be taken.

The National Church League was completely opposed to the amended Book. A special meeting of the Executive Committee was held on March 22, 1928, to consider the new Measure and Book. A resolution was passed, pledging complete opposition to it, putting forward also the view that the amendments had changed the matter very little. They were opposed to the new Communion Office, which had not been changed and which was 'doctrinally erroneous and contrary to the Word of God'; they were opposed to permission for Reservation as 'it is well known that this practice has led

1. Ibid., Hunkin to Hinde, March 25, 1928.

2. Ibid., Pulvertaft to Hinde, April 17, 1928.

3. Ibid., Thorpe to Hinde, March 5, 1928.

and will lead to Adoration'; they also opposed prayers for the dead and 'the unsatisfactory treatment of the Old Testament scriptures'.¹ At a later meeting the League resolved to send a letter to the Ecclesiastical Committee, and this formed one of the many Protestant objections with which the Committee had again to deal.²

The Church Intelligencer displayed its characteristic vigour throughout these months. Malines, Baldwin, Henson and Disestablishment, the lack of discipline in the Church, as well as the content of the Book itself: criticism was sharply focused on all these old and new themes; The Church Intelligencer was aptly entitled. The relationship of the bishops to their congregations was likened to that of the Spider and the Fly in the nursery rhyme:

"Will you walk into our Parlour?"
Said the Bishops to the Pews;
"There are odours to perfume you,
There are robes of varied hues;....
If the Clergy oft are restless,
And refuse to toe the line,
We must give them ample licence,
Lest to follow they decline...."³

In the final analysis, it was the doctrinal issues that the Church Association saw as the key ones. This point is made quite clear in its submission to the Ecclesiastical

-
1. Ibid., National Church League, Executive Committee Minutes, March 22, 1928, pp. 217-218.
 2. Ibid., April 25, 1928, p. 230.
 3. Church Intelligencer, March 1928, p. 34.

Committee and in the final article on the subject in June 1928.¹

The Missionary Messenger affords little evidence of the work of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society at this time, though in May 1928 it reaffirmed the Society's complete opposition to the Book.²

The Protestant Truth Society continued uncompromising and exciting opposition. The 'Stand Fast' campaign, begun earlier in the year, was continued. In April the Society was entrusted with the task of sending commemorative Bibles to every M.P. who had voted against the Book in December. This generous gesture originated with the Reverend Henry Anton, Vicar of Christ Church, Coventry, and involved the dispatch of half-guinea Bibles with the Houses of Parliament blocked in gold on the front and the inscription 'In grateful remembrance of December 15th, 1927'.³

The methods of the Protestant Truth Society appeared to be much as in 1927. One of its more prominent activities was the Annual Meeting at King's Hall, Holborn on May 21, 1928. 'In the evening there will be a general Protestant Rally, when the latest position of the Prayer Book Fight will be fully dealt with.....No Protestant in London should

1. Ibid., June 1928, pp. 61-64.

2. Missionary Messenger, May 1928, p. 58.

3. Churchman's Magazine, May 1928, p. 117. There are a number of references to this matter, but I regret I have been unable to find any copy of the Bible with this inscription.

let his or her place be empty!'¹ The Society also composed rhymes to press its opposition:

'Why is it that the Bishops have
In secret Convocation
Concocted this most deadly bomb
To fling upon our Nation?' 2

The output of literature throughout 1928 continued unabated and the controversy was approached from every conceivable angle. Much of the literature was slight in content and written by enthusiasts who played little major part in the controversy itself. Books of particular importance were written by Joynson-Hicks, Henson and Davidson.

Davidson's book, The Prayer Book: Our Hope and Meaning, was little more than an extended pamphlet when it was published in May 1928 and it must have been a disappointment to those who earlier in the year had encouraged Davidson to write it. The origin of the book appears to lie in an exchange of views between Bell and the Reverend Arthur Hird, of Hodder and Stoughton, after Christmas 1927. Subsequently Bell wrote to Davidson that both Hird and Parsons had pointed out 'the great opportunity that the Church of England has through the Parliamentary check of stating their case as a Church to the public'. Hird felt that the Commons vote was 'really based on deep religious convictions' and

1. Churchman's Magazine, May 1928, p. 110.

2. Ibid., p. 119.

that the moment was opportune for response in this way.¹ Bell then proposed that the draft should be prepared by Parsons, the Reverend J. K. Mozley and himself. In the event, the efforts of these men were not really employed, and Davidson - who had been persuaded that a book of this kind could be useful - composed it himself in April. Bell was kept in touch with progress by M. Gott in a letter from Lambeth Palace. Gott wrote that it was developing as 'a rather turgid and Randallian Open Letter of about (say) 3,000 - 3,500 words'. The book began 'wellish' but then became lost in 'rather vague prosy generalities - and I rather tremble about the thing'.²

The eventual publication had a simple format and was comparatively brief and cheap: only 44 pages in length and only 6d. in cost. It was purposefully aimed at a popular appeal and carried considerable weight on account of its author. Davidson wrote for people 'who have the religious well-being of England at heart, but who find the ecclesiastical discussions either irritating or puzzling or intolerably dull'.³ The justification for the Prayer Book was put in general terms. It was a 'Book for the Twentieth Century', it had been approved by the Church and the dangers it held had been exaggerated.

-
1. Bell Papers, Pink File, Bell to Davidson, January 23, 1928.
 2. Bell Papers, Pink File, Gott to Bell, April 3, 1928.
 3. R.T. Davidson: The Prayer Book: Our Hope and Meaning, London, 1928, p. 7.

The pamphlet was not considered a success. Bell, who may have been disappointed that the book did not possess the firmness that he had earlier envisaged, subsequently considered that Davidson's 'own brochure, while straightforward and disarming, did not influence votes' and that this was so because it appeared 'too late in the day'.¹ The Record called it the 'Primate's manifesto' and viewed it unfavourably.² The Guardian showed, as ever, its loyalty to the Archbishop in a leading article entitled 'The Captain's Faith' and described it as 'the most effective presentment of the matter that has yet been made' and attributed its effectiveness to its aiming at 'explanation rather than defence',³ but it may have been defence that was more seriously needed than was explanation at that stage.

Temple also contributed a booklet that was virtually a reply to Joynson-Hicks, but it was not an adequate response. Henson wrote of it as 'confessedly a hasty composition, and [it] very plainly discloses the fact'.⁴

More impressive support than was represented by either of these two publications came from Henson himself in The Book and the Vote, published in February 1928, much earlier than the efforts of Davidson and Temple. It was different

1. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1350.

2. The Record, June 7, 1928, p. 399.

3. The Guardian, June 8, 1928, p. 360.

4. H.H. Henson: Retrospect, vol. ii, p. 195.

in purpose to the other two, and whilst making a strong support for the Book, its main intention was to make recommendation for Disestablishment. It occasioned perhaps greater comment on the latter issue than on the former.

