

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1896.

ART. I.—RUSSIA AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH.¹

AMONG symptoms of the "reunion" movement may be reckoned the formation of an "Eastern Church Association," for promoting mutual acquaintance and intercourse between the Anglican and Eastern communions. One of its modes of operation has been the publication of books bearing on the general subject. A translation of "The East Syrian Daily Offices" is one of these; the first volume of a work entitled "Russia and the English Church during the last Fifty Years" is another, and a second is in preparation. Interesting as this first volume is, if the second is not more encouraging to the hopes of reunionists, we gravely doubt the value to their cause of the publication of either; if (which is probable) it is, we think it would have been wise to issue both together. For the impression left on an average reader by the volume under review by itself will assuredly be that reunion with the Russian section, at any rate, of the Eastern Church, looks even more hopeless than with Rome!

The book opens with a copious introduction by the editor, Mr. Birkbeck, of Magdalen College, Oxford, but consists mainly of some twenty letters on Church questions exchanged during the years 1844-54 between William Palmer, of Magdalen (brother to Lord Selborne, and well known as a prominent figure in, as well as a chronicler of, the "Oxford Movement"), and a distinguished Russian layman and leading "Slavophile," M. Khomiakoff (pronounced Hōmiākoff). Not the least valuable section, however, consists of the closing chapters, which contain Palmer's justification of his surrender to Rome in 1855, and Khomiakoff's *précis* of the position and teaching of the "Orthodox" Church, approved as correct by

¹ "Russia and the English Church," vol. i. Rivington. September, 1895.

the Russian ecclesiastical "censura," and printed in 1863, three years after his decease.

It will be seen that the contents of the book are for the most part half a century old, but a great compensating advantage is found in the tests which events thus enable us to apply to the views and prognostics contained in M. Khomiakoff's letters.

Palmer's share in the correspondence is melancholy and disappointing. The interest of his personality, his learning, perseverance, and scrupulous love of truth, are beyond question, and his portraiture by Newman, in his "Visit to the Russian Church," only whets one's appetite for the fuller account of him from the pen of the late Lord Selborne, announced for early publication. But a staunch English Churchman feels dissatisfied almost to indignation with Palmer's apologetic, faint-hearted championship of the Anglican position in these letters, interpreted ere long by phrases like the following: "I can contemplate without any sense of absurdity the admission that the Anglican Church should have erred even fatally—nay, I even think the *primâ facie* probability runs that way." "A reformed Church (if the word be understood of any essential point of faith) must certainly be heretical." "The Anglican Church has gone very near heresy by taking away the law of Confession as a pre-requisite to Communion." "So long as my father lives, I am unwilling to do anything which my conscience does not absolutely require that might give him pain, as showing dissatisfaction with the Anglican Church." After seeking in vain enduring terms of reconciliation with the Easterns, he writes: "I may go and study in Rome." The end of that might easily be anticipated; but it is truly painful to read the sinuous explanations of his final submission: "Father Passaglia informed me of an 'opinion' which served to facilitate my conviction, namely, that I could be received into the Roman Catholic communion by merely suspending my private judgment, and making up my mind to affirm nothing contrary to the known dogmas of the Roman Church. I followed his advice, for it seemed unjustifiable to pass my life in judging Churches without belonging to any of them. . . . My intellectual opinion has remained almost without change, only . . . I find it much more agreeable to be on the side of the stronger than on the side of the less strong." Again: "It may be objected that, as 'he who comes to God must believe that He is,' etc., so he who comes to any community (as the Roman) as to the true Church with unreserved submission . . . must be persuaded that it is really the whole Catholic Church, exclusive of any other. . . . Still, in the case of one who needed valid absolution, it seemed safest to submit himself to

the undoubted Primate of the Apostolic College, so as to take from him, upon trust, even the definition of the Church itself . . . on which particular doctrines depend." So the fly walked into the spider's parlour.

