

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

Vers. 20-22.—Why are these verses banished to the foot-notes? Isaiah only predicts that, in the day of the Lord, “shall a man cast away his idols of silver and his idols of gold which they shall have made for him, that he may bow down to moles and bats when entering into the clefts of the rock.”

The last verse is a final persuasive appeal to the ten tribes to leave poor Judah alone. A similar appeal was probably made to them by the prophet Oded after the first invasion of Judah, with the happy result that they released the captives whom they had taken (2 Chron. xxviii. 9, etc.).

In conclusion, it is impossible within the limits of this paper to notice everything the author of the Polychrome said and did in these two chapters. But, considering the great scholarship that is arrayed against Isaiah, I feel exceedingly grateful to Almighty God that, by His grace and by more correct and more literal translation, I have been able to vindicate the truth so much as I did. I am confident that many unbiassed Hebrew students will deem it enough to show two things. First, it shows that all glosses, interpolations, omissions, corruptions, etc., which this Book of Isaiah is supposed to contain entirely disappear when the Hebrew is properly understood. Secondly, it shows that a good rendering of Isaiah is yet wanting.

E. FLECKER.



ART. IV.—LANDMARKS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

“REMOVE not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set” (Prov. xxii. 28). Thus spoke Solomon the Wise; and we members of the Church of England would do well in these days of change and impulsiveness to attend to his advice, and not hastily allow our Church’s doctrinal landmarks to be thoughtlessly altered or wilfully ignored.

There are few things more remarkable in Scripture than the care with which God fixed bounds and limitations. In all God’s arrangements there is *exactness* and *definiteness*: the alternation of day and night, the succession of the seasons, the Divine restraint over the restless billions of the ever-aggressive sea (Jer. v. 22), His interposition even in the matter of national boundaries, “when he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel” (Deut. xxxii. 8), to say nothing of the countless instances when tribal and family boundaries were settled by direct Divine guidance (for the word translated here “bounds” occurs fifty times in the Book of Joshua), all assure us that order and restraint are principles of perpetual obligation and universal utility.

1. First, let us remember that "landmarks" or "bounds" are a necessity. For purposes of convenience, discipline, and peace, it is of the highest importance that we should know most distinctly and plainly what is ours and what is not, "where we are," in fact, that there may be no undue intrusion on the rights of others. In the East, a trench or stone sufficed to show people's respective possessions and territories, so that he was cursed that removed his neighbour's landmark (Deut. xxvii. 17).

Now, what is necessary and beneficial for individual and social life is equally so for the Church.

2. Then they were assigned deliberately, after due consideration and thought concerning the character and circumstances of the persons for whose benefit they were placed. It was so in the case of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, on the further side of Jordan (Num. xxxii. 4, 5, 33); and we can certainly claim these principles for the doctrinal boundaries of our Church. Most carefully and considerately are they drawn up. We are clearly told in Article XXXIV. that "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word"; and "Every national Church hath power to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

That there is no vagueness or haziness in our Church's treatment of doctrinal and ritual restrictions we shall abundantly prove; but the very strength of her position, founded on the rock of Holy Scripture, enables her to dispense with unnecessary and antiquated limitations.

3. But with regard to the placing of these bounds, *the Divine guidance was always most earnestly sought*. All the land of Israel was divided by lot; the portion of each tribe, each family, was referred to the Divine decision (Num. xxxiii. 54; Josh. xviii. 10), and being thus referred, no doubt was entertained that God did really hear and direct. Would that we had such faith in carrying out all His commandments! And do we not know full well how devoutly and prayerfully our Reformers sought the guidance of the great Head of the Church when they fixed "the landmarks" of this our section of it?

4. *Their long continuance was a strong argument for their retention*. Their utility was proved, their necessity was a matter of constant experience; then, surely it would be unwise to remove or alter them (except under extraordinary

circumstances). It might be very easy to do, but it would be very foolish. Anyone can disorder and destroy, but very few can satisfactorily arrange and define. Let us acknowledge that landmarks which have served successfully our Church and nation for more than three hundred years are not lightly to be set aside.

We are distinctly told in Scripture that it is a sign of the last days to disregard "bounds." There is to be at the close of this dispensation a hatred of all restraint, an impatience of control, a manifestation of lawlessness and self-will, in antagonism to Divine authority and order, which shall be unprecedented (1 Tim. iv. 1-3; 2 Tim. iii. 1-7, iv. 3, 4). This is a Divine warning that we must not ignore.