Joynson-Hicks was virtually the only opponent to write an important book on the subject, though pamphlet production was very probably more extensive among Protestant opponents than it was elsewhere. His book, The Prayer Book Crisis was published in May 1928. In the Preface, Joynson-Hicks paid tribute to Mr. Guy Johnson 'who has assisted me in the preparation of the work';¹ Guy Johnson is said to have undertaken the bulk of the preparatory work for the book.² Joynson-Hicks' book had an unexciting style but it fell into a tradition that Henson well recognised in his review of it for The Times: 'It is an excellent example of the full-blooded Protestant polemic with which the late Sir William Harcourt regaled the British public a generation ago, though it would be unfair to that admirable writer to suggest that together with his ecclesiastical opinions has been resuscitated also his fine controversial style'.³

Joynson-Hicks' book was historical in form and the earlier part of it surveyed the circumstances leading to the emergence of the Book of 1662. Much was made of the

-
1. W. Joynson-Hicks: The Prayer Book Crisis, London, 1928, p. v.
 2. I am indebted to the Reverend R. T. Beckwith, Librarian, Latimer House, Oxford, for this information.
 3. The Times, May 30, 1928, p. 9.

'ritualistic aggression' engendered by the Oxford Movement, of the controversies at the turn of the century and of the Anglo-Catholic developments in the 1920s. The approval of the 1927 proposals by the Convocations was basically attributed to the fact the 'Anglo-Catholic interests are very strongly represented in Convocation, especially in the two Lower Houses'¹ and later 'the strongest episcopal pressure was exerted' to secure the favourable result in the Church Assembly.² His opposition to the 1927 Book on doctrinal grounds was adumbrated and the changes in the 1928 Book were held to be virtually meaningless by the utterances of Winnington-Ingram and Lang, whose comments to that effect were quoted.³ Joynson-Hicks' book gave a full consideration to the whole issue from the Protestant point of view and its general tenor is interesting in showing the continued emphasis upon doctrinal issues, that had won Joynson-Hicks and his fellow-travellers success in December 1927. By contrast the doctrinal content of books among the supporters was slight.

1. W. Joynson-Hicks: The Prayer Book Crisis, p. 113.

2. Ibid., p. 123.

3. Ibid., p. 142.

CHAPTER 12.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, JUNE 1928

After the amended Measure and Book had passed the National Assembly on April 27, 1928, the Measure was destined for re-presentation to parliament. The Ecclesiastical Committee was duly re-assembled and gave consideration to the amended Book and to the plethora of objections that were lodged against it. The objections were entirely from Protestant opinion¹ and the Committee felt that 'they do not seem.....very materially to strengthen the arguments which were presented by representatives of that school of thought last year.....'² The agreed concessions were outlined and the Committee in paragraph 6 made highly pertinent comment on the present and future legal standing of much of the 'innovation' for which the Book provided. 'The Prayer Book in its revised form presents certain features, or concessions, such as the limited practice of Reservation, the permissive use of the chasuble, of wafer bread and of the mixed chalice, and the use of prayers for the dead, which to uncompromising Protestant feeling will certainly be found repugnant. The legality of these practices has long been at least a matter of controversy; if the Measure were to pass, the legality could be in controversy no longer.

-
1. Report by the Ecclesiastical Committee on the Prayer Book Measure, 1928, laid before the Houses of Parliament in pursuance of the Church of England (Assembly) Powers Act, 1919. A copy of this document is among the Davidson Papers Box 13.
 2. Ibid.

It is argued that these practices involve, or may be held to involve, a change of doctrine, and that in an anti-Protestant sense. Obviously opposition on these grounds cannot be conciliated by concessions on points of detail and explanatory amendments such as are now proposed'.¹ As in 1927, the Committee could see no reason why the Book affected 'prejudicially the constitutional rights of His Majesty's subjects' and it ought to proceed. The report was dated May 16, 1928, only some three weeks after the passage of the Measure through the National Assembly.

The Measure was debated for a second time in the House of Commons on June 13 and 14, 1928. There was felt to be no need for it to go again to the House of Lords - and no pressure for it to do so - and a two-day debate was considered to be an improvement on the one-day debate in December 1927.

The Measure was introduced by the Solicitor General, Sir Boyd Merriman, who gave a more forceful and more successful speech than had Bridgeman in December. The historical circumstances surrounding the origins of the Book were competently outlined and he pointed out the concessions that had been made in order to clarify the fact that there was no doctrinal change. It was a sound speech of defence of the Book and concluded by stating the objective of these changes: 'comprehensiveness, toleration, loyalty'.² Kenworthy spoke

1. Ibid.

2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 218 H.C. Deb. 5s. columns 1003-1023.

from the Labour benches, eager to assist the Book's passage and conscious that as 'the members of the Labour Party form the greatest proportion of those who abstained from voting on the question last December' it was consequently 'in their hands that the fate of this Measure rests'.¹ Many in the Labour party felt 'their politics are their religion' and for that reason alone they ought not to deny to those who want it certain aids in worship.² Birchall asked members in considering the question of doctrine to look to the qualifications of those supporting and opposing the Book and the fact that many bishops who might be described as Evangelicals were in fact giving their support to the Book. He also countered the idea that the whole issue was 'priest-ridden' by pointing out the new powers of the Parochial Church Councils and that so much of the Prayer Book had been approved under the terms of the Enabling Act, which made provision for the views of the laity.³

The Countess of Iveagh spoke of the ill-informed opinion that abounded on the subject and considered whether many who opposed the Book had in fact read it. She spoke movingly of the impact of the war upon society and welcomed the Book as showing regard to a changed situation.⁴ Davidson later wrote

-
1. Ibid., column 1036.
 2. Ibid., column 1043.
 3. Ibid., columns 1054-1060.
 4. Ibid., columns 1065-1068.

to thank all the M.P.s who spoke in support of the Book and he thanked the Countess of Iveagh in particular 'for raising the level of the discussion to a higher plane'.¹ Another sensible speech of support came from Colonel Lane Fox, whose immediate object of criticism was the wooliness of Boyd-Carpenter's speech. It included a warm appreciation of the social work of moderate Anglo-Catholics, who ought to be accommodated by concessions such as those that were proposed.² A lengthy speech from Mr. Goodman Roberts dwelt on the difficulty the bishops had and of the need to accept the changes in order to create an improved situation of discipline.³ The Duchess of Atholl was the first Scottish member to take part in the debate. She valued the freedom that the Reformation had brought and that freedom ought now to be accorded to the Church of England.⁴ Courthope gave a speech that was 'good but heavy' in Temple's estimation.⁵ He spoke as an Evangelical who accepted the Book and felt that 'the confusion will be worse counfounded' if parliament did not also do so.⁶

-
1. Davidson Papers, Box 7, Davidson to the Countess of Iveagh, June 15, 1928.
 2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 218 H.C. Deb. 5 s, columns 1075-1081.
 3. Ibid., columns 1087-1095.
 4. Ibid., columns 1104-1112.
 5. F.A. Iremonger: William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, His Life and Letters, O.U.P., 1948, p. 353.
 6. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 218, H.C. Deb. 5 s, column 1119.

