

*Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue*

# WILLIAM TEMPLE AND CHURCH UNITY

The Politics and Practice  
of Ecumenical Theology

Edward Loane



# Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue

Series Editors

Mark Chapman  
Ripon College Cuddesdon  
Cuddesdon Oxford, United Kingdom

Gerard Mannion  
Georgetown University  
Washington, D.C., USA

Building on the important work of the Ecclesiological Investigations International Research Network to promote ecumenical and inter-faith dialogue, the Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue series publishes scholarship on interreligious encounters and dialogue in relation to the past, present, and future. It gathers together a richly diverse array of voices in monographs and edited collections that speak to the challenges, aspirations, and elements of interreligious conversation. Through its publications, the series allows for the exploration of new ways, means, and methods of advancing the wider ecumenical cause with renewed energy for the twenty-first century.

More information about this series at  
<http://www.springer.com/series/14561>

Edward Loane

# William Temple and Church Unity

The Politics and Practice of Ecumenical Theology

palgrave  
macmillan

Edward Loane  
Moore Theological College  
Newtown, Australia

Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue  
ISBN 978-3-319-40375-5      ISBN 978-3-319-40376-2 (eBook)  
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-40376-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016954156

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Cover illustration: © imageBROKER / Alamy Stock Photo

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature  
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG Switzerland

*For my darling wife Jocelyn  
Your patience and grace have made this book possible.*



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This monograph is a slightly revised version of the doctoral thesis for which I was awarded a PhD from the University of Cambridge in 2015. As I reflect on how this project came together over the last few years, I feel a tremendous sense of gratitude towards all those who have helped make it possible. Eighteen months before commencing my doctoral studies, I had only encountered William Temple in a superficial way and had read very little of his published work. He interested me greatly, and as I made some preliminary investigations into his thinking about church unity, I found that this was a fertile area for fresh and original research, and that it had apparently been neglected in previous scholarship. Armed with only this germinal topic and a great deal of enthusiasm, I made contact with Rev. Dr Jeremy Morris to explore the possibility of doctrinal supervision treating this subject. He was hugely supportive and has continued to be so ever since. Jeremy's supervision has provided much helpful feedback and many constructive suggestions, while always leaving the direction of the research as my responsibility. I cherished our supervisions greatly and always looked forward to the time we spent together. I am also indebted to the comments and feedback from various people who read drafts of this thesis, most especially, Dr Andrew Atherstone and Dr Jonny Gibson. My examiners, Dr David Cornick and Dr Matthew Grimley, were very enthusiastic about the research and encouraged me to seek publication. I am grateful to them for their comments and enthusiasm for the project, as well as the most enjoyable *viva voce* I could have imagined.

From the time I first contacted Palgrave Macmillan about the possibility of publishing this book, their enthusiastic support has been tremendously



encouraging. The series editors, Mark Chapman and Gerard Mannion, of the Pathways for Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue have provided positive feedback and helpful suggestions. Also, the editorial team at Palgrave, Philip Getz and Alexis Nelson, have made the process extremely smooth, and I have greatly appreciated their prompt and patient responses to all my silly questions. The process has been a pleasure.

Much of the research behind this book is based on archival sources, and as I travelled around, even to Geneva, I have always found library staff to be most helpful. A special mention must be made of the staff at Lambeth Palace Library, where I have spent so many days. Also, my time in Geneva at the World Council of Churches archive was a very fruitful and enriching experience.

I was extremely fortunate to have been awarded scholarships to undertake this work, without which it would have been impossible. Two of my *almae matres*, The King's School and Moore Theological College, were extremely generous in their financial support. I owe these institutions a great deal, not just for enabling me to pursue this research, but also for the foundational education they provided me in years gone by. I have also received funding from the Latimer Trust which has been tremendously helpful. My Cambridge College, King's, has provided a wonderful community of scholars as well as generous travel grants for me to visit archives in York, London and Geneva, without which I would have felt more constrained in my research.

My parents have also provided generous financial support throughout my study, not just at Cambridge, but for so many years of education previously. But this is only a fraction of the support they have given in love, encouragement and nurture throughout my life. I am constantly thankful to God for the blessing they have been to me and all the opportunities they have provided. My children, Jemima, Sophie, Ben and Sam, have endured two moves across the world, each turning their lives upside down, so this study could take place. Then, as I was making the final touches of the final chapter for the monograph, Abigail joined us. Although they probably will not understand this book at the moment, I hope one day my children will read it and be motivated to learn new things about interesting people. My wife, Jocelyn, has been my steadfast support for the last 15 years. I broached the topic of moving to the other side of the world and becoming a student again when she was severely sleep-deprived with one-week-old twins. At that stage, neither of us believed it would ever become a reality. But through God's providence, it did, and throughout our experiences, I

cannot but marvel at her grace and love and care as we have gone on. She is a true gift from God. This project has involved at least as much effort on her part, with the trials of five small children and navigating life so far from family and friends. I love her more every day, and it is to her this book is dedicated.