5. But yet, again, *they were designed for the purpose of being both inclusive and exclusive.* They afforded liberty and freedom of action within bounds, with due respect to limitations. They showed exactly where and how far a person might go, but beyond these limits they assigned penalty; they forbade encroachment. We cannot fail to notice how strict and precise were God's rules for the ritual and ceremonial of the tabernacle worship; all the enactments were specially suitable to protect Israel from the surrounding temptations to idolatry, materialism, and sensuality, while, at the same time, they permitted all lawful freedom and happiness in the individual and national life. So the landmarks of our Church are intended to fence us off from all that would be misleading and pernicious in doctrine and practice, while preserving for us all healthful and useful freedom. Let us now consider some of the more prominent landmarks of our Church, with their reasonable liberty and their needful restriction.

These "bounds" are clearly laid down for us in those formularies of which every clergyman expressed his approval in a precise and public manner at his ordination, namely, the Prayer Book, the Articles and the Homilies. (We may say, in passing, it seems a matter of regret that no more decided steps are taken than usually is the case to ascertain how far ordination candidates do really understand the contents of these Homilies, to whose doctrine they assented in their subscription to the Articles, but of whose teaching they seem to be lamentably ignorant, or hopelessly at variance, if we judge by the utterances of many of them after their ordination.) And taking for our consideration the principles enshrined in these official documents of our Church's belief and practice:

1. *Let us never permit that landmark to be removed which includes the Gospel minister and excludes the mediæval priest.*

The Church of England places as pre-eminent among the duties of her clergy the ministry of the Word. Her ordinal bears abundant and conclusive evidence to this fact. Deacons are to read the Scriptures in the church. Priests are to be "studious in reading and learning the Scriptures;" they are to "draw all their cares and studies that way;" they are, "by daily weighing and reading the Scriptures, to wax stronger in their ministry;" they are publicly questioned as to their belief in the sufficiency of Scripture, and their determination to teach nothing but what can be proved out of it; they are cautioned to drive away strange doctrines contrary to God's Word. Not the slightest hint is given of their being "propitiatory priests;" no mention whatever is made of their duties or responsibilities in that respect. They are called "Messengers, Watchmen and Stewards of the Lord," they are told to "teach, premonish, feed and seek for Christ's sheep," but there is no mention of their offering propitiatory sacrifice, of their regularly hearing confessions, or personally absolving people's sins. If they are supposed to do these things, it is strange that at the most important moment of their lives the Church so deliberately leaves them unreminded of it. In the Exhortation to Priests Sacraments are positively not mentioned, while the concluding prayer is a beautiful petition that they may faithfully and lovingly *preach the Word* and the people obediently follow the same.

The Articles do exactly the same thing. While they place the Sacraments in their proper position, as of Christ's direct institution, they place before the administration of the Sacraments the preaching of the Word (see Articles XIX., XXIII., XXVI.). "The Ministration of the Word" is first, the "Sacraments" second. "We may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God and in receiving the Sacraments." This order of expression must be intentional; there is no carelessness in the wording of our Formularies.

Our Church emphatically declares her doctrinal difference with the Church of Rome (and what a vital, fundamental difference is it!) by giving the ordained minister a *Bible*, and not, as the Romish Church, the Cup and the Paten. Surely no object-lesson could be more instructive and decisive than this. For no consideration must we allow this landmark to be altered. It guards against all the mischief of auricular confession and the Mass, it prevents all "official" interference and arrogance, while it secures to us the pure ministry of God's Word and Sacraments. By every dictate of humanity, purity, honesty, this "bound" must be respected, and all encroachments forbidden.

2. *Next we must loyally maintain that landmark which*

includes the sovereignty of Scripture and excludes the authority of tradition. The Church of Rome asserts that tradition is of equal authority with Scripture; she affirmed this principle at the Council of Trent, and it is necessary to her very existence. Not for one moment could her vast fabric of superstition and fraud be upheld were its only foundation the Bible; but it is not founded on the Bible, it does not pretend to be; it is maintained solely by a complex mass of human tradition, which Cardinal Manning defined as every word the Popes have uttered in every age, whether by Bull, brief or encyclical.