Ammon concluded the first day's debate with a speech following that of the extremely Protestant Rosslyn Mitchell; he had no easy task and spoke to an emptying house. It seems that members had stayed especially to hear Mitchell and had little desire to listen to Ammon, who was rated as much less exciting. Temple records 'most people left when R.M. sat down. R.M. had had a house of about 200. When I went in it was about 100 and grew till he began'.¹ His speech, like his one in December 1927, was a forthright speech of support from a non-Anglican stance and it involved reference to the opinion of the Ecclesiastical Committee, of which he was a member.²

The second day, June 14, 1928, began with the important speech of Joynson-Hicks. Atkinson followed in support of the Book and spoke also as an Evangelical, who felt that Joynson-Hicks had exaggerated the reasons for opposition and that the campaign of opposition 'has been based upon misrepresentation of what the Book does'; he went into detailed argument to justify his contention that the Book did not alter Anglican doctrine.³ Hugh Cecil, on this second occasion, spoke with much greater effect than he had in his disastrous December speech. He dealt with three issues: that the Book did not alter the Church's doctrine,

1. F.A. Iremonger, Temple, p. 353.

2. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 218 H.C. Deb. 5 s. columns 1132-1139.

3. Ibid., columns 1211-1224.

that it was an instrument for order and an instrument for peace.¹ Other quite useful speeches of support followed from people who approached the issue from very different points of view. Ponsonby spoke as one who was outside 'any section of institutional religion'² but he wished to support a Measure that had the clear approval of the Church itself. His speech was finely worded and concluded with an appeal made 'as a Member of Parliament and not as a Churchman, as an Englishman and not as a sectarian, as one who values tolerance and detests persecution in the realm of conscience'.³

A very valuable speech of support came from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Winston Churchill. He had played no active part in the controversy and had regretted the passing of the archaic language of the old Book. His approach, he assured the House, was 'from a definitely more secular angle than that which has directed most of the speeches to which we have listened with so much interest this afternoon and yesterday'.⁴ To refuse the Church of England the liberty that she was requesting 'appears to be contrary to the spirit of religious toleration which, I am quite sure, would rule the House of Commons in the case of

1. Ibid., columns 1230-1241.

2. Ibid., column 1248.

3. Ibid., column 1251.

4. Ibid., column 1264.

any other faith or sect among the hundreds which exist side by side within the circuit of the British Empire'.¹ He did not cherish the spectacle of the Church's plight: 'The Church stands at the Bar of the House of Commons and waits. That, to me, is a most surprising spectacle. Here you have the greatest surviving Protestant institution in the world patiently listening to Debates on its spiritual doctrine by twentieth century democratically-elected politicians who, quite apart from their constitutional rights, have really no credentials except goodwill. It is a strange spectacle, and rather repellent'.² The prospect of defeat was an unhappy one and was seen in the parliamentary image that Churchill so often projected. The bishops, clergy and National Assembly, he maintained, 'will be in the position of a Government which has been defeated on a vital question and is unable to resign'.³ He had no wish to see Disestablishment and he urged that Commons to support the Church of England in what she was trying to do. 'I would like to see the English people - and this is an English matter mainly - make a further effort to work together for the sake of preserving those English institutions which have largely formed the nation and which are ancient because they have been flexible'.⁴

1. Ibid., column 1265.

2. Ibid., column 1267.

3. Ibid., column 1269.

4. Ibid., column 1270.

It was a speech well-calculated to appeal to the House of Commons and is an impressive, though of necessity comparatively neglected, example of Churchillian oratory of the classic pattern.

On this occasion the Prime Minister was able to give the final speech. It was one of mixed achievement. Temple said that in the later stages of the speech 'he lost grip altogether'.¹ It is interesting to know that Haigh had assisted Baldwin in its composition and that in the later stages of the speech Baldwin 'added various other points which he had also discussed with me but which in some respects he rather "muffed" when on his feet'.² He started by speaking of the acceptability of the Book to the Ecclesiastical Committee and of its acceptability to many leading Nonconformists. He considered the lack of enthusiasm for the Book and felt that there inevitably was 'a lack of enthusiasm for compromise'.³ Then followed what Temple described as 'a beautiful passage' about the two streams of Evangelicalism and Catholicism within the Church of England as a 'preservative salt against sterilisation and decay' and he referred to Bishop King of Lincoln and Bishop Chavasse of Liverpool as 'representing those two streams. I want those two streams to go on. I want to see the Noble

1. F.A. Iremonger: Temple, p. 354.

2. F.A. Barry: Haigh, p. 89.

3. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 218 H.C. Deb. 5 s, column 1315.

Lord the Member for Oxford University (Lord H. Cecil) and my right hon. Friend the Home Secretary representing those streams in the Church of England'.¹ He dealt with the matter of discipline and the manner in which the situation would be eased by the Book's passage and he concluded on the minatory note of Disestablishment and its attendant problems which, he held, would be brought nearer by the rejection of the Measure.²

The opening spokesman for the opposition on the first day was Sir Samuel Roberts, who spoke after Merriman. He stressed the responsibility that members had to hand the Church undefiled to those who came after and he outlined many dangers that he, from a Protestant angle, conceived to be implicit in the Book.³ Hayes, a member for Merseyside, felt from his own enquiries that the December rejection had been justified and he intended to support rejection.⁴ Major Sir Archibald Boyd-Carpenter gave an exceptionally vague speech, prefaced by the confession that it was the first time he had spoken in the House of Commons in four years; presumably this was intended to suggest the importance with which he regarded the matter, rather than anything else. His basic objection appeared to be that the Book was 'an attempt

1. Ibid., columns 1315-1316.

2. Ibid., columns 1319-1320.

3. Ibid., columns 1023-1036.

4. Ibid., column 1048.

to define something which is indifinable'.¹ Snell was cautious in his opposition, which was self-confessedly rooted in his Puritan origins and upbringing. "There is great stillness in the Courts of Heaven," and all this over-dressing, this embroidery, comes to me as a harsh noise in a welcome stillness.² Sir Walter Greaves-Lord had voted for the Book in December but now intended to vote against it as the National Assembly had done so little to meet the objections that M.P.s faced.³ Sir Malcolm Macnaghten, a member of the Church Association, directed the issue, in a comparatively brief speech, on to the doctrinal ground that the Association enjoyed to traverse, particularly doctrine concerning the Holy Communion. He also stressed the right of every M.P. to be involved in these issues.⁴

Rosslyn Mitchell's speech had been awaited by many members as likely to be exciting. Interruptions received short shrift as Rosslyn Mitchell plunged once more into the Protestant polemic for which he had made himself such a reputation in December 1927. Amidst mounting fury he castigated the Book as a 'milestone' to Rome, along with others such as Malines and the declaration of 2,229 Anglican

1. Ibid., columns 1068-1075.

2. Ibid., column 1086.

3. Ibid., columns 1099-1100

4. Ibid., columns 1112-1116.

priests who pledged that they would hold and support Transubstantiation.¹ It was the penultimate speech of the day, but there is suggestion in Temple's comments that it may not have lived up entirely to general expectation; nevertheless, an exodus followed and there were comparatively few to hear the last speech of the day, the able one by Mr. Ammon.²

On the second day, the opposition opened with a speech from Joynson-Hicks. He had hoped that this matter had been solved in December, but it was again before the House and he defended the right of the House to deal with the issue, in spite of the suggestion by Henson that it was a domestic matter for the Church of England. Joynson-Hicks could not take that view: 'Was the Reformation a domestic concern of the Church of England? Ask the Free Churches, ask the laity of the land'.³ He dealt with the issue of doctrine and claimed that in spite of episcopal reassurances there was a change of doctrine and he cited Lord Parmoor 'one of the great ecclesiastical lawyers of to-day' as saying that there was a distinct change of doctrine in the Book.⁴ Among other opponents who spoke on the second day were Sir Robert Horne,

1. Ibid., columns 1121-1132.

2. F.A. Iremonger: Temple, p. 353.

3. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 218 H.C. Deb. 5 s, column 1200.