# CONTENTS

1	William Temple and Church Unity: Framing the Debate and Providing the Context	1
2	Temple's Philosophy and Theology of Church Unity	21
3	Anglican Church Unity: Bridge and Barrier	49
4	Home Reunion: "So Close and Yet So Far"	85
5	South India: "Reunion by Destruction"	123
6	William Temple and the World Council of Churches: Church Unity "Lite"	153
7	Wartime Opportunities and Threats	179
8	Conclusion	205
	Bibliography	227
	Index	247



# ABBREVIATIONS

## ORGANISATION ABBREVIATIONS

BCC	British Council of Churches
CSI	Church of South India
COPEC	Conference on Christian Politics, Employment and Citizenship
F&O	Faith and Order
L&W	Life and Work
SCM	Student Christian Movement
WCC	World Council of Churches

## BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

<i>CH</i>	<i>Church History</i>
<i>ET</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
<i>DEM</i>	<i>Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement</i>
<i>JBS</i>	<i>The Journal of British Studies</i>
<i>JEH</i>	<i>The Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>JES</i>	<i>The Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>The Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>ODNB</i>	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>

# William Temple and Church Unity: Framing the Debate and Providing the Context

## REPUTATION AND SCHOLARSHIP

In the early twentieth century, there was probably no more ubiquitous character in the movement for Christian unity than Archbishop William Temple (1881–1944). His indefatigable efforts have led to a seemingly indelible association between his name and the ecumenical movement. Surprisingly, considering the stature of Temple, there is relatively little scholarly analysis on his effort to apply his theology in the practice of church unity. This monograph focuses on that lacuna. It demonstrates that the portrayal of Temple in this area has been largely caricature, either positive or negative, that fails to account appropriately for the complexity of Temple’s context and the multifaceted approaches he took in the various situations which he faced. This study shows that Temple was motivated by deep convictions but that, paradoxically, in some aspects, those convictions were detrimental to his ultimate goal. It explores the politics and practice of Temple’s ecumenical theology both nationally and internationally and evaluates the contribution Temple made to the ecumenical cause.

Temple’s stature within Anglicanism and his work towards church unity have been widely acknowledged. Matthew Grimley proclaimed Temple as “the pre-eminent Anglican leader of the inter-war period, and indeed of

the whole twentieth century”.<sup>1</sup> Kenneth Hylson-Smith goes even further, declaring him “One of the most outstanding churchmen not only of the twentieth but of any century”.<sup>2</sup> Temple was held in such high regard, one theologian even described the biblical prophet Isaiah as being “the William Temple of his day” because of his “metropolitan sphere of influence, his close contacts with the king and court, his grasp of national policies, and his ability to speak effectively and unmistakably”.<sup>3</sup> One aspect that has led to such claims was Temple’s ecumenical concern. Only months before he died, the *Church Times* described the goal of Christian reunion and the ecumenical movement as “nearest to the Archbishop’s heart”.<sup>4</sup> Soon after his death, his achievements in this regard were praised. Cyril Garbett claimed that Temple probably did more than any one man had ever previously done for Christian unity.<sup>5</sup> Alec Vidler stated, “Temple played a leading part ... in all aspects of the ecumenical movement”, while Roger Lloyd described him as its “architect”.<sup>6</sup> These early assessments have been reiterated in recent years. Stephen Spencer has described Temple’s role in the ecumenical movement as “crucial”, while David Carter labelled it as “key”.<sup>7</sup> Suffice to say, Temple is widely held in high esteem both within Anglicanism in general and as an early ecumenist.

In the 70 years since his death, Temple’s reputation has remained largely unsullied. Recent biographers of Cosmo Gordon Lang and Geoffrey Fisher have contrasted the honour surrounding Temple’s memory with the prevailing perception of Lang and Fisher.<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, Temple has

<sup>1</sup>M. Grimley, *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State Between the Wars* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004). p. 5.

<sup>2</sup>K. Hylson-Smith, *The Churches in England from Elizabeth I to Elizabeth II: 1833–1998* (London: SCM, 1996). p. 179.

<sup>3</sup>S.B. Frost, *Old Testament Apocalyptic: Its Origins and Growth* (London: Epworth, 1952). p. 112.

<sup>4</sup>“Review of W. Temple, *Church Looks Forward*,” in *Church Times* 4 Aug 1944, p. 413.

<sup>5</sup>Cited in J.F. Fletcher, *William Temple, Twentieth-Century Christian* (New York: Seabury, 1963). p. 273.