To turn from this to M. Khomiakoff is refreshing. The loyal inflexibility of his faith and Church allegiance is magnificent; it commands one's admiration of itself, as Dean Burgon's did the American's "I like you, you're so beastly positive!" Yet some of Khomiakoff's Burgonisms almost take one's breath away; and one can hardly help smiling, in 1896, at the havoc history has made with his vaticinations of 1846. A laughable and significant incident is told in connection with an engine which Khomiakoff (who was an inventor) sent to the Great Exhibition, under the name of "The silent motor," confidently expecting it to work in perfect silence. When put together on trial, it made such an appalling noise that the neighbouring lodging-houses sent to know the cause of the horrible sounds, threatening legal proceedings if they did not cease. Khomiakoff might re-christen his engine, but to restore faith in his forecasts must have been less easy; and his estimates in other matters besides engines were nowise infallible. Here are some of his views in 1848: "Every Englishman is a Tory at heart. . . . I am not speaking of peers and professors, but of mechanics and cab-drivers; there is quite as much Toryism in the common people as in the upper classes of society." "Anglicanism is dying, and it has not long to live. . . . Romanism has received the deadly blow from its own child, Protestantism; indeed, I defy anybody to show me the man, with true theological and philosophical learning, who is still at heart a pure Romanist. Protestantism has heard its knell rung by its most distinguished teachers. The Gorham question is a point of mere curiosity . . . but the decision admits that dogmatic doubts in the Church may be set aside by civil authority. . . . Protestantism is the death of religion." Again: "The hand of decay is on Germany, notwithstanding its apparent progress." Then, on the eve of the Crimean War: "The Russian people are not thinking of conquest; that never had any seduction for them. They think of duty; they contemplate a holy war. We need not conjecture to whom the true victory will fall; it has already been secured irrevocably by Russia." Yet again: "The general aspect of things in matters of religion is very favourable in our country." Yet it is curious to read, only five lines lower down, of "the innumerable heresies of the worst description which are constantly spreading their deleterious influence in the ranks of our common people!" Khomiakoff casts the horoscope of England thus:

“ Albion, Freedom’s darling daughter ! gracious land ! what gifts are thine !
 How with life thy streets are teeming ! how thy fields with harvests shine !
 But—for this, that thou art wicked ; but—for this, that thou art proud,
 That thou settest worldly greatness higher than the throne of God :
 That with sacrilegious daring thou Christ’s Church hast trampled down,
 Chaining her unto the footstool of a fleeting earthly throne—
 There shall come, O Queen of ocean, there shall come, and soon, a day,
 That thy glory, gold and purple, as a dream shall pass away.”

Was the intense State-Churchism of Russia forgotten by our poet in this prophecy of England’s ruin through her “ Establish-ment ” ?

Then he takes up his parable and speaks of his own country :

“ Lo ! before thy sovereign splendour nations quail with timid eye,
 And seven seas, in one rough chorus, hymn ceaseless thy supremacy ;
 Where is Rome ? where are the Mongols ? Albion, empress of the main ?
 She, too, ’mid gathering signs of vengeance, hides in her breast a deadly pain.
 Lo ! for this, that thou art humble, childlike, and simple to believe,
 That in thy heart’s deep silent treasure thy Maker’s word thou didst receive,
 To thee He gave a heavenly calling, to thee He gave a glorious meed,
 To keep this heritage for nations, high sacrifice and holy deed !
 Attend to it ! and so, embracing all nations with affection true,
 Tell them of God’s mysterious freedom, pour faith’s bright beams upon
 their view !”

To those who recall the shamelessly unscrupulous diplomacy of “ Holy Russia ” in the past, and have learned during the last few decades to tremble for the early future of the country, as a stronghold of administrative corruption, religious intolerance, arbitrary and cruel punishment, and a shackled press, the home of popular ignorance, intemperance and penury ; perched over a seething volcano of deadly and desperate revolutionary forces, the image of a child-like Russia, the affectionate evangelist of spiritual freedom to a benighted Europe, is not easy to conjure up.