4. Ibid., column 1207.

who dwelt vividly on his position as a member of the Church of Scotland;¹ Barr, who gave an emotional speech ending with a rhyme about Latimer whose 'Light shall never go out, However the winds may blow it about';² and Rentoul, who had previously abstained but who would now vote against the Book, making his main reason the 'somewhat unseemly haste' with which it had again been brought before the House.³ He would oppose on three grounds: it would not bring peace, the bishops could not be trusted and it would open the door to doctrines that were repugnant to the Reformation.⁴

Sir Thomas Inskip gave the penultimate speech of the debate and the last speech of opposition. He welcomed the opportunity that the debate allowed for the Commons to discuss questions of this type. He made clear his dislike of the Book and entered upon the matter of his conversations with Davidson earlier in the year, about concessions that might be possible on Reservation,⁵ a matter on which Davidson subsequently took issue with him as not fairly representing the tenor of their conversations.⁶

1. Ibid., columns 1251-1259.

2. Ibid., column 1276.

3. Ibid., column 1283.

4. Ibid., columns 1284-1290.

5. Ibid., columns 1299-1312.

6. G.K.A. Bell, Davidson, vol. ii, pp. 1350-1351.

In the division the Measure was again lost and by the larger majority of 266 to 220.¹

The situation was virtually as it was after the December rejection, though by this time the Church had received a double humiliation. The bishops met to consider the defeat and the best course that they might then adopt. Opinion among them was diffuse. Among the Davidson papers are letters that the bishops sent to Davidson after the June rejection and, in the absence of the minutes of the bishops' meetings at that time, they furnish useful evidence of the differing opinions within the episcopate.

Henson had no doubt that the June rejection, though a matter of regret, in fact confirmed his advocacy of Disestablishment: 'I postulate that our first and evident duty is to vindicate the spiritual independence of the Church of England' and he quoted historical precedents that might be followed, and favoured a somewhat obscure precedent as the most appropriate: 'My mind inclines to a second precedent - the Petition of Right 1628. If the National Assembly could agree to a Protest affirming the inherent rights of the Church as a spiritual society.....and pointing out the inequity of the recent action of the House of Commons, I think it would clear the air, ease many consciences, and lay the foundations for future action'.² In a further

1. Parliamentary Debates (Official Report), 218 H.C. Deb. 5 s, column 1320.

2. Davidson Papers, Box 7, Henson to Davidson, June 18, 1928.

letter, two days later, he urged Davidson to seize the opportunity that the rejection presented: '.....we have now an opportunity of stating the case of the Church as against the aggression of the State which is probably far the best we can ever hope to have; and that if we let it slip, we shall have to stand the conflict shortly in far less satisfactory circumstances...'¹ But Henson failed to fire Davidson's enthusiasm for the cause of Disestablishment, just as he failed to fire the enthusiasm of any of his fellow-bishops.

The anger and irritation of many of the other bishops who supported the 1928 Book is quite apparent from their correspondence and none felt that the situation of rejection should be merely accepted. Headlam put forward the view that 'we resent, and resent strongly, the interference with the proper liberties of the Church; that we resent the way in which a minority defeated in the Assembly has overruled what the Assembly determined on by an appeal to those who are not members of the Church of England and who are not even resident within the country; and that, in particular, we resent the action of those Bishops who have acted as they have done'. He warned against 'anything heroic' in the action which the bishops might propose and his suggestion of diocesan consultations came very near to the compromise

1. Ibid., June 20, 1928.

solution that was eventually agreed to.¹ Less high-flown, but equally forceful views came from Woods: 'If ever case [sic] when the Church might properly assert her rights and claim her liberty, this is one'. But he held that there were certain mitigating circumstances, foremost among which was the obvious one, rarely given formal expression: 'The controversy is within the Church itself rather than a dispute between Church and State.....It is not a case of a unanimous Church against a hostile State'. He also held that the subjects of dispute had been too readily dismissed and cited the 'Western' views on the Canon, forcefully advanced by Robinson and Brightman, and that, possibly bearing in mind the conference he chaired in 1925 on the subject, there had been no adequate discussion in Convocation or elsewhere of the theological implications of Reservation. After a careful analysis, he concluded moderately that the Book should be issued as 'an extension by corporate episcopal action of what every bishop has done for years', but the Alternative Communion Service and the Communion of the Sick, with its rubrics, should be withdrawn.² A similar tendency is found in Temple's letter, which shows a dislike for the idea that parliament 'is a fit arbiter on the points in dispute'.³

-
1. Ibid., Headlam to Davidson, June 19, 1928.
 2. Ibid., Woods to Davidson, June 23, 1928.
 3. Ibid., Temple to Davidson, June 19, 1928.

A letter from Pollock shows that he had no wish to attend the meeting of the bishops and he had no particular idea to advance about future episcopal action. 'You see,' he wrote to Davidson, 'my words carry no weight with the Bishops, and it is best, with perfect good humour, to recognise the fact.....Meantime you know me well enough to be aware that I shall not, in these first days, say or do anything that would further complicate a complicated situation.'¹ But Davidson wished Pollock to attend: '....it is not quite fair to the bishops in the majority that they should be bereft of the aid of criticism from those who have not seen eye to eye with them. This is the view which Worcester and Birmingham have throughout taken, and personally I believe it to be right'.² In the face of this letter, Pollock attended the meeting.

Davidson also had important advice from laymen at that time. Hugh Cecil was, as always, in frequent correspondence. He advanced a view of his elder brother, Lord Salisbury, who held 'there ought to be some definite and unequivocal assertion made now of the claims of the Church to independent authority in spiritual matters'. He felt this assertion would best proceed from the bishops' meetings rather than from any other, or formal, body; it was the bishops 'who have "received" the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a

1. Ibid., Pollock to Davidson, June 18, 1928.

2. Ibid., Davidson to Pollock, June 19, 1928.

bishop and whatever authority the laity or even the clergy exercise in the Assembly, it is through the will of the bishops and by their ordinance'.¹ It may well be that support for episcopal action independent of the clergy and laity coming from the leading layman in these matters had weight with the bishops in reaching conclusion that responsibility for action rested entirely with them.

