

of authorship in Isaiah. Then Isaiah ought to harp on the one string through sixty chapters, and for a period of forty or fifty years; if he changes a note he is not the same man. That is really Dr. Driver's contention. His own words will show that I do not misrepresent him. Speaking of the supposed author of the latter part of the book, Dr. Driver says, "the prophet moves along lines of thought different from those followed by Isaiah; he apprehends and dwells on different aspects of truth." We should think he would. He would not be much of a prophet if he did not. Delivering messages of urgent national importance for a period of half a century, and all of them suited to the changing conditions of the time, we would be very much surprised if he did not "move along different lines of thought" and "dwell on different aspects of truth." But, no; Dr. Driver says the change of thought proves a change of authorship. Even where there is a similarity of thought or expression in the earlier and later parts of the book, Dr. Driver sees an *expansion* of the thought, and the mere *expansion* of it, means different authorship. He says, "Even where there is a point of contact between the two parts of the book, or where the same terms are employed, the ideas attached to them have a wider and fuller import." And this wider and fuller import implies different authorship! Isaiah may live a long life; he may be the leading prophet of his time or of all time; he may live in a period of stirring change; he may have a fitting message for every new condition of the nation, but he must not move along any new line of thought, or present any new aspect of truth. This is actually Dr. Driver's position. It is silly enough in all conscience, but it becomes even more so when we notice some of the instances by which it is sustained. The phrase, "high and lifted up" is quoted by our author to show that because it is used in a larger sense in the later than in the earlier part of the book, it must have been used by a different author. That the same phrase is used at all in the earlier and later portions gives no suggestion to our author that the same man might have written the whole. O dear, no. His genius is of far too refined and subtle a kind to take any such common suggestion as that. He goes much deeper. He sees that the phrase expands in its meaning; and his ingenious, active mind seizes the conclusion at once that it was used by a different person. The phrase, "high and lifted up" in chapter ii. is applied to the cedars of Lebanon; in chapter vi. it is applied to God's throne; in chapter lvii. it is applied to the loftiness of Jehovah himself. Now, in the first and second instances quoted, it is agreed that the phrase is used by the same author. Dr. Driver and all the higher critics admit that. But what about the expansion of the meaning of the phrase in the second instance? The cedars were "high and lifted up" in the first instance; now it is *God's throne* that is "high and lifted up." What about the expansion here? Does it not indicate a change of author? I suppose it would, if the case required it; you can find indications of anything you want if you start out to find them. And the higher critics do find the indication they want when they come to the same phrase used, as it is for the third time, in the latter part of the book. Here the phrase is applied to Jehovah himself; and that expansion of the thought, we are told, indicates a new author! The advance from the cedars to *God's throne* is far greater than the advance from the throne to *God himself*, as humanly conceived and expressed. But that does not matter. The critics are bound to find a new author in the latter part of the book, and they are going to find him, common sense notwithstanding.

In another paper I will deal with Dr. Driver's two other positions, namely, that a difference in *theology*, and difference in *words*, between the earlier and later parts of Isaiah, indicate a difference of authorship.

Knox College, Toronto.

Which is more misshapen—religion without virtue, or virtue without religion?—Joubert.

## ENGLAND'S LAWS IN OLDEN TIMES

A glance through the Statute Book gives, perhaps, as good an idea as anything of the manners and customs of England in the middle ages, besides an occasional insight into the doings of the world at that period. We hear of the blindness of justice and inefficacy of the law at the present time, but in those dark days justice was only a name, and law meant only the pleasure of the king and the powerful nobility.

For many years human life was regarded almost as worthless, often being taken in punishment of what we should deem now trivial offences. For a long time man was regarded as belonging to the soil, to be bought or sold with the land, similar to the position of a Russian serf in our days.

In those days superstition was rampant; and the dread of foreign competition exercised the minds of England's legislators to an unwholesome degree. Indeed, in the early part of the middle ages the Statute Book received its chief additions from Acts relating to the customs and trade of England, interspersed with severe denunciations of heretics, traitors and night walkers.

