


was not, as Romanists contend, the beginning of our reformed religion; nor was it, as some extremists appear to hold, the end of our development. All healthy organisms must grow, even ecclesiastical organizations. We cannot possibly, in this twentieth century, occupy precisely the positions of the sixteenth, any more than we can go back to the theology, the Church discipline, the social conditions, or the intellectual standpoint, of the thirteenth. It is with these truths before us that we must study Church history and theology, and apply historical methods both to ancient controversies and to our modern problems.

ARTHUR GALTON.



### ART. III.—STUDIES ON ISAIAH.

3. *THE Return of the Exiles* (ver. 10 to end).—Two points may be noted here: First, the return of the remnant referred to in this passage is figurative, not literal. That is to say, it refers, not to the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, for they were not driven to the places named, neither are any known to have returned thence, but to *the return of exiled humanity in general to their God through His Anointed One* (cf. ver. 10, and chap. xlix. 22). And, next, a *second* return is spoken of. The first return was the return of the first fruits of the heathen in the days of the Apostles. Their work of evangelization was chiefly confined to the countries bordering on the Mediterranean. The *second* is the era upon which we have lately entered, when the principles of Christianity are being increasingly acted upon by Christians, and increasingly accepted by heathen nations as the true principles on which men should act. The “root of Jesse” is to be the banner to which all men shall gather, and under which they shall combat (cf. vers. 10, 13). The obvious leavening of mankind by Christian civilization which is going on at present is the destined preparation for the proclamation of Him as King. The “spoiling” of Philistia, Moab, and Edom, the destruction of the “tongue of the Egyptian sea,” signify the victory of truth, moral and spiritual, over the superstitions and errors of heathendom; the “highway” signifies the “way of holiness” (chap. xxxv. 8),<sup>1</sup> which is

<sup>1</sup> There are some curious undesigned admissions of the homogeneity of the writings which go by Isaiah's name in the Cambridge Bible for Schools. Thus the “highway” (ver. 16) is stated to be “a frequent

Christ Himself, Who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" (John xiv. 6); and the reference to the deliverance from Egypt recalls the language of St. Paul, when, in 1 Cor. x., he speaks of Christians as passing through the waters of baptism as the Israelites passed through the Red Sea.

We proceed to make a few special remarks about the character of the epoch which is here predicted. It is to be specially an era of peace and brotherhood. It is not described as an era of the proclamation of dogmas, though without a knowledge of Christ, as revealed in His Word, such peace and brotherhood would be impossible. But the insisting on dogmatic propositions as such, apart from their spiritual vitality, has ever been the source of misery and strife. It is not characterized by the inauguration of a ritual, for they who would worship the Lord must do so "in spirit and in truth" (John iv. 24). It is a time of laying aside ancient jealousies and antagonisms, of reconciling conflicting interests, of the abandonment of former hatreds, prejudices, and resentments. It was the love of pre-eminence and power in Israel which envenomed Ephraim and Judah mutually against each other. It will be the inward acceptance through faith of the Spirit of the one Perfect Man—of Him who bade us be as little children, and not to seek pre-eminence—which will enable men to lay those animosities aside.

Let this be henceforth the object of the Christian ministry. We of the Church of England have been somewhat too much afraid of entering upon politics in the pulpit. We have left this difficult task to our Nonconformist brethren. And truly our task is a far more difficult one than theirs, and must be performed in a different spirit than that which they have