The correspondents we have thus introduced discuss the possibilities of re-union with unusual frankness. Palmer seems to admit the soundness of all Eastern doctrine, but cannot accept the pretensions of the Easterns (of which he doubts the full sincerity) to be the whole of the true Church, deplores their want of vitality and missionary zeal, and is scandalized by the inconsistency of their discipline, the Greeks exacting re-baptism from him as a condition of recognition, which the Russians would dispense with (the Greeks have given way on this point of later years), while he regards the excessive State-Churchism of Russia as an enormous difficulty.

Khomiakoff's lance is always in rest to do battle for "the Orthodox Church" (a name, by the way, which can only be conceded under protest, as it begs all questions), but he is happier in attack than in defence. It has to be conceded to him that the "Filioque" should never have been added to the Nicene Creed without an Œcumenical Council; in this, as in other matters, we suffer to-day for the unbrotherly arrogance of Papal ages, yet the wisdom and possibility of its formal excision now are puzzling questions indeed. The intense feeling still inspired in the Easterns by this ancient controversy is extraordinary. They hold that the "Filioque" absolutely differentiates the Western Creed from the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan Symbol, making them contradict each other. Scholars know that such contradiction can be extracted from the Greek, but disappears in the Latin and English versions altogether. Yet the acceptance of the "Filioque" by the English Church, says our writer, has constituted it "schismatical for ages and ages. . . . No community which accepts the inheritance of sin can be considered a real part of the Church of God!" One wonders, by the way, how far the faith and practice of a single Christian has ever been directly and appreciably affected by his standpoint in regard to the mysterious dogmatic detail in question. The issue is thus stated by M. Khomiakoff: "The Church does not deny that the Holy Spirit is sent not only by the Father, but also by the Son; the Church does not deny that the Holy Ghost is communicated to all rational creatures, not only from the Father, but through the Son; what she does reject is, that the Holy Ghost had the principle of His procession in the Godhead itself, not merely from the Father, but also from the Son." Not only do we accept this statement of the issue, but for ourselves we willingly adopt the Eastern view of it, yet entirely fail to see that doing so involves the duty of condemning the "Filioque" as heretical in itself. And if it is not, and the question is really one of the significance to be attached to words, and of discourtesy shown by Church officials who died over a thousand years ago, could not some registered explanation, disowning the obnoxious interpretation, be accepted, and "bygones be bygones"? Surely this is Christian common-sense; but the East (if Khomiakoff correctly represents her) demands an absolute self-condemnation from the West, which would stultify all her true Church life for centuries past, and is practically unthinkable. Khomiakoff feels this, yet his only inference is, "Hope for unity (where it exists) turns rather to the Nestorians, Eutychians, and so forth. They are farther from orthodoxy than the Churches of the West, but not withheld from a return by feelings of proud

disdain." One is reminded of the juryman's complaint of his eleven "obstinate colleagues."

Khomiakoff's strictures on Papal arrogance are natural enough ("it is the true plague of humanity," he says), and we feel no call to rebut them; and there is some truth, no doubt, in his complaint of the supercilious, unsympathetic attitude long maintained by Western Christendom towards that of the East, as well as in his remarks on party extremes in the Church of England.

But when he comes to repel Palmer's criticisms, it is done with an air of confidence not warranted by the strength of his arguments. If missionary zeal was scant in the East, he pleads, its abundance is no sign of doctrinal purity, for the Nestorians displayed it, and Mahomedans and Buddhists, while Romanist zeal produced more persecutors than martyrs. Nor had the East been without missionary conquests, though eschewing the Latin instruments of sword and fire. (The editor mentions in a note that the missionary work done within the Russian Empire during the last forty years need fear comparison with no other for zeal and success.)

As for rebaptizing Christian proselytes, it need not be an error (only a ritual difficulty) any more than re-marrying heathen couples on conversion would be, though the Church admits married heathen (as St. Paul's words suggest) without it. "The discipline of a whole local Church cannot be expected to be altered for an individual."

