

marvellous position among earth's races, should prepare the Higher Critics for finding in the history of that people something more and something very different from the phenomena which other religions present. "To come, therefore, to the examination of Israel's religion," says Prof. Robertson, "with a formula, or equation, that will represent the history of all religions, and then apply it to the religion of Israel, is to prejudge the whole question in a most unscientific way, and to run in the teeth of historical fact." "The science of Comparative Religion," says Professor Robertson, again, "is legitimate and most useful; but it becomes unscientific when it is a levelling science." We know how the Bible explains the problems raised by these and the other equally marvellous facts of Jewish history, by saying that they were a divinely guided people, that their religion was originated and maintained by supernatural interpositions at sundry times and in divers manners, and surely, if the forces which entered into the development of their history cannot be explained on natural principles, the inference is legitimate, nay, unavoidable, that they must have come from above. "It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes."

Another observable thing about the methods of this new criticism, and which is largely responsible for its surprising results, is that it is almost altogether a subjective process. It relies upon internal evidence alone. De Wette, whose Introduction to the Old Testament marks an epoch in the history of the Higher Criticism, proclaimed this as the method of his school. Criticism, he maintained, must henceforth set aside tradition, and get to the facts by means of its own researches. All external sources of information, it was said, were wanting; but their loss was not material, and by no means to be regretted; for it called in-