<sup>6</sup>A.R. Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution: 1789 to the Present Day* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1962). p. 260; R. Lloyd, *The Church of England 1900–1965* (London: SCM, 1966). p. 250.

<sup>7</sup>S.C. Spencer, *William Temple: A Calling to Prophecy* (London: SPCK, 2001). p. 119; D. Carter, “The Ecumenical Movement in its Early Years,” *JEH* 49 (1998). p. 465.

<sup>8</sup>R. Beaken, *Cosmo Lang: Archbishop in War and Crisis* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012). pp. xi, 2; A. Chandler and D. Hein, *Archbishop Fisher, 1945–1961: Church, State and World* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012). p. 5. The contrast may also result from apparent shortcomings in their chosen Archbishops. For example, MacKinnon suggested that the real misfortune to



certainly not been without critics; yet even detractors have acknowledged the profound influence he had. For example, Edward Norman described Temple's social thinking as "unoriginal" and "inept", though he does admit Temple's views achieved "an ascendancy in the Church of his day".<sup>9</sup> Likewise, John Kent's biography is rather critical, yet he still labelled Temple "the undisputed world leader and major statesman of the ecumenical movement" in the period between the wars.<sup>10</sup> One of the key weaknesses of Kent's work, however, has been that it does not adequately answer how highly one should rate Temple's achievement in his work for the ecumenical movement.<sup>11</sup> As this book explores Temple's theology and practice of church unity, it will also fill the void left by Kent and offer an assessment of Temple's achievements in this field.

Temple's achievements may appear more impressive on account of the ecclesiastical situation of today. Rodd has pointed out that while it was in the ecumenical movement that Temple "is commonly regarded as having his greatest success", his statements about the movement's success and momentum appear "sadly dated" and "almost quaint".<sup>12</sup> *The Tablet* in 1990 published an article entitled "The Winter of Ecumenism", which stated that "the restoration of unity with any Church, let alone all, still seems a distant dream", belonging to a naïve and over-optimistic earlier time.<sup>13</sup> Gillian Evans speaks of the repeated dashing of ecumenical hopes, leading to "ecumenical gloom" among leaders of the movement.<sup>14</sup> Likewise, Paul Avis has contrasted the excitement linked to ecumenism of Temple's day with its "humdrum" and "dreary" association today.<sup>15</sup> While there have been ecumenical advances over the last 25 years, such

befall the leadership of the Church of England at the end of the war was less the premature death of Temple and more who was chosen to succeed him. (D.M.K. MacKinnon, "Justice," *Theology* LXVI, no. 513 (1963). p. 102.)

<sup>9</sup> E.R. Norman, *Church and Society in England 1770–1970: A Historical Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). pp. 281, 283.

<sup>10</sup> J. Kent, *William Temple: Church, State, and Society in Britain, 1880–1950* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992). pp. ix, 30.

<sup>11</sup> W.A. Poe, "Review of J. Kent, *William Temple*," *CH* 65, no. 2 (1996). p. 309.

<sup>12</sup> C.S. Rodd, "Half Crown Article in a Penny Bazaar," *Expository Times* 104, no. 12 (1993).

<sup>13</sup> "The Winter of Ecumenism," *Tablet* 13 Jan 1990, p. 35.

<sup>14</sup> G.R. Evans, *Method in Ecumenical Theology: The Lessons So Far* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996). p. 5.

<sup>15</sup> P.D.L. Avis, *Reshaping Ecumenical Theology: The Church Made Whole?* (London: T&T Clark, 2010). p. vii.

as the Porvoo and Reuilly Agreements, they pale in comparison with the earlier optimistic hopes of organic reunion. Avis points out that there is now much uncertainty, doubt and heart-searching about the movement's future.<sup>16</sup> He states:

It seems to many observers that the ecumenical movement has reached a watershed. Its momentum slowed noticeably in the last decade of the twentieth century. In the first decade of the new century it has definitely been faltering. The dreams that marked the heyday of ecumenism—the dream of “the coming great church” and the dream of visible unity by the year “whatever” now look naïve, if not foolhardy. All our ecumenical endeavours seem to be shot through with doubt and uncertainty now.<sup>17</sup>

The same trend can be demonstrated within Anglicanism. Temple and his contemporaries often described a growing sense of unity within the denomination in the period between the wars.<sup>18</sup> This can be contrasted with Avis' observation that today, “the Anglican Communion appears to be racked by internal argument and conflict” and the “word ‘split’ is seldom absent from any headline or news report on the Anglican Communion”.<sup>19</sup> Kenneth Locke has also recently argued that, through the twentieth century, Anglican “party lines and various theological emphases and concerns became even more pronounced”.<sup>20</sup> In 2008, almost 300 bishops from around the Anglican Communion gathered in Jerusalem for a conference perceived by many as a rival Lambeth Conference.<sup>21</sup> In the last 20 years, the Church of England has been divided over issues of human sexuality and women's ordination, and novel structures have

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. p. vii.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. p. 21.

