

to Dr. Hort; but for breadth of interest, and as an influence, not only upon the English Church, but upon English theology and religion, we believe, the first place must be conceded to him.

It has sometimes been charged against this little band of great theologians, that at Cambridge they have left no successors of equal eminence to continue the school which they may be said to have founded, and that to-day the theological faculty in Cambridge is not maintaining the traditions which they bequeathed to it. But has the time yet come for us to pronounce such a judgment?

If, in the providence of God, it has been decreed that no group equally pre-eminent should yet have arisen to take their place, but that, instead, hundreds should already look back upon their teaching and their influence as, humanly speaking, the highest inspiration of their lives, while they and thousands of others constantly turn for spiritual nourishment to their works, it is not for us to question the wisdom of the Divine Will.

W. EDWARD CHADWICK.

---

#### ART. III.—DR. HORTON'S CHALLENGE.

THE address given last month by Dr. Horton as Chairman of the Congregational Union deserves a warm reception at the hands of Churchmen. Of course, there are many things in it which Churchmen cannot agree with. On some of these things I shall have something to say presently. But if Dr. Horton fairly represents those whom he addressed, the Congregationalists are feeling their way towards reunion with the old Church. Here are some of his words:

"And we, facing still the organization of the Church of England, can but repeat the thought and purpose of our fathers. We have a sacred deposit which we are not at liberty to surrender. I am not aware that we in any way separate from the Church. We simply say we stand for the notes of the Church as it was at the beginning, is now, and ever shall be. To Catholic, Roman, or Anglican we frankly say that our organization is incomplete because we never designed a new Church system, but were merely compelled to indicate essential elements of the old. Make room for us *and our truth* in your system, and we are prepared to re-enter your borders in fact, as we always have done in spirit. . . . And may we not say that far better than creating other machinery of a diocesan or connectional type would be the re-emerging of our churches

in the Church, diocesan or connectional, which already exists? . . . None are less hampered with denominationalism, none are better affected to reunion, than we."

And what is the "truth" which Dr. Horton calls upon us Churchmen to make room for in our system?

"The first note of the Church," he says, "is that it is a community of redeemed souls which becomes for that reason 'a pillar and ground of the truth.' It is composed of those who are new creatures in Christ. . . . The second note of the Church is that the community, the local community, being, as Hort says, 'a body of Christ, a sanctuary of God,' has its own inviolable rights, and is the depository of supernatural powers . . . the members by word and deed can edify one another . . . they are able to recognise and appoint their rulers and teachers . . . they exercise disciplinary power, they can bind and loose, they can remit and retain sins. . . . The third note . . . is negative. . . . In the community there is a variety of mutual ministry and of spiritual powers for operating on the world, but there is no priest. . . ." Dr. Horton goes on to speak of priesthood as claiming an official exclusiveness of access to God. And to his third note of the Church, thus explained, I suppose most of those who read the *CHURCHMAN* will agree. I need not repeat what I wrote myself on the subject in the April number, p. 376. As to the second note, I go a long way with the speaker. With us Churchmen, except the patron and his nominee, and the patron at long intervals, there is nobody in the parish or out of it that has any substantial voice or part in the parish church and its institutions. While everything else has changed in England, the Church has been trying to grapple with the complicated problems of these latter days under arrangements which were probably the best that were possible a thousand years ago. And when good work is done, as it often is, it may fall down any day, like a house of cards, on the arrival of a new incumbent, or through the perversity of an old one. Lay workers amongst us, from the youngest Sunday-school teacher to the Chairman of the House of Laymen, have no assured position. They are helpers of the clergy, not servants of the Church. And to this absence of local organization as part of our Church system I attribute a large part of our failure. Our position is, in this respect, at the very antipodes of the Congregationalists'. Our position is not right. But is theirs? It would not be right even if Dr. Horton's first note of the Church were matter of fact, instead of an ideal; for while he says he is not aware that he has separated from the Church, that is the very thing that he and his friends have done. Instead of holding fast to the local Church and labouring to