Advice that came from another leading layman was briskly dismissed. Lord Halifax, despite his lack of enthusiasm for either the 1927 or the 1928 Book asked 'Why does not your Grace tell the King that if He approves, He ought to assent to the Revised Book?.....Loyalty would go up by leaps and bounds, and the King of England would indeed be a King we could respect, admire and fight for. Let him imitate Elizabeth who would not have hesitated for a moment, and assert himself for once'.² Davidson described as 'a startling suggestion' the idea that the King should 'act independently of his Ministers who obviously cannot defy the Commons. I certainly could not in accordance with the Constitution of England at present make that suggestion'.³

Eventually the bishops were able to agree upon a statement that reflected many of the opinions that had been sent to Davidson and that was marked by sufficient compromise

1. Ibid., Hugh Cecil to Davidson, June 24, 1928.

2. Ibid., Halifax to Davidson, June 20, 1928.

3. Ibid., Davidson to Halifax, June 20, 1928.

as to render it acceptable to all the 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 forms of worship.'¹

Davidson's last public utterance on the whole subject was made in a speech to the National Assembly on July 2, 1928. He was critical of the vote of the House of Commons but 'If the House of Commons is supposed to have flouted or violated the well-proven working arrangement of Church and State, the House did it with no intention of a constitutional kind' and the interest displayed in the House of Commons was a good feature. The future then lay in their dioceses with the individual bishops who 'will have to consider what variations from the old prescribed law they can or ought to sanction. They have had to do it more or less for years, and different bishops have acted in different ways'.² Two days later the Assembly gave its support for what the bishops proposed.³

In adopting this proposal, the National Assembly made

-
1. Quoted in G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, p. 1351.
 2. Church Assembly, Report of Proceedings, vol. ix, no. 3, pp. 114-119.
 3. Ibid., pp. 178-179.

use of the authority given to a bishop by virtue of the Ius Liturgicum, urged upon Davidson by a number of correspondents at that time, amongst them the Reverend P.R.B. Brown, Priest-Vicar of Chichester Cathedral, who reminded Davidson that 'each bishop possesses severally the "ius liturgicum" for exercise in his own diocese, being competent to issue supplements to the Book of Common Prayer without the least reference to any democratic cabal'.¹ The employment of the Ius Liturgicum was not as simple as Brown made out, and it was certainly not without controversial aspects. But the action of the bishops in the late Summer and Autumn of 1928 was rooted in the implicit right of the bishops to adjust the Prayer Book within reasonable limits. With this as its foundation, there developed what became known as the 'interim policy' of the bishops, by which they would regard the 1928 Book as the standard measure of acceptable deviation from the Book of 1662. The 'interim policy' lasted for more than a quarter of a century, until the era of liturgical experimentation in the 1960s. The bishops formally decided to adopt this policy at meetings held on September 25-27, 1928, and they presented their policy to diocesan conferences and synods, which generally showed a willingness to accept this policy of the bishops, just as they had accepted the Prayer Books of 1927 and 1928 when laid before them.

1. Davidson Papers, Box 7, Brown to Davidson, June 21, 1928.

But the Measure and the Book had been rejected by parliament and on strictly legal grounds that ought to have been an end to the matter, unless it was to be introduced for a third time, an idea that found no general acceptability, though it was urged by some, notably Hinde. Many Protestant societies, which had rejoiced in their own ways at the June rejection, were naturally concerned at this policy. The Church Association stated that the bishops 'are endeavouring to impose the "Deposited Book" upon the Church by what the Archbishop himself describes as "extra-legal action"'.¹ Joynson-Hicks made a spirited attack on the policy of the bishops in the Empire Review.² The Protestant Truth Society made reference to the Bishops' 'Shamefaced decision to authorise 1928 Book'.³ J. A. Kensit described it as 'another false step'; the King in parliament was the authority in the land and 'no State can brook a rival authority to its sovereign head'.⁴ The Council of the Protestant Truth Society stated 'To make a rejected scheme the standard of allowance is disastrous and challenges the verdict of the House of Commons in a manner which will force the country to assert the supremacy of its parliamentary institutions.'⁵

-
1. Church Association, 65th Annual Report, 1929, pp. 6-7.
 2. Empire Review, November 1928, vol. xlvii, pp. 310-314.
 3. Churchman's Magazine, November 1928, p. 276.
 4. Ibid., p. 277.
 5. Ibid., p. 278.

In the General Election of May 1929, the Protestant Truth Society conducted a political campaign to conserve the Protestant 'victory' of the rejection of the Prayer Book and urged electors to vote Protestant, whatever their party.¹ But for all these and similar protests from those who held that the authority of parliament had been flouted, the policy of the bishops continued and the 1928 Book began to be used in a number of churches.² Parliament itself seems to have been comparatively unconcerned by the action of the bishops, though questions were from time to time asked.

All the ad hoc organisations had terminated their activities by the Autumn of 1928. The Protestant Parsons Pilgrimage ended and its leaders formed the 'Britons Back to the Bible' campaign in April 1928.³ The Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith appears to have continued until 1929, largely in endeavours to frustrate the interim policy of the bishops. It also was encouraged to give its support to the revived Evangelicalism that the June rejection appears to some extent to have heralded. F.W. Gilpin,

-
1. Poster for the General Election of May 1929, in the archives of the Protestant Truth Society. Also Churchman's Magazine, May 1929, pp. 118-119.
 2. A survey of those parts of the 1928 Book that were most frequently used in Anglican churches in the next three decades is to be found in Church of England Liturgical Commission: Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England, A Memorandum, London, 1957, pp. 14-17.
 3. The Record, April 5, 1928, p. 246.

an honorary secretary to the Committee, wrote to Hinde at the end of September 1928 expressing his strong feeling 'that the Committee should not, for the present, be disbanded. Not only have we to watch carefully over the decisions of the Bishops collectively and in Diocesan Synods; but it seems to me that the Truth and Faith Committee are in a position to take some definite and united action in regard to a revival of Evangelicalism in the Church'.¹

The League of Loyalty and Order came to an end, its work in the final analysis unsuccessful. Oldham wrote to Davidson about plans for its dissolution only a few days after the June rejection: their raison d'être had been to assist in securing parliamentary approval for the Book and they had failed; 'there can be no doubt that the League, as such, must come to an end'.²

Archbishop Davidson announced his resignation on July 25, 1928, only a month after the June rejection, though there is reason to believe that his motive in resigning was not strictly connected with the rejection of the Prayer Book.³ His retirement caused moves by a number of bishops: Lang went to Canterbury, Temple went to York, Warman went to Manchester and Canon H.A. Wilson was elevated to the episcopate and went to Chelmsford. Protestant opponents

1. CSA, FCTF, Gilpin to Hinde, September 27, 1928.

2. Davidson Papers, Box 7, Oldham to Davidson, June 19, 1928.

3. G.K.A. Bell: Davidson, vol. ii, pp. 1361-1364.

were angered at these moves, as all those who secured these important ecclesiastical positions were active supporters of the rejected Book; indeed, they had been foremost in the struggle.

Few churchmen were eager in the thirties and forties to engage in further revision of the Book of Common Prayer and when the matter was again embarked upon in the 1960s, both the methods of approach and the forms and bases of the revision were radically different. Congregational experiment was then the main feature in the approach to revision and the employment of scholarly liturgical investigation was reflected in the form and bases of the new rites.