The State control of the Church in Russia was not essential, he continues, only due to the weakness of the "higher representatives" of the latter; no dogmatical error had ever been submitted to for want of protestation.

As for Mr. Palmer's discouraging reception, it was due to his not having approached the Synod with a document admitting that the orthodox Church was true and right in every respect, and any changes made in the West were false.

Behind all his defences, however, Khomiakoff has a reserve argument to fall back upon which he evidently regards as impregnable. "There *can* be no sin in the Church of God, the holy, elect and perfect vessel of His truth and grace. . . . Local errors are not errors of the Church, but errors into which individuals fall; the Church herself stands blameless and pure, never in need of a reform. No error, even the slightest, can be detected in the whole Eastern Church . . . and without this doctrine the idea of a Church becomes an illogical fiction. The possibility of error being once admitted, reason stands as a lawful judge over the work of God, and unbounded rationalism undermines faith." Let an evil or abuse be pointed out (and M. Khomiakoff incidentally, in the

most naïve way, admits very many), the reply is always ready: "It is an accidental error of persons—not of the Church; it is a historical, not an ecclesiastical fact," the latter being one of those explanations which to some plain minds seem to need explaining. "It is impossible there should have been a time when the Church could have received error into her bosom, or laity, presbyters and bishops submitted to instructions inconsistent with the teaching and Spirit of Christ. A man living within the Church does not submit to false teaching; he will not follow false rites. The Church does not err, for she is the truth; she is incapable of cunning or cowardice, for she is holy. And of course she does not acknowledge that to be error which she has at any time acknowledged as truth. Within her members false doctrines may be engendered, but the infected members fall away, and no longer defile her sanctity. . . . The Church does the works of God and has written the Scriptures (!). Every writing which the Church acknowledges as hers is Holy Scripture. Such are the creeds of the General Councils. The writing of Holy Scripture has gone on up to our day, and yet more will be written. . . . In the Church there have not been, nor ever will be, any contradictions, either in Scripture, or tradition, or works, for in all three is Christ, one and unchangeable. . . . Communities of Christians which broke away from the Holy [Eastern] Church preserved the external form of faith, but lost the inner meaning and the grace of God; as in their confession, so also in their life. . . . There neither was, nor could have been, nor ever will be a time when the Church's sacraments will be mutilated, holiness dried up, or doctrine corrupted. She never could err for want of understanding, for the understanding of God dwells within her; or submit to false doctrines for want of courage, for within her dwells the might of the Spirit of God. Her rites, even if not unchangeable, can never in any case contain any, even the smallest, admixture of error or false doctrine. By the will of God, the Holy Church, after the falling away of many schisms, and of the Roman Patriarchate, was preserved in the Greek Eparchies and Patriarchates; and only those communities can acknowledge one another as fully Christian which preserve their unity with the Eastern Patriarchates, or enter into this unity. For there is one Church, and within her there is neither dissension nor disagreement."

That all this is an "end of controversy" must be admitted. Unfortunately, the argument, resting on an assertion merely, can be appropriated by others! That the Church in its ideal is free from error, no one will deny; but that the ideal is embodied in the Russian Church, for instance, is assuredly

matter for argument and proof! The Church of God was to be found in Corinth and Galatia, in Ephesus and Sardis; yet, if St. Paul and St. John are to be trusted, they were by no means free from error. To claim orthodoxy is not enough. "Try the spirits," "By their fruits ye shall know the prophets," say the Scriptures. A profound fallacy, as Dr. Salmon has shown, lurks under this claim of infallibility for "the Church," when thus used to repel all criticism of particular Churches. And, whether we wish it otherwise or no, our ultimate appeal on Church questions can only be to the individual conscientious judgment, guided by the prayerful study of the inspired Scriptures of the apostolic age, and not without respectful deference to the conclusions of historic Christendom. Of course, that is Protestantism; but whether it is "the death of all religion," *pace* M. Khomiakoff, we take leave to doubt.