picture in prophetic descriptions of the return from exile. *Cf. chaps. xxxv. 8, xl. 3, 4, xlii. 16, xlii. 11, etc.*" (The italics are mine.) The word used here is found almost exclusively *in Isaiah* among the prophets. It signifies a *highway*, one raised above the surrounding land. And it is found in the sense specialized in chap. xxxv. 8, not only in the passages cited (Isa. xlii. 16 excepted), but in chaps. xix. 23, lxii. 10 (*cf. lvii. 14*). Elsewhere it occurs in this sense only in Jer. xxxi. 21. The word used in chap. xlii. 16 is a different one; it signifies a *path*. And this only occurs once in Jeremiah and once in Hosea. The mode of citation mentioned above throws the argument for common authorship into the shade. The other undesigned admission refers us to chap. xlix. 22 in explanation of the "ensign" here mentioned. It is true that *all* these passages have been ingeniously torn from Isaiah and assigned to someone else. We shall discuss this question later. Meanwhile, let the reader observe that the allusion to the "ensign" or "banner" is found in chap. v. 26. Possibly some day *this* will be found to be by another hand. The ultimate conclusion will probably be that *all* Isaiah was written by someone else. This is the result which has already been attained in regard to the Psalms. 3

too frequently adopted. They have addressed themselves to a particular party or a section of society. The Church has aimed at ministering to all. And her task in reconciling differences, adjusting claims, softening down jealousies, holding the balance even between classes, is one of immense perplexity and difficulty. The clergy have certainly been right in avoiding *party* politics. But, however difficult the task may be, it is their duty to see that the principles of the Bible—of the Old Testament as well as the New, because the Old Testament especially lays down the principles of corporate civil life—are properly understood by their flocks. They cannot avoid politics altogether. That they have endeavoured to do so is one source of the present weakness of the pulpit among us. There are certain fundamental principles of practical Christianity which neither nations nor individuals should be allowed to forget. Among such is the duty of patriotism, by which is meant not an arrogant and aggressive spirit, which strives after conquest and domination, but a serious and sacred conviction that our first duty is to seek the welfare of those with whom God has conjoined us in ties of race, language, and religion. In enforcing this duty the pulpits of our Church have been much too slack. As has already been intimated, it is ingratitude and even treachery to God to imply that the blessings He has showered upon us have been the result of our sins. Our historians have shown that British expansion has, as a rule, been the result, not of an aggressive, but of a defensive attitude. In America, in Asia, in Africa alike, we waited almost too long. We delayed to strike until we were in imminent danger of being deprived of our fairly-earned privileges as traders or as settlers. Then, indeed, we turned to bay, and too often retorted on our adversaries with unnecessary harshness the treatment they had designed for us. Yet our vast heritage has, as a rule, been honourably acquired, and summary has been the punishment meted out by the nation to any able but unprincipled rulers who have tarnished the honour of the British people.<sup>1</sup> We may therefore justly cling to what God has given us. Nor is it an unworthy boast that we mean, with His help, to hand down to our descendants what our forefathers by their valour, wisdom, and forethought have acquired.

In home politics we have the task of composing the class jealousies and hatreds which men ambitious of power rather

---

<sup>1</sup> *E.g.*, Clive and Warren Hastings. The innocence of the latter was affirmed by a court of law, and its verdict has of late been confirmed by fresh evidence. But Warren Hastings suffered long under the *imputation* of guilt.

than observant of principle have done their best to foment. On one side we have numbers; on the other wealth. In time past the wealthy few have undoubtedly oppressed the ignorant many. But those times have passed away. The franchise has been widely extended. The combination of numbers has been opposed to the ascendancy of wealth. In the Spirit of Christ, which should animate both parties, old jealousies such as these ought to disappear. The poor man should not "envy" the rich; the rich man ought not to "vex" the poor. Accumulations of capital, *as* such, ought to excite neither disapprobation, jealousy, nor cupidity. They are as necessary for the supply of labour as reservoirs of water are to insure cleanliness and to slake thirst. It is only when they are misused that a Christian public opinion should rise up and protest. The "trusts" which some fear as a public danger ought no doubt to be closely watched. But they ought not to be put down unless they conflict with the public welfare. We Christian nations are at present shamed by the example of Japan. No nation—not even England in her colossal duel with Napoleon—since the world began has ever shown such an example of true Christian morals as she has. The heroism of her troops; the modesty, patience, and truthfulness of her leaders; the self-sacrifice of the whole nation as well as of her soldiers; the humanity with which the war has been carried on; the chivalrous treatment of fallen foes; and, above all, the hushing of all petty and party disputes in face of a war waged, not for aggression, but for existence—all these present a spectacle to which the world's history affords no parallel. If we seek for an explanation of this phenomenon, we shall find it in the fact that Japan is acting up to her principles, and Christian nations are not acting up to theirs. Japan, in religion, has chosen the policy of a wise eclecticism since she began to seek her inspiration from the West. She has preserved the spirit-worship of Shintoism without its superstition and obscenity; she has preserved the self-abandonment of Buddhism without its fatalism and apathy. And, impelled by Christian civilization, she has garnered and acted upon all that is best in the morals of both. Some day she will crown her amazing intellectual and moral progress by becoming perhaps the brightest jewel in the crown of Christ.