<sup>18</sup> W. Temple, *Thoughts on Some Problems of the Day: A Charge Delivered at his Primary Visitation* (London: Macmillan, 1931). p. 83, W.M. Horton, *Contemporary English Theology: An American Interpretation* (London: SCM, 1940). p. 141.

<sup>19</sup> P.D.L. Avis, *The Identity of Anglicanism: Essentials of Anglican Ecclesiology* (London: T&T Clark, 2007). p. 152.

<sup>20</sup> K.A. Locke, *The Church in Anglican Theology: An Historical, Theological and Ecumenical Exploration* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009). p. 89.

<sup>21</sup> For example, it was described as a “counter-conference” to Lambeth, by B. Farran. Cited in P. Ashworth, “Bishop lashes ‘imperious and embarrassing’ GAFCON,” *Church Times* 18 Jan 2008, p. 10. A second GAFCON was held in Nairobi in October 2013.

been implemented, such as Provincial Episcopal Visitors.<sup>22</sup> It is true to say that global Anglicanism is an impaired communion, as various ministries and ordinations are recognised by some jurisdictions and not by others.<sup>23</sup> Perhaps today's turmoil inclines Christians to view Temple and his period with "rose coloured glasses", not an accurate portrayal of the events of his time. Indeed, this monograph demonstrates that there were similar internal Anglican tensions and threats of secession in the early twentieth century and ecumenical advances were, likewise, difficult to achieve.

It has been an easy criticism of the ecumenical movement that it was motivated by sociological factors, and in particular, increasing secularisation. Wilson offered the critique that the ecumenical movement was a reflection of the weakness of religion in an increasingly secularised society and that church reunion involved compromise, a sign of further weakness.<sup>24</sup> The increasing secularisation of England was once considered to have been a continuous phenomenon from Victorian times up to the present day. For example, Kenneth Hylson-Smith argued the decline began in the 1880s and increased rapidly after the First World War.<sup>25</sup> More recent historiography has turned this theory on its head, most notably in the work of Callum Brown, who demonstrated the strength of Christianity in England until the 1960s, when it began to decline rapidly.<sup>26</sup> As such, the rise of the ecumenical movement cannot be attributed to sociological factors alone, as it was largely a theological movement. As David Thompson has noted, historians have to be aware that supporters of the movement were concerned with the question of whether a united or divided church more properly represented the mind of Christ.<sup>27</sup> This fact warrants the foundation of this book on Temple's theology and philosophy of church unity.

<sup>22</sup> "Synodical Position of the Provincial Episcopal Visitors," *General Synod Proceedings* (11 Nov 1993). pp. 999–1018.

<sup>23</sup> Avis, *Reshaping*. p. 168.

<sup>24</sup> B.R. Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society: A Sociological Comment* (London: C.A. Watts, 1966). pp. 125–129.

<sup>25</sup> Hylson-Smith, *Churches*. p. 8.

<sup>26</sup> C.G. Brown, *The Death of Christian Britain: Understanding Secularisation, 1800–2000* (London: Routledge, 2000).

<sup>27</sup> D.M. Thompson, "Theological and Sociological Approaches to the Motivation of the Ecumenical Movement," in *Religious Motivation: Biographical and Sociological Problems for the Church Historian*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford: 1978). p. 475.

At this point, it is worth defining various terms that are of significance in this study. Temple defined the “ecumenical movement” as the name “given to the various enterprises in which the several Churches are invited to co-operate”.<sup>28</sup> In other words, it referred to denominations working together for common purposes. These common purposes were broader than later definitions offered by others that referred only to “political, social and economic issues”.<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, the ecumenical movement is somewhat distinct from, but not mutually exclusive of, attempts to achieve organic unity. Organic unity results from the amalgamation of denominations into an outwardly visible and unified society with a coherent form of church polity.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, Temple’s work towards “Home Reunion” was an attempt to achieve organic unity among the churches of the UK. A lesser form of unity is “full communion”, which refers to the interchangeability of ministries and members between two denominations.<sup>31</sup> As we shall see, Temple also advocated “partial communion” as an intermediate step towards full communion in relation to the Church of South India (CSI).<sup>32</sup> Earlier in Temple’s work, full communion was spoken of as “intercommunion”. Thus, intercommunion means more than just sharing the Holy Communion among different denominations, a practice that was strongly promoted by some as a path to church unity in the inter-war period. I will refer to this practice as “reciprocal Communion”. A further alternative to reciprocal Communion was the position Temple came to adopt, later known as “Eucharistic hospitality”. This position happily offered Anglican Holy Communion to Christians from non-episcopal churches, but refused to receive from them. These various goals and methods of reaching them were causes of great controversy in Temple’s era.