The Flemings were a particular bugbear, inasmuch as they wove a better class of woollen cloth than that turned out by English workmen. The import of their goods was prohibited, but they were allowed to settle in England, and bring their looms with them. The apparel of the king's "loving subjects" was the frequent cause of contention, and Parliament seemed to exercise considerable anxiety, considering the great number of acts required to settle the costume of the commonalty. In 1337, a protection Act was passed which decreed that "none should wear any cloth, but such as is made in England," and in the same year another Act prescribed "who only shall wear furs;" an Act that would scarcely be brought before the Dominion Parliament to-day. There is such a persistency in the regulation of dress by Parliament, that some confusion appears to have been made as to due distinction of class, for, after a century and a quarter of legislation on this matter, an Act passed in 1463 definitely fixed "what kind of apparel men and women of every vocation and degree were allowed, and what prohibited."

Workmen's wages were fixed by Parliament, and altered as occasion required. In 1347, Parliament attempted to solve the labour question in a very high-handed manner. It was ordered that "every person able in body under the age of sixty years, not having to live on, being required, shall be bound to serve him that doth require him or else be committed to the gaol until he find surety to serve." In the same year another Act of Parliament was passed, declaring that "if any artificer or workman take more wages than were wont to be paid, he shall be committed to the gaol." And another Act enjoined that "no person shall give anything to a beggar that is able to labour." Trade unions were forbidden by two Acts of Parliament passed respectively in 1424 and 1436. The former prevented masons from confederating "themselves into chapters and assemblies," and the latter was passed as "a restraint of unlawful orders made by masters of guildes, fraternities and other companies."

What would the exponents of "Woman's Rights" think of an Act which was passed in the year 1225 and seems to suggest the total distinction of the softer sex. In that year it was decreed that "no man shall be taken or imprisoned upon the appeal of a woman for the death of any other than that of her husband."

The people's and the king's food has exercised the attention of the ancient law-givers. The sturgeon was pronounced a royal fish by a statute passed in 1343, which recites that "the king shall have the wreck of the sea throughout the realm, whales and great sturgeons taken in the sea, or elsewhere within the realm, except in certain places privileged by the king." An earlier Act ordained that things purveyed for the king's house should be

praised." It required a special act to regulate the several prices of a hen, capon, pullet and goose; and an Act was passed to regulate the sale of herrings at Yarmouth. Herrings were to be sold "from the sun rising till the sun going down, and not before nor after, upon the forfeiture of the same merchandise." Six scores were to be counted to the hundred, and 10,000 herrings were to be sold for 40s., and that people who bought them at that rate should sell "for half a mark of gain, and not above."

Butchers were prohibited by Henry VII's Parliament, from killing beasts within any walled town, and the same privilege was also accorded Cambridge.

The Parliaments of the last of the Tudor monarchs passed many measures which seem curious in our time. The spirit of Elizabeth to appear well in the eyes of neighboring countries burns throughout the whole of the work of Parliament. Take for example the preamble to a statute for abolishing logwood in the dyeing of cloth, wool or yarn:—"Forasmuch as the colors made with the said stuff, called logwood, alias blackwood, is false and deceitful, and the clothes and other things therewith dyed are not only sold and uttered to the great deceit of the Queen's loving subjects within her realm of England, but also beyond the seas to the great discredit and slander as well of the merchants as of the dyers of the realm." In 1545 an unique Act of Parliament (passed in 1541) was repealed. It recited, "that no manner of person or persons from and after the 1st day of August then next, ensuing, should vent, utter or put for sale, by retail, in the gross or otherwise, any manner pins, within this realm, but only such as should be double-headed, and have the heads soudered fast to the shank of the pins, well smoothed, the shank well shaven, the point well and round filed, canted and shaped; upon pain that every offender in that behalf should lose and forfeit for every 1,000 pins not sufficiently wrought and made, vented, uttered or put to sale, contrary to the purport of this Act, forty shillings."