The 1927 Book had owed little to liturgical scholarship. Of the few liturgiologists of the day, Frere was virtually the only one who had any real influence on the final form the revision took. The study of liturgy in the early twentieth century held a comparatively low place in the order of things. Many bishops felt that it was a subject in which they ought to be interested merely because of the situation of chaos and ecclesiastical indiscipline with which they were confronted; the approach of many of them to the framing of the 1927 Book was virtually that of amateurs, so far as knowledge of liturgy was concerned. But the whole scheme of Prayer Book revision was seen more as an exercise in restoring discipline within the Church than as a venture in liturgical construction per se. There was talk of 'enrichment', of modernising archaic features, there

was the bold use of eastern forms in the Canon; but all these matters were secondary to the main feature of the revision, which was to secure better order within the Church. Many opponents held that even that goal was pursued with inadequate vigour. It was an unsatisfactory basis on which to construct a revision of the liturgy of the Church of England.

There was substance in the accusation that the Church was not at all united on many of the features of the revision. The twenties formed one of the periods in Anglican history when internal differences were acute. The acceptance of the Book by the Church's legislative machinery ought not to cloak the fact that there was intense friction within the Church and the 1927 Book at once gave expression to that friction and exacerbated it. Observers could not but have been aware of its intensity. The Church was by no means ready for liturgical reconstruction at that time; the warring elements within were sufficiently strong to make such efforts foredoomed to failure. In this connection it was fortunate that the Book was rejected. No experiment with the 1927 rites had been permitted and no real policy had been worked upon for the practical implementation of them. A successful passage of the Book through parliament may have heralded further friction at the parochial level; it may have resulted in an Evangelical secession. As it was, the interim policy of the bishops enabled use to be made of the Book by those who wished it and the termination of

formal discussions on Prayer Book revision enabled internal strife to abate on this issue at least.

Advocates of the Enabling Act had seen as a significant part of their work the creation of a situation in which the entry of ecclesiastical controversy into the parliamentary arena might be repelled; the Prayer Book controversy was evidence of their failure. That many Members of Parliament were embarrassed by the differing views of their constituents on religious issues is amply shown in 1927 and 1928. But there is also evidence to suggest that many of them were moved by the view of Prayer Book revision as a process dominated by the episcopacy and the clergy, and one in which lay views had been accorded slight regard; the provisions made for the employment of the Book further emphasised the allegedly insignificant role that lay opinion was to possess. The suspicion of clerical domination, linked with the traditional Protestantism that was held to be endangered by the new Book, were potent forces in motivating opposition among Members of Parliament, whose right to a final opinion on the legality of the Book was unassailable and widely acknowledged even by the Book's episcopal advocates.

Archbishop Davidson noted privately after the second rejection that he had never known 'a situation which was so perplexing - every pathway in every direction seems to lead into a morass'.¹ The situation would have been

1. Private Papers of Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1903-28, vol. xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-30, Memorandum of June 17, 1928, p. 12.

familiar to a late Victorian churchman, involved in the ritualistic disputes of, say, the time of Archbishop Tait; the same issues, in slightly different guise, were the motive forces in the controversy. The Enabling Act had in the meantime obscured but not removed the responsibility of the Established Church to the State; that underlying responsibility had been re-emphasised by the Prayer Book controversy. So long as the Church of England remained established, she was in the final analysis answerable to parliament. Though there was much talk, after both rejections, of asserting the rights of the Church as a spiritual society, Disestablishment found few advocates and no enthusiasts; the benefits of Establishment were held to outweigh its dangers and all took alarm at the upheavals and complexities that Disestablishment would involve. Both Church and State in the late 1920s were unready to think fundamentally of the problems they encountered. The issues that motivated protagonists were of so solid a character that under the circumstances the bishops' compromise was the only sensible solution. The Church of England may not have been ready for liturgical reconstruction; neither Church nor State was ready for any far-reaching change in their relationship.

APPENDIX IDIOCESAN ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS MOST CLOSELY
CONCERNED WITH PRAYER BOOK REVISION, 1927-28.Bishops who supported the Prayer Book

Canterbury:	Randall Thomas Davidson
Chelmsford:	Frederic Sumpter Guy Warman
Chichester:	Winfred Oldfield Burrows
Durham:	Herbert Hensley Henson
Gloucester:	Arthur Cayley Headlam
London:	Arthur Foley Winnington-Ingram
Manchester:	William Temple
Oxford:	Thomas Banks Strong
St Albans:	Michael Bolton Furze
Southwark:	Cyril Forster Garbett
Winchester:	Frank Theodore Woods
York:	Cosmo Gordon Lang

The Six opposing Bishops

Birmingham:	Ernest William Barnes
Exeter:	Lord William Rupert Ernest Gascoyne Cecil
Norwich:	Bertram Pollock
St Edmundsbury and Ipswich:	Walter Godfrey Whittingham (opposed only to the 1928 Book)
Truro:	Walter Howard Frere (opposed only to the 1928 Book)
Worcester:	Ernest Harold Pearce

APPENDIX II

THE MEMORANDUM OF BISHOP STRONG

Two reliable secondary sources make reference to the fact that Bishop Strong composed a memorandum of his impressions of the bishops at Lambeth in the discussions that took place between 1925 and 1927.¹ Bishop Strong had a lively wit and the content of the memorandum was so frank, that it was felt advisable to place a ban upon it for a number of years.

It now appears likely that this interesting document has been lost. Enquiry has been made, without success, of the following persons:

At Oxford

The Director of the Bodleian Library

The Bishop of Oxford

Sir John Masterman

The Reverend A.J.M. Saint

The Reverend Father T.L. Manson, S.S.J.E.

The Dean of Christ Church

Elsewhere

The Archbishop of Canterbury

Lambeth Palace Library

The Bishop of Ely

1. H. Anson: T.B. Strong, Bishop, Musician, Dean, Vice-Chancellor, London, 1949, p. 62, and C.S. Phillips (editor): Walter Howard Frere, A Memoir, London, 1947, pp. 135-136.

The present Bishop of Oxford suggests that the document may well have been destroyed when the old Palace at Cuddesdon was demolished and when a number of Bishop Strong's books and papers were thrown out.

APPENDIX III
ARCHIVE MATERIAL, RELEVANT TO THIS STUDY,
BUT TO WHICH SCHOLARS ARE AT PRESENT
DENIED ACCESS

The bulk of the material that has survived on the Prayer Book controversy is now available to scholars and provides sufficient material for a study of the controversy in depth. The papers of the Archbishops are available in the Library at Lambeth Palace after the lapse of forty years, so it has only been in recent years that the Davidson papers on the Prayer Book controversy have become available. Early in 1974 a ban was lifted on further private papers left by Davidson, including dictated memoranda.

There still remain certain items that are not available, and these would probably cast some further light on the controversy.