strengthen and reform it, they have gone forth from it and set up rival communities. And then, with all the alleged superiority of their system, human nature being what it is, the difference, morally and spiritually, between one of our congregations and theirs by no means corresponds to the difference of organization. Congregationalists have their fair share of faults. If we have Lord Bishops at a distance they often have Lord Deacons on the spot—a kind of official who was described long ago by John Angell James, in his "Church Members' Guide," as being in some cases "the patron of the living, the Bible of the minister, and the wolf of the flock." I have on my table a large collection of extracts from the writer just named, from the once famous Mr. Binney, and others, which show that in their days the communities they had to do with were just what might have been expected from the system of Independency, as it was then called, and the sort of people who worked it. This was a long time ago; but I myself once saw a letter from a worthy Congregational minister in which he said he had watched the work of the Church of England in one of our large towns, and was satisfied that it was good and sound, while he was weary of the pretentiousness and unreality among the people he had to do with. Ministers of strong character and great ability may no doubt lift their hearers to a high level; but Church organization should take account of the average minister; and pure democracy, on the scale of the single congregation, cannot do that. To compare the Congregational ideal with the actual working of Church and State is as much beside the question as a comparison of King Edward VII.'s Coronation Service with Salem Chapel.

The fact is that our divisions in religion are only very partially founded on "the truth" in the sense that Dr. Horton uses that expression. They are, at least, as much social as theological or ecclesiastical. In a small market-town which I knew very well some years ago there was a Primitive Methodist Chapel, attended almost entirely by labouring folk and very small tradespeople; a Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, attended also by working folk, but with the larger shopkeepers as its distinguishing feature; a Congregational Chapel, attended also by some working folk, but also by a professional man and his family and some well-to-do farmers from neighbouring villages. In the parish church there were no gentry, in the sense of county family people, because there were none in the parish; but while all the actual classes were represented, there were some churchgoers who, for reasons more or less social, would have hardly liked to be regular attendants at either of the chapels. Take another illustration. I once

read a report of an address by the Chairman of a County Congregational Union to this effect: "I notice that when ministers come to us from other denominations, they usually come from the minor forms of Methodism, but that when ministers leave us, they usually go to the Established Church or the Presbyterians. Are we to suppose that all those who join us do so from purely spiritual motives, and that all those who leave us are worldlings, or is it not all alike one social drift?"

There is no one complete form of Church government laid down in the New Testament as obligatory upon all Christians in all places and at all times, and there is no one form of organization at the present time which has a monopoly of good Christians. It may be prejudice, but my experience, now long, though not extensive, leads me to the conclusion that a good Churchman, when you get one, is a finer article than a good Dissenter. And I see no sufficient reason for calling upon Churchmen to adopt the Congregational organization in their local Churches as of exclusively Divine authority, with or without a diocesan system superadded, than for claiming the like exclusiveness for Methodism or Presbyterianism. It is not true that the local Churches mentioned in the New Testament were as self-contained as Dr. Horton seems to think; and it is certain that, if episcopacy was not actually instituted by St. John, it sprang up in his time or immediately after to meet real needs. No doubt the hundred and twenty at Jerusalem filled up the vacant apostleship by election, but Peter first defined the kind of man that was required. When deacons were needed, the people elected, but subject to appointment by the Apostles. When Philip had formed a Church in Samaria, the converts did not proceed at once to elect a pastor, but Peter and John were sent by the Apostles to confirm them. When the dispute arose at Antioch about Judaizing, the local Church did not settle the question, but a Council was called for the purpose at Jerusalem; and the decrees of this Council were regarded as authoritative, not only at Antioch, but in other Gentile Churches. St. Paul's Epistles bear witness, no doubt, to a very large autonomy at Corinth and elsewhere, but they also bear witness to a large authority vested in the Apostle. He can even appoint deputies, both as messengers, and as temporary, if not permanent, overseers. Even in the Revelation, where each of the seven local Churches is represented by a golden lampstand standing on the earth, distinct from the other six, and by a distinct star in the Lord's right hand, they all receive the messages of Him who walks in their midst from the hand of His servant John, and the stars together form a wreath.

