

tuted for the other. They are of value in so far as their respective exponents, or the same exponent, at different times, adopt, or adopts, as the case may be, an attitude of complete neutrality in regard to the alternative method by restricting himself exclusively during that time to his chosen field of investigation. Thus between religion and science there is no inherent antithesis, and it is only when teachers of science and religion ignore these distinctions that a sense of antithesis, rivalry, and incompatibility insinuates itself. It cannot be too clearly stated in Canada, at present, even at the risk of repetition, that these two methods are not in themselves mutually exclusive and destructive, but complementary or correlative and consequently indispensable within their respective spheres. Each constitutes a semi-process from the metaphysical stand-point; each has a real psychological basis; each rests in the last analysis upon its own basal assumption or hypothesis which is a sovereign law unto itself. They rest upon the two earliest and grandest hypotheses ever conceived by man, "the existence of God," and "the uniformity of nature." Since each of them is of immemorial antiquity and of universal distribution, we assume that they are ineradicable in some shape or other from the human mind, and rest upon a basis of reality. So essential to progress do they seem to have been in the past that it is no longer possible for us to determine, within precise limits, which of the two has ministered most effectually to the growth of civilization and culture.

The historical critic is essentially an exponent of the method of evolution. He is able to achieve success and propound judgements valid and acceptable to thinkers in proportion to his professional ability to eliminate from his mind while at work in his own proper laboratory any particular set of theological and ecclesiastical presuppositions. Though *qua* historical critic of Hebrew customs and institutions his subject matter happens to be of a highly religious complexion, it by no means follows that his method is properly or necessarily the method of theology, for in adopting this method, he has already *ipso facto* prejudged a large part of his subject