Space will only allow me to briefly refer to a few other curious Acts. In 1236 it was declared that the day of Leap Year and the day before should be regarded as one day only. In 1331, it was made a penal act to convey gold or silver out of the country. In 1565 it was made unlawful to work hats and caps with foreign wool, unless the artificer had been apprenticed to the mystery of hat-making, and in the same year it was made a felony to carry over sea rams, lambs or sheep. In 1585 an Act was passed for the preservation of the timber in the wilds of Surrey, Sussex and Kent, and is chiefly noteworthy on account of the total absence of timber in that locality in our time. Parliament, in 1581, prescribed the true making, melting and working of wax, and in 1597, prohibited the excessive making of malt. This is perhaps the earliest appearance of the political prohibitionist. In the same year they proscribed "lewd and wandering persons pretending themselves to be soldiers and mariners." And about the same time they passed an Act against "vagabonds calling themselves Egyptians." This Act was apparently abortive to judge by the number of gipsies in our days. Tin was prohibited from export from all the ports of the realm, except Dartmouth. In 1403 we learn "what things may be guilded and laid over with silver or gold, and what not."

James I., the English Solomon, vented all his energies on the suppression of witchcraft. And many interesting Acts were passed during the Stuart period, but time will not allow me to cite enactments posterior to the death of Queen Elizabeth.—A. Melbourne Thompson, in *The Week*.

The Ontario Government crop bulletin says the excessive drouth, especially over the large western area, has caused a great falling off in some crops. Considerable damage was done by grasshoppers in midland counties. The fall-sown crops show the best average; spring wheat very poor; hay good; oats and barely under the average; corn fair; peas and roots poor; average crop fruit, except in east; fall apples up to the average.

## Christian Endeavor.

### THE ALTERNATIVES.

REV. W. S. MCTAVISH, B.D., ST. GEORGE.

Sep. 9.—John iii. 16-21; 31-36

From the earliest ages God has been giving mankind the choice of good or evil, of blessing or cursing, of life or death. Adam was given the privilege of choosing whether he would obey God and enjoy life, or disobey and suffer death (Gen. ii. 16, 17). Cain had a similar choice. God said to him, "If thou doest well shall thou not be exalted, and if thou doest not well sin is crouching at the door" (Gen. iv. 7). Moses said to the children of Israel, "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life that thou and thy seed may live" (Deut. xxx. 15, 20). Isaiah was sent to Israel with this message, "Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him for they shall eat the fruit of their doing. Woe to the wicked; it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be done to him" (Isa. iii. 10, 11). Solomon also said, "Though a sinner do evil an hundred times and his days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God. But it shall not be well with the wicked" (Eccles. viii. 12, 12). When John the Baptist came, he made this declaration, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (John iii. 36). Christ also set before men life or death, joy or sorrow, pleasure or pain, peace or unrest, holiness or sin.

Every individual must make the choice for himself. He must decide for either the one or the other. Joshua said to the children of Israel, "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve" (Joshua xxiv. 15). He recognized the fact that it was impossible for them to occupy a middle ground; and that if they were not enlisted under the banner of heaven they were still serving the wicked one. Jesus himself presented the same idea in the clearest and most unmistakable terms, for He said, "No man can serve two masters, for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will hold to the one and despise the other" (Matt. vi. 24). Every man therefore, is either a child of God or a servant of the devil.

What does God wish us to choose? Every precept, every command, every exhortation, every promise, every warning, indicate very clearly that God desires to choose life. He has no pleasure in the death of the wicked. He would rather that all would turn unto Him and live. "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might have life" (John iii. 17). He invites all to look unto Him and be saved (Isa. xlv. 22.)

God is so desirous of saving men that He has made the terms of salvation very simple and very easy. To every one who asks, "What must I do to be saved?" He replies, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." If salvation depended upon good works, or human merit, or riches, many might despair, but what could be easier than to trust a loving, compassionate and mighty Saviour?

Not only are the terms of salvation very simple, but the sinner is urged in every possible way to take advantage of them, and to take advantage of them without delay. "Now is the accepted time, behold, now is the day of salvation." The sinner is further assured that he may enjoy eternal life here and now. This is what the Rev. F. B. Meyer would call one of the "present tenses of the blessed life."

The fear of God frees from all other fear.

Who never looks for angels will see fiends.

A street car conductor at Cleveland paid this compliment to the visiting hosts of Endeavorers: "They are the easiest people to collect from I ever had. If I miss one, he comes and hands me his fare."