In the final vision of the Church—a vision of the ideal of the true Church as it was shortly to be when St. John wrote, and as we ought to be trying to make it now—the local separation is no longer discerned. All is one grand city compact together, standing four-square, very different from the stragglewise conglomeration that we see now. No *vaðs* is therein, and therefore no *ίερεύς*. But the nations are walking in its light, and they and their kings are bringing their honour into it—an important detail which Dr. Horton ignores. I cannot say that he ignores the strong and repeated demands for unity in the New Testament, or the equally strong denunciations of division. But he assumes, unconsciously perhaps, that any member of a local Church, if he does not think it sufficiently like the first Churches in its constitution or practice, may forsake it, and set up a new Church in the same locality, independent of the first, and drawing its members from the same population. From this it follows that if a member of the new Church thinks he can improve upon it, he has the same liberty as the first seceder, and so on. I once had a talk with a Congregational minister on this subject. "Of course," he said, "if I saw in my congregation any tendency to division, I should think it my duty to warn them against the sin of schism." "But," said I, "as soon as they had actually split into separate bodies, each with its own chosen officers and organization, you would have no further fault to find with them?" "No," he said, "I cannot say that I should." It reminded me very forcibly of the couplet:

"Treason doth never prosper; what's the reason?  
When it doth prosper, 'tis no longer treason."

I do not say there may not be places where the local Church has ceased to be a Church of God altogether. But a Christian man, with the New Testament as his guide, should be very slow in coming to such a conclusion. We read there of some very corrupt Churches; but in these cases the rule is always "Strengthen the things that remain," and never "Set up a rival community." Can anyone honestly say, with all the facts before him, that all or any of the cathedral and parish churches of England have passed beyond the point of unchristliness which had been reached by the Church of Sardis, which was dead?

Of course, the relations of Church and State in England have become anomalous through the change from a Parliament of Englishmen and Churchmen to a Parliament which represents Presbyterian Scotland, Roman Catholic Ireland, and the Nonconformity, Indifference, and Unbelief of the

three kingdoms, as well as the avowed members of the Church of England. But England is still the predominant partner, and in England the Church is far ahead of any one of her rivals, and, including her nominal adherents, who do not wish to upset her, ahead of them all together. No doubt the choice of our Bishops by a Premier "flung to the top by the turn of a party wheel" is what no body of Christians who had to start afresh would wish for. But the Premier is, for the time being, the representative of the United Kingdom, and especially of the predominant partner. Hitherto he has always been at least nominally, and sometimes very sincerely, a member of the Church. And the *congé d'élire* is not the blasphemous thing which Dr. Horton calls it. There is, I believe, no such prayer offered as he speaks of for the Divine guidance; and the election is by no means a farce. Every Premier, in making his choice, knows that if he chooses a man obviously unfit, the Dean and Chapter may refuse to elect, and that the country would probably support them in their refusal. There have been abuses in the appointment of Congregational ministers quite as great in their way as any that have occurred for a long time in the appointment of Bishops in the Church of England. I do not uphold our system as a model; but I say it is not a sufficient cause for those appalling divisions which have destroyed the very idea of a Church as a Divine institution—or, in Dr. Horton's good phrasing, "the sanctity of the Church meeting"—in the minds of the bulk of the English nation. When once you have told a man that he may choose his Church among an endless number of competitors, you have told him he may find his cathedral in his own armchair.

A Congregationalist might perhaps reply that he does not allow such choice, and that the only true Churches are Congregational. Dr. Horton draws a glowing picture of a Congregational Church:

"The life of the Church destroys the false individualism of the monastery; it corrects the introspection of Pietism. In the organism the member lives; the personal is merged; even as Christ pleased not Himself, so the members of the mystic body live for one another and the world, not for themselves," and much more to the like effect. And then he goes on to contrast with all this "the Donative of Constantine, the support and patronage of the State, the crumbling strength of an imperial organization," till he comes to Queen Elizabeth and James I., and at last to Mr. Balfour, and breaks out: "Oh what a falling off was there! For spiritual power, the mean omnipotence of States! For the reliance on the invisible Lord, the bare clinging to visible rulers! For the riches in

glory in Christ Jesus, the grudging tithes and endowments, clutched by a faithless Church from a faithless people."