A further matter worthy of clarification is the difficult question of classifying Temple’s churchmanship. He has been described as standing in the Liberal Catholic tradition, and there is little doubt that Charles Gore was a significant influence on him.<sup>33</sup> Yet Temple was no mere disciple

<sup>28</sup>W. Temple, *Readings in St. John’s Gospel* (London: Macmillan, 1945). p. 267n.

<sup>29</sup>D. Hudson, *The Ecumenical Movement in World Affairs* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1969). p. 4.

<sup>30</sup>L. Newbigin, “Organic Unity,” in *DEM*, ed. N. Lossky, et al. (Geneva: WCC, 1991). pp. 1028–30.

<sup>31</sup>Locke, *Church*. p. 132.

<sup>32</sup>See Chap. 5.

<sup>33</sup>A.E. McGrath, ed. *The SPCK Handbook of Anglican Theologians* (London: SPCK, 1998). p. 26. In dedicating a book to Gore, Temple said that he had learnt more from him

of Gore, differing from him substantially on numerous points. Both Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals claimed that Temple came very close to Anglo-Catholicism itself, but the major disagreements he had with Anglo-Catholics over the years indicate he never fully identified with that party position.<sup>34</sup> Temple had always been reticent to claim any party affiliation, but declared his desire to work harmoniously with everyone.<sup>35</sup> For this reason, the best classification for Temple should be “central churchman”. Indeed, in a contemporary analysis, Walter Horton chose Temple as the epitome of a central churchman.<sup>36</sup> He described Temple as “a truly central figure to whom all parties look up with equal respect”.<sup>37</sup> Another contemporary, Henry Goudge, emphasised the importance of the role of central churchmen “in holding the Church of England together”.<sup>38</sup> This assessment has been reiterated by Adrian Hastings, who argued that Temple’s heavy involvement in the Student Christian Movement (SCM) and his close Anglo-Catholic friends meant that “more and more he came to express the consensus of these two streams of thought in a manner that never seemed partisan but redolent rather of the confidence of a rejuvenated central Anglicanism”.<sup>39</sup> This position was best suited to Temple’s “complementarian” theology discussed below.

Focusing now on the scholarship relevant to this research, Grimley is right to lament the neglect of serious critical study of significant churchmen such as Temple. His comment is pertinent that “tombstone

than any other living person. (W. Temple, *Studies in the Spirit and Truth of Christianity: Being University and School Sermons* (London: Macmillan, 1914).; cf. J. Carpenter, *Gore: A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought* (London: Faith, 1960). p. 9). A link absent in scholarship when stating this influence is that Gore and Temple were related by marriage. Temple’s aunt was Gore’s sister, and thus their affinity and affection for one another were based, in part, on kinship.

<sup>34</sup> For example, the evangelical newspaper *English Churchman* stated, “Temple has drawn closer to the Anglo-Catholics in recent years, but we were not aware he had advanced as far as this.” 5 Mar 1931, p. 118. On the other side, staunch Anglo-Catholics such as Williamson and Dix made similar claims. (H.R. Williamson, *The Walled Garden: An Autobiography* (London: Michael Joseph, 1956). pp. 123–124; J.G. Leachman, “An Interesting Letter in 1940: Individual or Corporate Reunion?,” *STR* 53, no. 1 Christmas (2009). p. 27).

<sup>35</sup> Temple to Full Convocation of Canterbury, 1917, cited in F.A. Iremonger, *William Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury: His Life and Letters* (London: OUP, 1949). p. 217.

<sup>36</sup> Horton, *English Theology*. p. 148.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* p. 150.

<sup>38</sup> H.L. Goudge, *The Church of England and Reunion* (London: SPCK, 1938). p. 18.

<sup>39</sup> A. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity, 1920–2000*, 3rd ed. (London: SCM, 2001). p. 178.

hagiographies” have tended to be the last word.<sup>40</sup> Frederic Iremonger’s biography, published just four years after Temple’s death, has remained the only comprehensive treatment of his life: Many would share Hastings’ sentiment that “Nothing, perhaps, is needed more for the religious history of Britain in the twentieth century than a really major new biography of Temple”.<sup>41</sup> The critical scholarship that has taken place has generally focused on Temple’s social thought, and Norman has said that it is for this “that he has been remembered in the Church”.<sup>42</sup> This work is associated with names such as Ronald Preston, Robert Craig and Alan Suggate.<sup>43</sup> In relation to his ecumenical work, only a few specific studies have focused on particular events, such as Diane Kirby’s work on Temple’s proposed visit to the Pope.<sup>44</sup> There has, however, been no systematic and comprehensive analysis until now.