The Church of England erects a definite barrier against this, and appeals to God's written Word as the supreme authority for all her beliefs. She rejects this vague, nebulous mass of human tradition as worthless and meaningless for doctrinal purposes. "Nothing is to be ordained against God's Word" (Article XXXIV.). She does not reject the light any tradition, well substantiated, may throw on primitive doctrine or practice, but she steadily refuses to allow it any equality with Scripture. It is the best and earliest of the Fathers to whom she refers as interpreters of Scripture. With her "Holy Scripture containeth *all* things necessary to salvation" (Article VI.). The Creeds are only to be received and believed because they can be "proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture" (Article VIII.). She is not led away by any dream of General Councils, but boldly declares "they may err and have erred even in things pertaining to God," therefore their decisions are not to be received unless they have the clear support of Scripture (Article XXI.). She declares the Church itself is only "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, and must not enforce anything contrary to it" (Article XX.). In the whole of her Prayer Book she reminds the devout Churchman that his strength, his power, his comfort, is the Word of God, as John Wesley well said to a man who complained to him of the poor chaff they got in the pulpit. "At any rate," he said, "you have plenty of good wheat in the reading desk."

Thus does our Church ever glorify and reverence the Bible. Let us take great care that this priceless landmark is maintained.

3. *Another boundary* we must not suffer to be tampered with is that which includes the Sacraments of the Gospel, but excludes the Sacraments of superstition.

Our Church acknowledges but *two* Sacraments as of Divine institution, namely, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Article XXV. is perfectly clear on the subject; it is as precise in its statements as plain English can be. It says the other five so-called Sacraments are the outcome of corruption or

misapprehension, and "have not the like nature" of the first two. "Orders" and "matrimony," etc., are simply "states of life," and not Sacraments at all. "Sacrament" was a word used originally in the loosest manner, and having the widest signification. Kneeling, crossing, reading the Creed or the Gospel, etc., had all been called Sacraments. Their number varied, sometimes being reckoned at more than a dozen; they were in the time of Peter Lombard reduced officially to seven, perhaps with reference to the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost. But the Church of England, under the wise guidance of her reformers, determined to put an end to all this vague phraseology and unscriptural exaggeration, and limited the word "Sacrament" to those two which were alone ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel.

Upon this boundary-stone our Church also inscribes the noteworthy statement that no merely mechanical reception of any Sacrament is of any avail; to have a wholesome effect "we must duly use them"; "we must worthily receive the same." She acknowledges no mechanical theory for the reception of grace, no *ex opere operatum* idea of getting good. She takes the divinely-appointed means of grace, and puts them in their proper place with all reverent attention, but with no insensate adulation.

This discreet and most necessary landmark must be maintained intact, and with its inscription clear and legible.

4. But no less important is *the landmark that includes the Lord's Supper as a memorial, but excludes it as a propitiatory sacrifice.*

The boundary mark is so clearly defined in all our formularies that it can only be deliberately and ruthlessly neglected or destroyed. The whole tone and tenor of the language used emphasizes the fact; it is "writ large" throughout.

This is no little insignificant waymark so small as to escape notice except from the cautious and observing eye; it is a great "cairn," riveting the instant attention of every traveller through the history and phraseology of the English Church. Most strenuously does the Prayer Book in its Communion Office remind us that this Holy Sacrament is "*in remembrance of His death and passion*"; "*a perpetual memory of His death*"—"a perpetual memory of that His precious death until His coming again." Not the slightest loophole is given to suggest the idea of any propitiatory sacrifice or carnal presence.

The Articles (XXV., XXVIII., XXIX., XXXI.) and the Homilies (specially those on "Common Prayer and Sacraments," and "The Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament") entirely coincide with the Prayer Book. It is perfectly childish

to say the reformers wrote one thing and meant another; or used language which will bear a different construction in the Prayer Book, etc., to what it would anywhere else. The circumstances under which they purified and rearranged and moulded our Liturgy were not those to make men careless and indefinite. Human bonfires were then too common a spectacle to make persons desirous of courting a nearer acquaintance with them through thoughtlessness.

No candid person can read the outspoken condemnation of transubstantiation in Article XXVIII., and the clear statement "that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*," and say it can by any juggling with words be made to agree with the Creed of Pope Pius IV. (Article V.) or the decrees of the Council of Trent, by which it is affirmed that "in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is really, truly, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. This materialistic notion is maintained in the most direct terms by Romish ecclesiastics of our own day. The Church of Rome has erected her "landmark," imposing, strong, conspicuous; we have erected ours, and we mean to have it maintained. We exclude what she includes, and she excludes what we include. Let anyone deny it who can. Instead of destroying or suffering to fall into "mossy" neglect this glorious boundary-stone, we must keep it clean, strengthen it, draw attention to it.