One asks with interest, What security or pledge of unchanging truth is relied upon by the "Orthodox" Church? It is not an infallible Pontiff, it seems, nor Scripture. Where is it to be found? In the Church's own "inward knowledge," is the answer given. "The Church has not, like the Protestants, to search for Christ [!], for she possesses Him, by the inward action of love, without requiring an external phantom of Christ, such as the Romans believe in. . . . We have no sort of sacred direction, but are united only in the bond of love and zeal for our common mother. . . . We alone can give the assurance of truth; but no hierarchical order or supremacy is a guarantee of it; it is guarded by the totality, by the whole people of the Church; the knowledge of the truth is given to mutual love. It would be difficult to ask for explanations more positive or more clear [?]. In this tradition of the Church a unity is to be found more authoritative than the despotism of the Vatican, for it is based on the strength of mutual love; a liberty more free than the licence of Protestantism, for it is regulated by the humility of mutual love. There is the Rock and the Refuge. Humanity has only one choice: 'Orthodoxy,' or infidelity; all middle terms are but preparatory steps to the latter. . . . Everyone who seeks proofs of the truth of the Church either shows his doubt, and excludes himself from the Church, or preserves a hope of proving the truth, and arriving at it by his own powers of reason; but powers of reason do not attain to the truth of God." Very true! yet an Apostle says "Prove all things," "Judge ye what I say," "Be ready to give a reason for the hope that is in you."

Our readers will be able by this time to judge how far proposals for a "Reunion" of the Anglican Church with a

communion taking up the attitude attributed to the Russian Church by its authorized expositor, M. Khomiakoff, have much promise of success in them. Yet that they exhibit so little is to be deplored, for it must frankly be owned that doctrinally the Eastern Church seems singularly free from vital error. A glance at M. Khomiakoff's *précis* of her teaching may fitly close our notice of the book before us.

The "Orthodox" Church repudiates as uncatholic and unscriptural the Papal Supremacy, the Immaculate Conception and sinlessness of Mary, Purgatory, Works of Supererogation, Extreme Unction at the point of death, the veneration of images, the denial of the cup to the laity, and Transubstantiation in the Roman sense; while she seems to draw a wise distinction between "the two higher Sacraments" and their five inferior companions. Her language on Transubstantiation is scarcely Protestant: "We dare not," writes Khomiakoff, "sympathise with a Church which gives Communion to those who declare the bread and wine to be mere bread and wine." But the Eastern Church "does not assign to the word 'transubstantiation' the material meaning assigned to it by the Churches which have fallen away." "It is not to be taken," say her four patriarchs, "to define the manner in which the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord; for this none can understand. Let it suffice thee to be told that it is by the Holy Ghost. The word of God is almighty, but its manner of operation unsearchable." All this is true enough, and is far nearer Anglican doctrine than that of Rome, albeit Articles XXVIII. and XXIX. of the Church of England would hardly be accepted in the East. Again, "The Church knows nothing of salvation by outward means, or of bargaining with God." And here is sound teaching as to faith and works. "It is not works which save, but faith. Both those who say that faith alone does not save, but that works are necessary, and those who say that faith saves without works, are void of understanding. If there are no works, faith is shown to be dead and untrue, that is, mere external knowledge. If it does works, what works are still required? When we ask, Can true faith save without works? we ask a senseless question, or, rather, no question at all . . . but we must understand that neither faith, nor hope, nor love, saves of itself: it is the Object of faith which saves."

On two points of difference between Anglican and Eastern teaching, M. Khomiakoff is worth hearing, viz., prayers to and for the departed, and veneration of icons. "To ascribe to the prayers of living Christians a power of intercession refused to Christians admitted into glory would be absurd. Well aware that we want no intercessor but Christ, we give vent to our

love and earnest longings for mutual prayer and spiritual communion, not only with the living, but with the dead. Those alive on earth, those who have finished their earthly course, those who have not yet begun it [!], are all united in one Church and grace of God. The whole Church prays for all her members; if any one prays, he is in the communion of [this] prayer. As each of us requires prayers from all, so each owes his prayers on behalf of all. All the members of the Church, living and departed, are being perfected incessantly by mutual prayer. And if we are permitted to pray of God that He will glorify His name and accomplish His will, who will forbid us to pray Him to glorify His saints and give repose to His elect? Mutual prayer is the blood of the Church. True prayer is true love."