The glorious age predicted by Isaiah is indeed coming. The progress of the world towards the ideal pictured by Isaiah in this chapter is undeniable, in spite of dark spots here and there. The most serious blots in our social system—poverty and its attendant miseries—are due, not to the want of will to deal with them, but to our having as yet failed to

find the best means of doing so. The enormous aggregations of population, the difficulty of doing good to the individual without demoralizing the race, the seeming impossibility of bringing the principles of Christ to bear upon the lives of the people—all these are at this moment perplexing and harassing the Christian conscience and driving it almost to despair. But the heart of society is right, and the blessed result will one day follow. But there is much to be done first. Each one of us, young and old, male and female, must gird up our loins, and address us to the fight with “ancient forms” of ill. We have too long made it our sole object to attain our own salvation. We must combine together now, as men in whom the Spirit of Christ is working, for the regeneration and salvation of society. And one by one the old fortresses of Hate, Pride, Convention, Custom, Suspicion, Jealousy, Ambition, as well as the inner keep of Self, will fall, as they are undermined by the working of the “Spirit of holiness” flowing from the Resurrection of dead humanity to a regenerated life.

“After madness, after massacre, Jacobinism, and Jacquerie,  
Some diviner force to guide us through the days shall I not see?

“When the schemes and all the systems, Kingdoms and Republics fall,  
Something kinder, higher, holier—all for each and each for all?

“All the full brain, half brain races, led by Justice, Love, and Truth;  
All the millions one at length with all the visions of my youth?

“All diseases quenched by Science, no man halt, or deaf, or blind;  
Stronger ever born of weaker, lustier body, larger mind?

“Earth at last a warless world, a single race, a single tongue—  
I have seen her far away—for is not Earth as yet so young?

“Every tiger madness muzzled, every serpent passion killed,  
Every grim ravine a garden, every blazing desert tilled.

“Robed in universal harvest up to either pole she smiles,  
Universal ocean softly washing all her warless isles.”

TENNYSON: *Locksley Hall Sixty Years Afterwards.*

And all this in the power and in the name of Christ. The days are gone by when the warrior was wont to carry on his warfare by “spitting the child” “on the spike that split the mother’s heart.” The King Arthur who centuries ago was pictured by Spenser as the fierce redresser of wrongs, riding backward and forward rescuing hapless maidens and slaying wicked oppressors and devouring dragons, the champion of Gloriana, Queen of Fairyland, comes now in the shape of a “modern gentleman”—in the only true sense of that much-abused word—imbued from head to heel with the Spirit of Him who is pattern of all humanity.

“There came a bark that, blowing forward, bore  
 King Arthur, like a modern gentleman  
 Of stateliest port; and all the people cried  
 ‘Arthur is come again: he cannot die.’  
 Then those that stood upon the hills behind  
 Repeated—‘Come again, and thrice as fair.’  
 And, further inland, voices echoed—‘Come  
 With all good things, and war shall be no more.’  
 At this a hundred bells began to peal,  
 That with the sound I woke, and heard indeed  
 The clear church-bells ring in the Christmas morn.”

TENNYSON: *Morte d'Arthur*.