In relation to Temple’s ecclesiology more generally, Stephen Sykes in *The Integrity of Anglicanism* castigated Temple for a lack of doctrinal clarity and especially attributed to him the liberalisation of Anglicanism, describing it as “a cuckoo in the Anglican nest”.<sup>45</sup> This book has been described as having an “acerbic mood”.<sup>46</sup> Sykes later regretted certain “parade and folly” in it, but upheld its general premise.<sup>47</sup> In *Integrity*, he railed against the notion of Anglican “comprehensiveness” as a nineteenth-century development, claiming it “was a theory with an irresistible attraction for bishops endeavouring to achieve a *modus vivendi* between warring groups

<sup>40</sup> Grimley, *Citizenship*. p. 23. Garth Turner has remarked that there is a common and significant defect in Anglican leaders’ biographies especially, but not exclusively, since the Second World War, complaining that they are below conventional standards. G. Turner, “Anglican Biography since the Second World War: A Modern Tradition and Its Limitations,” in *Sainthood Revisited*, ed. C. Binfield (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995). p. 124.

<sup>41</sup> A. Hastings, “William Temple,” in *The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism*, ed. G. Rowell (Oxford: IKON, 1992). pp. 215–216.

<sup>42</sup> Norman, *Church and Society*. p. 281.

<sup>43</sup> For example, R.H. Preston, “William Temple as Social Theologian,” *Theology* 84:701, no. September (1981).; R. Craig, *Social Concern in the Thought of William Temple* (London: Gollancz, 1963).; A.M. Suggate, *William Temple and Christian Social Ethics Today* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987).

<sup>44</sup> D. Kirby, “William Temple, Pius XII, Ecumenism, Natural Law, and the Post-War Peace,” *JES* 36, no. 3–4 (1999).

<sup>45</sup> S.W. Sykes, *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (London: Mowbrays, 1978). pp. 32–33.

<sup>46</sup> M.D. Chapman, *Anglican Theology* (London: T&T Clark, 2012). p. 174.

<sup>47</sup> S.W. Sykes, *Unashamed Anglicanism* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1995). p. 218.

in their dioceses”.<sup>48</sup> In Avis’ assessment, Sykes made Anglicans realise “that their comfortable comprehensiveness needs theological justification, if it is not to lay itself open to the charge of providing a refuge for woolly thinking, intellectual dishonesty and ecclesiological hypocrisy”.<sup>49</sup> Others have agreed that doctrinal comprehensiveness “is a mask to cover doctrinal indifference”.<sup>50</sup> An example of the position Sykes was critiquing would be Arthur Vogel’s comment in the preface to *Theology in Anglicanism*, where he admits refusing to be part of a project called *Anglican Theology*, since “Anglicans have always claimed not to have a theology of their own, just theology of an undivided Church”.<sup>51</sup> Sykes called this the “No-Special-Doctrine” understanding of Anglicanism and argued it was “fallacious”.<sup>52</sup> Soon after Sykes’ *Integrity* was published, some scholars attempted to refute Sykes’ claim that Temple was a dangerous and confusing influence on Anglicanism, arguing that Temple’s comprehensiveness stood in the tradition of other great Anglican thinkers, such as Hooker and Maurice.<sup>53</sup>

It is my contention, however, that it is inaccurate to suggest that Temple subscribed to the “No-Special-Doctrine” understanding of Anglicanism. Furthermore, when the corpus of Temple’s work is considered, rather than just a few paragraphs from the 1938 Report of the Doctrine Commission, it is apparent that he considered Anglicanism to have particular doctrines which he believed most closely represented his ecclesiology. Temple’s liberal attitude, certainly as he matured, should not be confused with the theological liberalism associated with the notion that humans are naturally good and reasonable. Temple’s attitude was one of “liberality”, such as Vidler described in *Essays in Liberality*.<sup>54</sup> He was willing to listen and learn and attempt a synthesis of different positions. As such, the “comprehensiveness” that Sykes attributes to Temple is not *mere* “comprehensiveness” but rather ecclesiastical “complementarity”. Comprehensiveness simply

<sup>48</sup> *Integrity*. pp. 7, 37.

<sup>49</sup> P.D.L. Avis, *Ecumenical Theology: And the Elusiveness of Doctrine* (London: SPCK, 1986). p. 112.

<sup>50</sup> P.H.E. Thomas, “Doctrine of the Church,” in *The Study of Anglicanism*, ed. S. Sykes, J. Booty, and J. Knight (London: SPCK, 1998). p. 260.

<sup>51</sup> A.A. Vogel, “Preface,” in *Theology in Anglicanism*, ed. A.A. Vogel (Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse Barlow, 1984). p. 7.

