

istic of the systematic setting forth of truth? Not at all; a botanic garden full of life and beauty may set forth the marvels of the vegetable kingdom as well at least as a herbarium. The true reason is that our modern theology is scholastic. It is deductive, not inductive. Like the Westminster divines, its authors first frame their system and then search the Scriptures for proof of their statements. It matters not whether the foundations of such a system be found in Calvin or Luther, in Aquinas or Scotus, in Augustine or John of Damascus, the foundations are at least fallible, and the process is vicious. Lord Bacon, who in England rang the 'death-knell of deduction in the realm of science, pointed out this excess in the use of human reason in things divine, that "it attributes an equal authority to the inference as to the principles." In other words, it makes too much of human logic, and that was the characteristic feature of scholasticism, which was simply an attempt, or series of attempts, to formulate theology in accordance with the philosophy, chiefly dialectic, of Aristotle. It matters not that the Bible is a book of real (so far as human reasoning goes), as well as of apparent paradoxes, nor that its Divine Author distinctly affirms a supernatural logic, saying, "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my thoughts than your thoughts"; the scholastic divine drives his logic rough-shod over it all. And, for the sake of consistency, he virtually overlooks that moral essence of the Divine nature which embraces within its vast compass all other moral perfections as the fulfilling of the whole law, whether for God or man—that essence so simply stated by the beloved disciple in the words "God is love," but of the manifestations of which the whole Scriptures are full. The Bible declares Divine Predestination and Human Freedom. They are paradoxical, and to our reason present antinomy; so the Arminian, for the sake of logic, rules out the former, and the Calvinist, with the same end in view, whatever his practice may be, as a matter of theological science, destroys the latter. In the middle ages this would have been called scholasticism; in the present age it is rationalism. The most serious abuse of this logic is when it creates a theory at variance with human experience, as in the case of the Pharisees, who logically cornered the blind man fresh from Siloam with sight restored. Unfortunately religious