

cludes the whole—of habits of order, cleanliness, and economy in good service.

It is curious to see that so many girls who turn from domestic service prefer the long hours and more trying business of shops, and in some cases the hard strain of factory life and of agricultural labor. With regard to factory work, it is probable that the large employment of women has tended to throw many men out of work and to lower wages. Women's labor is cheaper than men's. Often also women are worked in factories above their strength. Yet we are sure that the prejudice against factory girls in the South of England is unjust. In Lancashire and Yorkshire not a few women of good Christian type of character are to be found among 'factory hands.' There is often a good deal of earnestness, zeal, sympathy for their fellow creatures, and love of God among the women employed in our factories. Many a Lancashire parish owes good as well as evil to its factory girls. . . . Christian parents should not only consider what wages their daughters may earn, but what effect their occupations may have on their moral and religious character.

In our hospitals a Christian woman is in her proper place. To nurse the sick is one of woman's privileges, and it is one of the brighter sides of the progress of the last thirty years that nursing has been elevated into one of the noblest of female professions. It is a curious sign of the times that, while most female occupations are overcrowded, and the shrieking sisterhood are encroaching on men's specialties, the old-fashioned and especially feminine occupation of school teacher should be so neglected. There is a difficulty (as many of our clerical readers must know to their sorrow) to get good female teachers at moderate stipends, especially in villages where social attractions are not great. We only wish more ladies would be aroused by the present enthusiasm for Christian education to devote themselves to this definitely feminine and most useful form of woman's work. Two special divisions of woman's teaching work are, we hear, undersupplied—cookery and calisthenic teachers, but they only incidentally affect us. Then again Art is more studied by women now than in any previous period of England's history, and ladies who seek a little lucrative occupation may add by painting (especially decorative painting) to small means. Music also is becoming more a source of income for women than in other ages of English history. Not only in teaching music, but in performing, and even in bands we find women employed.

We might go further in dealing with divers occupations, but we must spare a few lines for what, like the postscript of a lady's letter, we wish to regard as the most important. Not unfrequently when a lady or even a communicant of the poorer classes finds her income insufficient, and that 'she must do something for herself,' she or some female relative consults—where he really has the confidence of his flock as he should—her parish priest on the subject. The question is, What should be his reply? It is useless to tell persons who are poor that they must not do anything to help themselves, and in many cases it is most undesirable to instruct them to ask their friends to help them. The best plan in a large number of cases is to find out what kind of work is available and how it will suit the candidate for employment. In the case of a woman the first point a priest, or even an earnest layman, would consider is, How far is the employment morally safe, and how far is the person seeking it likely to be deteriorated morally? If it is dangerous or evil, we should be inclined to say 'No.' For example (in spite of the kindly interest of the Church and Stage Guild members) we should not advise a young communicant to seek a living by the ballet. Other employments, however, are almost as dangerous though not considered so. Then we should advise the fitness and training of the ap-

plicant to be considered and the lucrativeness of the employment. One point is very often put off to the last, though a great deal of annoyance and even expense might be saved if it were considered at first, viz., Is the employment overcrowded? We heard lately that an advertisement in a Church paper for a lady's help brought a hundred replies. It is a pity it should. The occupation is overcrowded, and we fear there are more applicants than situations. On the other hand, we hear of some employers who find a difficulty in getting really efficient workers, though there is less of this in women's than men's work.—*Church Review.*

THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

[Paper read before the Montreal Diocesan Theological College by Rev. J. Ker, D.D., Rector of Grace Church, Montreal.]

Permit me at the outset to enter a protest against the use of the word *higher* in connection with the criticism we are now about to consider. "Higher" criticism suggests that there are other criticisms, inferentially of a lower and less important kind, from which the so-called "higher" criticism ought to be carefully distinguished. If I might venture to move an amendment, it would be to substitute the word *speculative* for the word *higher*. This would give us a nomenclature that would have some considerable correspondence with methods and results into which the speculative and hypothetical so largely enter.