The argument, it will be perceived, is *à priori*. The Communion of saints and oneness of the whole Church makes it presumable that mutual prayer between living and departed is possible; if so, the silence of Scripture on a point on which revealed guidance seems called for (which Protestantism urges) may after all be due to its lawfulness being assumed; and thus the absence of a prohibition should weigh more than that of a command. We know this is held as a "pious opinion" by many Protestants; it is not taught by the Church of England, but neither is it expressly condemned. Pre-Reformation times furnish a terrible object lesson, no doubt, of the peril of perversion waiting on the tenet, yet it is possible that recoil from Rome may have made us forget, in some cases, the maxim "Usum non tollit abusus."

On icons (sacred pictures) Khomiakoff argues thus: "If a man expresses his love for God by a visible representation, will the Church condemn him? If a man's love does not require an icon, he will be saved without one; but if a Christian dare not listen without reverence to a prayer or spiritual song composed by his brother, how dare he look without reverence on the icon which his love has produced? The Lord has deigned more than once to glorify a Psalm; will a man forbid Him to glorify an icon? The Old Testament has forbidden the representation of God, it is said, but it allowed Cherubim, and the brazen serpent, and the writing of the name of God. It was not a representation of God it forbade, but to make a god in the similitude of any object in earth or heaven. If a man paints an icon to remind him of the invisible and inconceivable God, he is not making an idol; an icon—the name of God painted in colours—made by love, is not forbidden. The Spirit of Christ which preserves the Church is wiser than man's calculating wisdom. A man may indeed be saved without icons. but he must not reject icons. The Church

accepts every rite which expresses spiritual aspiration towards God . . . she accepts prayer and icons." It must be allowed that all this is ingenious; also that there is a subtle but somewhat real difference between the images of Rome and the icons of the East.

We have quoted freely, abbreviating, in order to make this possible, but scrupulously careful to take no liberties with the sense. But we must quote no further. It will hardly be denied that our utter (virtual) estrangement from an immense and most ancient communion that can speak for herself as above, is lamentable. "The Russian Church," it is remarked in the volume before us, "is in many ways the most vigorous and powerful of all Christian bodies, with a very clear and definite theology. In numbers it contributes four-fifths, in learning at least nine-tenths, to the whole Eastern Orthodox Communion. It is by far the most important national Church now existing [?], and, next to the Roman, the largest Christian body on the earth's surface. It must be patent to all intelligent observers that the Reunion of Christendom will not be brought about without her."

The remarkable volume of which we have now given some account, if it makes us realize afresh the enormous difficulties in the way of that happy consummation, will certainly stimulate our yearning for it, and we wish there existed some petition in our Prayer-Book equivalent to the third clause of the "Great Ectene" said at Communion, Matins and Vespers in the Eastern Church: "For the peace of the whole world, for the welfare of the Holy Churches of God, *and for the union of them all*, let us make our supplications unto the Lord. *Kyrie eleison.*"

S. BALLARAT.

ART. II.—DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE.¹

IS marriage dissoluble? Can a marriage be annulled for adultery? Can divorced spouses during their joint lives marry others? Are ministers of the Churches of England and Ireland under any obligation to solemnize such remarriages?

¹ BISHOP COSIN'S Argument. Thirteenth State Trials. MACQUEEN, "Practice of House of Lords."

DEAN LUCKOCK'S "History of Marriage in relation to Divorce."

LORD GRIMTHORPE, "Marriage of Innocent Divorcees," *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1895.

Charge of DR. KING, BISHOP OF LINCOLN, 1895.

"The Present Aspect of the Controversy on Divorce," *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1896.