“Even so,” in Thine own good time, “come, Lord Jesus.”


V. *The Song of Praise* (chap. xii).—This needs no explanation. It is a perfectly natural outburst of joy and thanksgiving at the thought of the blessings which God has in store for His people; at the turning away of God's just anger (this last a tremendous fact in the Divine order in which the present age refuses to believe, although it is stamped in ineffaceable characters on the history of mankind); and at the salvation which He will bring about in due time. Such songs of praise the Church is now wont to lift up at Christmas and Easter. They may be intensified by the thought that so many centuries back they were revealed in anticipation to the inspired seer Isaiah.

J. J. LIAS.

CRITICAL NOTE.—The passage xi. 10—xii. 6 is the first which modern criticism has severed from Isaiah. It may be well to inquire into the reasons for this. Something has been said already on this point. It has also been pointed out that the passage has many signs of affinity with what is called the “second Isaiah.” Probably this is one of the reasons why it has been torn from the context. Here, as elsewhere, the criticism is built upon the theory, instead of the theory being derived from the facts. As we have already seen, the passage displays signs of connection with the undisputed work of the “first Isaiah.” Then there is the fact that Isaiah constantly quotes or repeats himself to an extent that no other prophet does. This passage is quoted almost word for word in chap. xlix. 22, as are vers. 6, 7, 9 (admittedly Isaiah's, be it remembered) in Isa. lxxv. 25. Then, further, ver. 10 evidently does *not* belong to vers. 11-16, in which a new branch of the subject commences. But it contains the allusion to the “banner” mentioned in ver. 16. So once more it must be torn from the context to which it obviously belongs, for the prophecy of the “earth” being “full of the knowledge of the Lord” is the consequence of the “banner” of the “shoot of Jesse” having been raised, and having attracted “the

Gentiles" to it. Then we have the word *shear* in vers. 11, 16, which, as we have seen in the January number, p. 204, is admitted to be "an Isaianic word." It only occurs elsewhere in the "first Isaiah." And so a good deal of special pleading is required to prove that it is here used "in a non-Isaianic sense." See for it "Cambridge Bible for Schools," p. 95. The reasoning will hardly be found convincing, save by those who have made up their minds beforehand. Lastly, we are told that "the variation of the figure from ver. 1 rather tells against the Isaianic authorship of this passage." *Is* there any "variation of the figure"? There is an *addition* to it, certainly. The "shoot" which has "grown" and "come forth" afterwards becomes a "banner." But even if there *were* a "variation of the figure," is that a thing unheard of among poets and orators, of whom Isaiah is certainly not the least? Are they bound to repeat their similes until everybody is tired of them? We may further compare ver. 9 with chaps. ii. 4 and lx. 18.

NOTE.—In the last article, on p. 240, line 14, "iv." should be "ix." In the last line but one, *for* "the coming" *read* "the coming One." And in note 4, last line but two, omit the word "here."



#### ART. IV.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY AND THEIR CONNECTIONS WITH SUSSEX.—I.

**D**ESPITE the distance of Sussex from the centre of their province, the Archbishops of Canterbury, from the very foundation of their see, were lords of many manors therein, and owners of the bodies as well as shepherds of the souls of many men abiding in them. Beginning with the days of the earliest Christianized Saxon Kings and kinglets, the acquisitions of the Archbishops continued to increase, till at the cataclysm of the Reformation their possessions in Sussex extended across the county from Pagham in the south-west to Wadhurst and Lamberhurst in the north-east, part of the latter—the Manor of Scoteney—indeed, extending into the neighbouring county of Kent. Between these two extremes so many manors lay under their lordship that it was said a Primate of all England could travel across the county of Sussex through his own territory, from the sea on the south-west to his homeland of Kent on the north-east, without passing over the land of any other lord. Be this as it may, the arrangement of these lands in Sussex was such as to go far to justify the saying, since they lay along a line stretching in the aforesaid direction, and not scattered here and there, up and down the county. It is possible that this particular