It never seems to strike Dr. Horton that there must be a very close connection between the Church and the State if the nation is to walk in the light of the holy city, and with its kings—that is, in its corporate and political capacity—to bring its glory and honour into it. That this connection has not been always what it should have been, and that both parties have been at fault, is only to say that the ideal has not been realized. But how does Congregationalism realize the Divine ideal? First, it deliberately rejects all that difficult connection of Church and State which Scripture prescribes and we have inherited. Then it places its strength in one particular class of citizens—that class which is making money in trade. It cannot live in poor neighbourhoods, and those of the higher classes who are sincere Christians find themselves repelled not by the realization of Christ's ideal, but by characteristics merely sectional. In villages Congregationalism is, and must be, a failure, not only for lack of funds, but for the same reasons as have made village School Boards a failure. There is much in the Congregational ideal which is both scriptural in itself and suitable for these times. But so there is in the system of the Church of England. Each has its good points; each has its bad ones. For my own part, I cannot but admire Dr. Horton. In order to meet him halfway, let us work more and more for "a more complete development of the constitution and government of the Church, central, diocesan, and parochial, and especially the admission of laymen of all classes, who are *bonâ fide* Churchmen, to a substantial share in the control of Church affairs." This is a quotation from a paper signed by Dr. Westcott and most of the leading Churchmen at Cambridge seventeen years ago, and the subject has not been allowed to sleep. We might have expected some notice of the Church Reform movement in Dr. Horton's address. Let him and his friends look to facts as well as theories, and, instead of threatening us and hindering us, help us to win from the State a reasonable autonomy, *such as by their help might be had to-morrow*; and when we have wrought into our system the best parts of theirs, let them, as he suggests, "remerge" their Churches in the Church from which they ought never to have separated, but whose shortcomings have, I fully admit, supplied much excuse for their separation. As a practical suggestion, I would say let the Committee of the Church Reform League try to arrange a conference with a few men of like minds with Dr. Horton, and then let a society to pray for reunion be formed, such as already exists in Scotland. Reunion is in

the air, or, as Dr. Horton says, "we are agitated by a Divine unrest"; and I cannot but hope that the Spirit of God is leading men of diverse minds by different paths to a union nobler than Christians have ever yet seen, not excepting the by no means ideal union of New Testament days.

The problems before us are largely social problems, and if they are to be solved by organized Christianity, they will be better solved by the long pull, the strong pull, and the pull altogether of a National Church, than by the overlapping and irregular, if not fratricidal, efforts of self-centred societies. Dr. Horton in his opening remarks referred to the appalling fact that nearly a million of people in one city are living under such conditions that they simply cannot obey the plain precept of Christ to enter into their chamber and shut the door for prayer, because there is no chamber for them to enter, and no door to shut. This is only one small sample of what all Christians should be thinking of, and preparing to deal with in Christ's name. Let us only believe what we profess to believe, that we all are brethren, and we shall see our way. Till then, the more "we are agitated by a Divine unrest," the better. The world is watching us, and if we delay much longer, it will try to do our work itself.

J. FOXLEY.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE UNIVERSITIES AND THE MASSES.

WE may well bewail the materialistic instinct which inspires the multitude. It is customary to regard the millionaire as the incarnation of the desire for wealth, and to regard the toiling masses as those who desire merely the pittance which will sustain life in more or less—probably less—comfort. This is an utter fallacy. The whole aspiration of modern trade-unionism is materialistic in its coarsest sense. That movement, which took its rise in a reasonable desire to protect those who were under the heel of a tyranny, has now become an aggression towards an equal, not an equitable, division of wealth. It has been notably reluctant to undertake efforts for the furtherance of less materialistic aims. Only in respect to the curtailment of hours of labour has it shown any sympathy with aims which cannot be directly estimated in the coinage of the realm, and it is to be feared that in its desire for the curtailment of hours of labour the trade-union movement has been impelled by an impulse from without—the same impulse which urged men, but fifty years ago, to smash machines and to hate inventors, the impulse which is timid and fearful lest the few should