5. But lastly, we must, in the name of God, keep standing upright and intact *the landmark which includes Justification by Faith and excludes Justification by Works*.

We can most thankfully affirm that no poor pilgrim on life's journey need go astray on this subject if he will but listen to the utterances of our Church on this vital matter.

What says Article XI.? "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings."

Most impressively and solemnly does the Homily "Of the Salvation of all Mankind" accentuate the same blessed truth; and this Homily has especial authority, being incorporated in Article XI. Nothing can be more beautiful and instructive than its carefully chosen language; it glorifies Christ and His finished work throughout. Let us consider a few of its sentences.

(a) "Consider diligently these words: without works, by faith only, freely we receive remission of our sins."

(b) "But this saying that we be justified by faith only,

freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being unable to deserve our justification at God's hands."

(c) "The grace of God doth not shut out the justice of God in our justification, but only shutteth out the justice of man, that is, the justice of our works, as to be merits deserving our justification."

(d) "Justification is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render unto Him, but which we receive of Him; not which we give to Him, but which we take of Him by His free mercy."

Yet most earnestly does the Homily urge the Churchman to remember that *faith in itself has no justifying merit*; it is only the hand that takes hold of Christ at the same time; out of this faith will necessarily spring good works. "For that faith which bringeth forth no good works is a dead, devilish counterfeit, and feigned faith," or, as Article XII. expresses it, "insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit."

That this is in accordance with Scripture we all know. "Not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law," says Paul (Phil. iii. 9); or again, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 5).

The doctrine of the Church of Rome is hopelessly obscure and confused on the whole subject. By the decrees of the Council of Trent she denied justification by faith, though her earlier Popes and doctrines allowed it (but contradiction of previous decisions is dust in the balance to the Church of Rome; she rather glories in an ostentatious inconsistency!). She mixes up in an inextricable tangle justification and sanctification, and she leaves her unfortunate adherents in absolute darkness where they most need light.

Thank God our Church has erected this grand and blessed "landmark," so useful to men, so honouring to Christ! Let us never suffer it to be interfered with by any one, in any way. These are some of the more imposing and important landmarks of our Church. They were erected carefully, thoughtfully, prayerfully, deliberately, by men of vast learning, eminent piety, devoted patriotism, unflinching courage. They knew well the dangers they fence us off from, the blessed privileges they enclose to us. To us remains the solemn duty of seeing that they are preserved and respected. Once let these barriers be altered, or suffered to fall into decay and desuetude, and we cannot tell what torrent of error, superstition, and evil-living will sweep over our Church and nation. Let us "hold fast the form of sound words," and

not permit any power or person to remove the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set.

W. B. RUSSELL-CALEY.



ART. V.—THE VOICE OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

WHAT is the reason why we educated Englishmen, living at the end of the nineteenth century, in an atmosphere of cosmopolitan ideas, with all the latest productions of criticism on our bookshelves and on our library tables, and able to make easy personal acquaintance with every religion of interest which has had its day in the world's history, attribute with all our hearts and souls supreme importance to the old sacred literature of the Jews?

Did not Voltaire prophesy that the Bible would not be read in the nineteenth century? Did he not say, more than a century ago, that in less than 100 years Christianity would have been swept from existence, and would have passed into history? Certainly the infidelity which he did so much to promote ran riot through France, red-handed and impious. More than a century has passed away. Voltaire himself has passed into history. But it is a curious coincidence that his own printing-press has been used to publish the revelation at which he scoffed; and the very house where he lived is packed with Bibles, as it has become the depot of the Geneva Bible Society.

Did not Tom Paine, in this country, think he had demolished the Bible by his "Age of Reason"? What is the fact? Since Tom Paine went despairingly to a drunkard's grave in 1809, more than thirty times as many Bibles have been produced and scattered through the world than had been produced since first Moses began the Pentateuch. Why is this?

It is because, without prepossession or predilection, on a calm survey of the facts, we have made up our minds that this unique and extraordinary literature is actually the transcript of God's message from the unseen world of spirit, thought and eternity, into the world of time, space, sense and action. There is no other book or literature like the Holy Scriptures in the whole history of mankind. It is of no use to mention the Egyptian Ritual of the Dead, or the Assyrian Tablets, or the Maxims of Confucius, or the Hindu Vedas, or the Homeric Hymns, or the Mohammedan Koran. The religious literature of all countries and ages has been brought into one focus by a great literary publication. Even a cursory