At present the higher criticism is principally concerned with the Old Testament. By a close examination of the various books, and by comparing book with book and part with part where comparison is believed to be possible, it is sought to determine the genesis of each. In reaching conclusions, tradition as to authorship, not otherwise supported, has but little weight. The style of the writer, the use of words and phrases which indicate an early or later stage of the Hebrew language: surroundings political, ecclesiastical, ethnological and geographical, as far as they can be ascertained, are taken into account, and, as far as they go, aid in the formation of the critical judgment.

As there is no contemporary Hebrew literature with which the Old Testament writings can be compared, it might seem at first sight as though the researches of the higher critics were of academical rather than of direct and present theological interest. Such, however, is far from being the case. The critics have discovered an "idealizing element" running through records which we and our fathers believed to be the inspired Word of God; and they have suggested questions the solution of which seems incompatible with that simple faith in the truth of the narrative which has been the traditional belief of the Church of God from generation to generation. Nor is this all. Even the knowledge of Him who is the Word and Wisdom of God, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, even His knowledge as a man has not escaped the questioning and the speculations of the "Higher Criticism." . . .

In the year 1817, DeWette, a German theologian, published "A Historical and Critical Introduction to the Canonical and Apocryphal Books of the Old Testament" in which he laid down the lines on which the higher criticism has since wrought out some of its most important results.

According to DeWette the historical criticism of the Old Testament should limit itself to the comparative study of the various books, seeking to recompose the history of the Jews according to their contents; the agreement or disagreement of the various parts will enable the critic to form a judgment as to the period to which the particular theocratic institutions belong,

and also enable him to settle approximately the time to which the books ought to be referred. DeWette further held that investigations pursued in this manner would enable the inquirer to understand certain historical events which, as they appear in the narrative, are surrounded with "a transparent veil of fable." Applying his own principles of criticism to the Old Testament, he decomposed the Book into a variety of parts. The Pentateuch he found to consist of a series of fragments differing from each other in age, origin and character. Deuteronomy was not the work of Moses, nor was it composed until nearly a thousand years after Moses' time. The compiler of the chronicle utilized the older writings of Samuel and Kings, and worked them over in a levitical and hierarchal interest. In a work published later, DeWette submitted the Psalms to a like treatment, in the detail of which he attacked not only the traditional authorship, but also the Messianic character of some of the most confessedly Messianic Psalms in the whole collection. . . .

Among the most important of recent contributions to the literature of this subject stand Professor Driver's Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, and Canon Gore's essay on the Holy Spirit and Inspiration. The latter of these two especially has called forth a host of replies and rejoinders, and counter rejoinders, has been a burning subject at Church conferences, and has disturbed the peace of various kinds of Church societies. Briefly stated, and I must be brief for I hasten much, Dr. Driver's conclusions are roughly as follows:

1. The Pentateuch, as we now have it, is not the work of Moses, though without doubt it embodies traditions derived from him.

2. In the Pentateuch (so far as it is from being a homogeneous work) there are distinct tokens of three independent traditions: i.e., the Jehovistic (J.); the Elohist (E.); and the Priestly (P).

3. The traditions J and E were combined into one whole about the period of the early Monarchy; the Priest's code was wrought into this about the time of the exile. Hence the Hexateuch, as it now stands, is probably not earlier than the Babylonian Captivity.

4. The Book of Judges was written about the same time as the Pentateuch and Joshua.

5. The Books of Samuel about 700 B.C.

6. The Books of the Kings about the time of Jeremiah.

7. The Chronicles about the time of Ezra.

8. The last twenty-six chapters of Isaiah are the work of an unknown prophet who lived about the close of the Captivity.

9. The Book of Jonah was not written until more than 300 years after Jonah's time.

10. It is not absolutely certain that any of the Psalms were written by David. The 110th Psalm ("The Lord saith unto my Lord") was probably not written by David. It is doubtful if any of the Psalms, as we have them, are earlier than 300 years after David's time; some are as late as the period of the Maccabees.

11. Daniel's Prophecies, in their present shape, were probably written about 300 years B. C.

(To be continued.)

THERE is, says the *Living Church*, a significance in the following quotation from *The Congregationalist*, which we are glad to note:

"More religious services on Christmas Day in Congregational churches have been reported to us this year than ever before. This is a tendency to be encouraged. Why should not other Churches besides the Episcopal and Roman Catholic provide for their constituency a service of worship on a day fraught with so much meaning to Christian hearts?"