<sup>52</sup> Sykes, *Unashamed*. p. 103.

<sup>53</sup> W.J. Wolf, J.E. Booty, and O.C. Thomas, *The Spirit of Anglicanism: Hooker, Maurice, Temple* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979). pp. vii–viii.

<sup>54</sup> A.R. Vidler, *Essays in Liberality* (London: SCM, 1957).

means “breadth”. In other words, many different positions, even positions that are antinomies, could find a place in a comprehensive church. In places, Sykes argues against this position, but his antagonists, such as F.D. Maurice and Temple, did not advocate for mere comprehensiveness but complementarity.<sup>55</sup> Sykes described fairly Maurice’s position, but his use of “comprehension” is a misnomer.<sup>56</sup> Likewise, Temple was an ecclesiological complementarian, believing the various individual parties within the church supplied important truth to the whole. Both philosophical and theological factors were the foundation for Temple holding this position. The interaction between these influences and Temple’s stance will be analysed in Chap. 2 of this book.

Joseph Fletcher’s *William Temple: Twentieth-Century Christian* is an attempt to comprehensively account for Temple’s theology. He organises his work under three headings, Constructive Theology, Ecumenical Theology and Social Theology. While Fletcher claims that “there is no attempt in the text to interpret Temple”, there are certainly passages that appear to reinterpret him and project the author’s own theological system on his subject.<sup>57</sup> For example, Fletcher portrays Temple as a universalist, validating all religions.<sup>58</sup> This was a position Temple repudiated, going so far as to describe Christianity as “a profoundly intolerant religion”.<sup>59</sup> Davies’ statement regarding Fletcher’s work is à propos: “One wonders if there is more of the interpreter than the interpreted in the thought as well as the expression.”<sup>60</sup> A more helpful account of Temple’s “Incarnational” theology is found in Michael Ramsey’s *From Gore to Temple*.<sup>61</sup> Ramsey also offers a brief account of the theology that motivated Temple’s efforts for church unity.<sup>62</sup> Interestingly, despite Temple’s theology shifting from a theology of “incarnation” to a theology of “redemption”, and generally moving in a conservative direction from the liberalism of his youth, his

<sup>55</sup> F.D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ*, 2nd ed., vol. II (London: Bloomsbury, 1842). pp. 322–27.

<sup>56</sup> Sykes, *Integrity*. pp. 16–24.

<sup>57</sup> Fletcher, *Temple*. p. vii.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.* p. 131.

<sup>59</sup> Temple to Samuel, 26 Nov 1942, in F.S. Temple, ed. *Some Lambeth Letters* (London: OUP, 1963). p. 41.

<sup>60</sup> H. Davies, “Review of J. Fletcher, *William Temple: Twentieth-Century Christian*,” *CHSCS* 33, no. 2 (1964).

<sup>61</sup> M. Ramsey, *From Gore to Temple: The Development of Anglican Theology between Lux Mundi and the Second World War, 1889–1939* (London: Longmans, 1960).

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 124–28.



theology of church unity was fairly consistent throughout his life. This will be demonstrated in Chap. 2.

The most recent, substantial monograph on Temple's theology is Wendy Dackson's *The Ecclesiology of William Temple*.<sup>63</sup> This work is a helpful and significant study, the conclusions of which I am in general agreement with. Dackson highlights the three biblical metaphors that underpin Temple's ecclesiology. The primary image she draws upon is the body of Christ and the subordinating metaphors of city and army.<sup>64</sup> Furthermore, she draws upon Temple's published work throughout his career to demonstrate her conclusions and illustrates a consistency of ecclesiological thinking over time.<sup>65</sup> The conclusions of this study extend Dackson's findings by focusing particularly on the issue of church unity and investigating not only Temple's theology in this area, but also the ways he attempted to implement his theology in practice. As such, this project not only draws upon Temple's relevant published work, but also investigates various events and organisations in which he was involved.<sup>66</sup> Unpublished papers, such as personal correspondence and minutes from meetings, shape the analysis of Temple's work for church unity.<sup>67</sup> The reception of these efforts, as recorded in the ecclesiastical press, is highly significant. Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 each investigate a different aspect of the relationship between Temple's theology and its application.

Chapter 3 focuses on Temple's thinking about Anglicanism and his efforts at what Avis would later describe as "internal Anglican ecumenism".<sup>68</sup> Temple believed Anglicanism best encapsulated his ecclesiology of complementarity, and as such, was a model and an important bridge in pursuit of organic unity. Various aspects of Temple's understanding of Anglicanism

<sup>63</sup>W. Dackson, *The Ecclesiology of Archbishop William Temple, 1881–1944* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 2004).