The Journal of Bishop Henson

Sections of the Journal, which Bishop Henson kept throughout his life, have been reproduced in the three-volume autobiography that Henson composed in his retirement in the 1940s, but the entire Journal has not been made available. The Dean and Chapter of Durham Cathedral were unable to grant permission for the reading of the sections on the Prayer Book controversy, but in 1972 Dean Wild pointed out that Henson drew very fully on the Journal for the long chapter on Prayer Book Revision in volume ii of the autobiography.

It is evidently the intention of the Dean and Chapter of Durham to allow a biographical study of Bishop Henson to be produced in due course, and until that is done, presumably scholars will not have access to the Journal.

The Minutes of Bishops Meetings

These are in the possession of the Archbishop of Canterbury and not of the Library at Lambeth Palace. They are regarded as possessing an all-time confidentiality. As the views of the different bishops were well-known throughout the controversy, it is unlikely that the minutes of their meetings would add very substantially to the study.

APPENDIX IVA SONG OF THE DEPOSITED BOOK

This skilfully composed song, in the style of Gilbert and Sullivan, was found among the Headlam Papers at Lambeth Palace Library, though with no reference to its author.¹ J. G. Lockhart, in his life of Lord Halifax, refers to a part of the song and names the Reverend G.G.S. Gillett, Editorial Secretary of S.P.G. at the time of the controversy and formerly domestic chaplain to Lord Halifax, as the writer.² In none of the secondary sources has the song been reproduced in its entirety, and the sections that have been reproduced have often been incorrectly rendered.

First Chorus of Wild Men

A set back the clock new Book,
 A bring in the Jesuits Book,
 A plainly Papistical, grossly sophistical,
 Most anti-Scriptural Book.
 A turn us all out new Book,
 A down with the Gospel Book;
 A give in to flummery, idols and mummery,
 A ruin to Souls new Book!

Second Chorus of Wild Men

A bait on the hook new Book,
 A thank you for nothing new Book,
 A part sentimental and part Oriental,
 And part made in Germany Book.
 A pickle the rod new Book,
 A put us in quod new Book,
 A no comprehensiveness, full of offensiveness,
 Anti devotional Book.

-
1. Headlam Papers, 2625, Papers concerning revision of the Book of Common Prayer, 1928-29.
 2. J. G. Lockhart: Charles Lindley Viscount Halifax, part ii, 1885-1934, London, 1936, p. 346, footnote.

Chorus of Bishops

Our noble deposited Book!
Our composite, copyright Book;
Our most diplomatical, anti-fanatical
Protestant - Catholic Book.
Our twenty years' thought new Book,
Our prayerfully planned new Book,
Our no change doctrinal, our quite 'semi-final'
Our richly enriched new Book.
Our please be good boys new Book,
Our don't make a noise new Book,
Our why can't you wait a bit? trust the Episcopate,
Save the Establishment Book!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript Sources

1. Church Society Archives

A file of letters and papers relating to the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith

Editorial Services Limited: Confidential report to the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith, June 1928

National Church League: Executive Committee Minute Book, 1924-29

2. General Synod Archives

Various files of correspondence and papers relating to the National Assembly of the Church of England. These are concerned with such matters as relations with Lambeth, Parliament and the Ecclesiastical Committee; there is substantial material on the High Court issue, October - November, 1927, and on copyright problems. Much of the material is also to be found in Lambeth Palace Library.

Where use has been made of a particular file in this study, the title of that file has been given.

3. Lambeth Palace Library

i) Bell, G.K.A., Bishop. Letters and Papers

Files and envelopes relating to Bishop Bell's work on Prayer Book revision are most conveniently referred to by their colour and title:

Buff envelope: Prayer Book revision, January 1928

Pink File

Buff file: Prayer Book Revision 1925-27

ii) Davidson, R.T., Archbishop. Letters and Papers

The Davidson papers on Prayer Book revision are kept in fourteen boxes and are not yet sorted and indexed. For the purposes of convenience in this study, the boxes have been numbered 1 - 14 by the author. The relationship between the author's numbering and the titles on the boxes is as follows:

<u>Author's number for the box</u>	<u>Title given by Lambeth Palace Library to the box</u>
1	Prayer Book 1915-1928
2	Prayer Book Revision 1906-1914
3	Prayer Book Revision 1916-1920
4	Prayer Book Revision 1920-1927
5	Prayer Book Revision 1927
6	P.B. Revision I, 1927-8. 161. Davidson
7	Prayer Book Revision 1927-28. Correspondence
8	Prayer Book Revision 1927 (P.C.C.)
9	Prayer Book Revision. Letters concerning bill 1927
10	P.B. II. 164 Davidson
11	Prayer Book Revision 1928-29
12	P.B. Revision VI. 166
13	P.B. Revision V. 165. Davidson
14	Prayer Book Revision

Of the twenty-five volumes of Davidson's private papers, made available in 1974, the following relate closely to the Prayer Book controversy:

Volume xv, Diaries and Memoranda, 1925-26

Volume xvi, Diaries and Memoranda, 1927-30

iii) English Church Union Papers

E.C.U. 49 3) Prayer Book Revision Committee 1922-23

E.C.U. 59 Minutes of the Council Meeting of the
Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927-33

E.C.U. 65 Anglo-Catholic Congress. Minutes of the
Executive Committee 1927-29

iv) Headlam, A.C., Bishop. Letter and Papers

2615. Correspondence with Archbishops of Canterbury,
1909-45:

Davidson, 1909-29

Lang, 1918-41

2623. Papers concerning revision of the Book of Common
Prayer, including minutes of a conference held at Farnham on
Reservation, 1906-25

2624. Papers concerning revision of the Book of Common
Prayer, 1926-7

2625. Papers concerning revision of the Book of Common
Prayer, 1928-9

v) Lang, C.G., Archbishop. Letters and Papers

One box of papers relating to Archbishop Lang's work on
Prayer Book revision, entitled: Don Deposit. Lang Papers 5.
Prayer Book Measure

vi) Riley, Athelstan. Letters and Papers

Various files, though reference to the Prayer Book
controversy is slight.

Official Records

Bible Churchmen's Missionary Society, Annual Records

Chronicle of Convocation, being a Record of the Proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury

Church Assembly, Report of Proceedings

Church Association Annual Reports

Crockford's Clerical Directory, 1929, O.U.P. No Crockford's was published in 1928

Labour Party, Annual Conference Report, 1928, Parliamentary Report

Parliamentary Debates (Official Report)

Journals and Newspapers

The Bible Churchmen's Missionary Messenger

The Church Gazette (monthly journal of the National Church League)

The Church Intelligencer, A Record of work in Defence of the Protestant Principles of the Church of England (monthly journal of the Church Association)

The Church Quarterly Review

The Church Times

The Churchman, The Evangelical Quarterly

The Churchman's Magazine and Wickliffe Preacher's Messenger (monthly journal of the Protestant Truth Society)

Daily News

The Empire Review

The Guardian, The Church Newspaper

The National Review

The New Statesman, A Weekly Review of Politics and Literature

Punch

The Record, The Church's Oldest Newspaper

The Review of the Churches, A Constructive Quarterly
The Times

The Universe, The Catholic Newspaper

Pamphlet Collections

No attempt is made here to classify the very large number of pamphlets that were produced in the course of the controversy, though a classification is needed and will itself be a very large task.