<sup>64</sup>Ibid. p. 64.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid. pp. 64–66.

<sup>66</sup>Temple was a prolific author. Baker claimed, "Never before has an Archbishop of Canterbury published so much", and Fletcher lists 221 separate and different items of Temple's published work (A.E. Baker, *William Temple and his Message* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1946). p. 49; cf. Fletcher, *Temple*. p. 349).

<sup>67</sup>There are 111 folios of Temple Papers at Lambeth Palace Library (LPL) as well as numerous important documents and correspondence in other Lambeth collections. Moreover, there are relevant papers in Queen Mary Archives in Mile End, The Church of England Record Centre in Bermondsey, the Borthwick Institute in York and the World Council of Churches Archive in Geneva (see Bibliography for further details).

<sup>68</sup>Avis, *Identity*. p. 23.

will be contested, such as his claim that Anglican complementarity had always been the church's "deliberate choice". Nevertheless, Temple certainly succeeded in enshrining his understanding of Anglicanism in some official statements, such as the resolutions of the 1930 Lambeth Conference and the 1938 Report of the Doctrine Commission. Other efforts, however, were rejected, such as the revised *Prayer Book*, and this had significant repercussions on ecumenical relationships.

Although Temple wanted to use Anglicanism as a model of the complementarity that he believed was essential for organic reunion, in his negotiations with the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches, his Anglican convictions proved to be a barrier. This is a key concern of Chap. 4. It investigates Temple's position on the key sticking points of episcopacy, reciprocal Communion and preaching exchanges. Moreover, Temple's conviction that no reunion should take place in one direction that could endanger reunion in another meant that he needed other bodies to resemble Anglicanism more closely rather than vice versa. Temple's approach also appears to have underestimated how much differing Anglican parties actually had in common compared with those of differing church order and, indeed, how much the Free Churches differed among themselves. The combination of these factors meant that, while significant effort was put into home reunion by Temple, little tangible progress was made towards his goal.

In contrast to Temple's attempts at home reunion, the potential for schism in the Church of England caused by organic reunion with non-episcopal bodies is the subject of Chap. 5. It focuses on the Scheme of Reunion in South India and its impact in England and around the Anglican Communion. This chapter also highlights the pragmatism of Temple's approach to church unity. First, it shows Temple supporting the South India Scheme in 1930, despite arguing in theory against such schemes only two years earlier. Second, when the hostility towards the union reached a crescendo in the 1940s, Temple distanced himself from the Scheme and pleaded that England had no decision-making responsibility. It was an attempt to pacify those aggravated by the proposals. The opposition was very disturbing for Temple because it was at odds with his conception of Anglicanism, and indeed, Christianity.

Chapters 6 and 7 also demonstrate the way pragmatic solutions tripped over Temple's principled positions in his pursuit of church unity. Chapter 6 focuses on the formation of the World Council of Churches (WCC) and Temple's vital role in its establishment. It demonstrates how

Temple again changed his earlier negativity on the formation of such councils to wholehearted support and active involvement. Moreover, it assesses whether the WCC under Temple's leadership aided or was detrimental to his aim of organic church unity. Furthermore, it evaluates whether the WCC achieved what he had argued its purpose was.

Chapter 7 investigates certain opportunities and threats to church unity arising from the Second World War and assesses the way in which Temple dealt with them. It shows an internal conflict within Temple about approaching the Pope to make a joint statement, and his personal correspondence on this subject reveals much about his character. Temple's handling of the case of a woman being ordained priest in Hong Kong is also investigated, demonstrating how he was prepared to forego his own theological principles for the sake of unity.

John Turner has claimed that "in the world of ecumenical scholarship, Temple was a paradox".<sup>69</sup> He points to the enduring popularity of Temple's devotional works despite the declining acceptance of his theology. The key paradox, however, was not the disjunct which Turner points to, but the way Temple's complementarian theology of church unity, when applied to various situations, could actually undermine unity. Moreover, his pragmatic responses in certain scenarios were in conflict with his theological convictions. These conclusions provide a richer and more complex picture of the Temple's character and the work he did for church unity than has hitherto been available.

## HISTORICAL CONTEXT

William Temple's work for church unity was not conducted in a vacuum; numerous antecedents significantly shaped his thought and provided the background for his work. It is necessary, as an orientation to the argument of this book, to provide some historical context to the factors that considerably influenced the movement towards church unity and the intellectual and ecclesiastical climate in which Temple pursued his goals. This survey will highlight both national and international stimuli for Temple's thinking and work.

From the sixteenth century, the Church of England had, to various degrees, offered a religious home for a variety of theological outlooks

<sup>69</sup> J.M. Turner, "William Temple," in *DEM*, ed. N. Lossky, et al. (Geneva: WCC, 1991). p. 977.