1. Lambeth Palace Library

Many pamphlets are found in the Davidson papers on Prayer Book Revision.

2. Pusey House Library, Oxford

PA/2000. Three pamphlet boxes:

1. Book of Common Prayer Revision. 1906-20
2. Book of Common Prayer Revision. 1921- A
3. Book of Common Prayer Revision. 1921- B

Contemporary Works, excluding Pamphlets

Alcuin Club Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets, xii-xiv. A Survey of the proposals for the Alternative Prayer Book:

1. The Order of Holy Communion,
2. Occasional Offices,
3. The Calendar, the Collects, Epistles and Gospels and the Ordination Service. (The Orange Book)
London, Mowbrays, 1923-24.

Davidson, R.T: The Prayer Book: Our Hope and Meaning, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1928

English Church Union: A Suggested Prayer Book (The Green Book), O.U.P., 1923

Farnham Castle Conference: Reservation, Report of a Conference Held at Farnham Castle on October 24-27, 1925, London, S.P.C.K., 1926

Group of Priests, A; (Editor: Darwell Stone): The Deposited Prayer Book, London, 1927

Headlam, A.C: The New Prayer Book, Being a Charge.....
London, Murray, 1927

Henson, H.H: The Book and the Vote, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1928

Joynson-Hicks, W: The Prayer Book Crisis, London, Putnam 1928

Knox, E.A: Spiritual Objections to the Alternative Communion Service, London, Skeffington, 1928

Milner-White, E: The Occasional Prayers of the 1928 Book Reconsidered, London, S.P.C.K., 1930

National Assembly of the Church of England:

Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923,
(N.A. 84)

Book Proposed to be Annexed to the Prayer Book Measure,
192-, London, 1927

Pollock, B: The Nation and the Church, Six Charges by Bertram Pollock, London, Murray 1925

Pollock, B: The Church and English Life, Sermons by the Bishop of Norwich, London, Longman, 1932

Relton, H.M: The New Prayer Book, Being a Course of Public Lectures Delivered at King's College, London, by Eight Lecturers Representing Various Schools of Thought in the Church, London, George Allen and Unwin 1927

Temple, W. (Foreword): A New Prayer Book, Proposals for the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer and for Additional Services and Prayers, drawn up by a Group of Clergy, (The Grey Book), London, 1923

Temple, W: The Prayer Book Crisis: A Reply to Sir William Joynson-Hicks, London, S.P.C.K., 1928

Woods, F.T: The Prayer Book Revised, London, Longman, 1927

Secondary Works

Anson, H: T.B.Strong, Bishop, Musician, Dean, Vice-chancellor,
London, S.P.C.K., 1949

G.R. Balleine: A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England, London, Longmans, 1908

Barry, F.R: Mervyn Haigh, London, S.P.C.K., 1964

Bell, G.K.A: Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury, two volumes, O.U.P., 1935

Bromiley, G.W: Daniel Henry Charles Bartlett, A Memoir, Dr. Bartlett's Executors, Burnham-on-sea, 1959

Carpenter, C.S: Winnington-Ingram, The Biography of Arthur Foley Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London 1901-1939, O.U.P., 1949

Chadwick, O: The Victorian Church, two parts, London, A and C. Black, 1966 and 1970

Church of England Liturgical Commission: Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England, A Memorandum, London, S.P.C.K, 1957

Crockford Prefaces: The Editor Looks Back, O.U.P., 1947

Cross, F.L: Darwell Stone, Churchman and Counsellor, London, Dacre Press, 1943

Dearmer, N: Life of Percy Dearmer, London, Jonathan Cape, 1940

Edwards, D.L: Leaders of the Church of England, 1828-1944, O.U.P., 1971

Fox, A: Dean Inge, London, Murray, 1960

Harris, G.H. Vernon Faithfull Storr, A Memoir, London, S.P.C.K., 1943

Henson, H.H: Retrospect of an Unimportant Life, volume i, 1863-1920; volume ii, 1920-39; volume iii, 1939-47; O.U.P., 1942, 1943, 1948

The History of The Times, vol. iv, London, 1952

Iremonger, F.A: William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, His Life and Letters, O.U.P., 1948

Jasper, R.C.D: Arthur Cayley Headlam, The Life and Letters of a Bishop, London, Faith Press, 1960

Jasper, R.C.D: George Bell, Bishop of Chichester, O.U.P., 1967

- Jasper, R.C.D: Prayer Book Revision in England, 1800-1900, London, S.P.C.K., 1954
- Jasper, R.C.D: Walter Howard Frere, His Correspondence on Liturgical Revision and Construction, Alcuin Club Collection, No. XXXIX, London, S.P.C.K., 1954
- Knox, E.A: Reminiscences of an Octogenarian, 1847-1934, London, Hutchinson, 1935
- Lockhart, J.G: Cosmo Gordon Lang, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1949
- Lockhart, J.G: Viscount Halifax, two parts, London, Geoffrey Bles, 1934 and 1936
- Lowther Clarke, W.K: The Prayer Book of 1928 Reconsidered, London, S.P.C.K., 1943
- Lloyd, R: The Church of England in the Twentieth Century, two volumes, London, Longman, 1946 and 1950
- Marsh, P.T: The Victorian Church in Decline, Archbishop Tait and the Church of England, 1868-1882, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969
- Middlemas, K (Editor): Thomas Jones, Whitehall Diary, vol. ii, 1926-1930, O.U.P., 1969
- Oldmeadow, E: Francis Cardinal Bourne, two volumes, London Burns Oates, 1940 and 1944
- Pare, P and Harris, D: Eric Milner-White, London, S.P.C.K., 1965
- Phillips, C.S. (editor): Walter Howard Frere, London, Faber and Faber, 1947
- Pollock, B: A Twentieth-Century Bishop, Recollections and Reflections, London, Skeffington, 1944
- Prestige, G.L: The Life of Charles Gore, A Great Englishman, London, Heinemann, 1935
- Procter, F and Frere, W.H: The Book of Common Prayer, With a Rationale of Its Offices, London, Macmillan, Third Impression, with corrections and alterations, 1905
- Smyth, C: Cyril Forster Garbett, Archbishop of York, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1959

Sparrow Simpson, W.J: The History of the Anglo-Catholic Revival from 1845, London, 1932

Stephenson, G: Edward Stuart Talbot, 1844-1934, London, S.P.C.K., 1936

Taylor, A.J.P: English History, 1914-1945, O.U.P., 1965

Taylor, H.A: Jix, London, 1933

Thompson, K.A: Bureaucracy and Church Reform, The Organizational Response of the Church of England to Social Change, 1800-1965, O.U.P., 1970

Vidler, A.R: The Church in an Age of Revolution, 1789 to the Present Day, London, Penguin, 1961

Woods, E.S. and Macnutt, F.B: Theodore, Bishop of Winchester, Pastor, Prophet, Pilgrim; A Memoir of Frank Theodore Woods, D.D., 1874-1932, London, S.P.C.K., 1933

Wrench, J.E: Geoffrey Dawson and Our Times, London, Hutchinson, 1955