

divines is as unjust as is his attempt to belittle Hodge's Systematic Theology. Referring to the alleged deadness characteristic, in his opinion, of the systematic setting forth of truth, he accounts for it as follows: "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." * * "There is no historical evidence of any attempt to build up theology, as other sciences have been built up *de novo*, by induction of fact."

In dealing with this very serious charge against the method alleged to be followed in modern systematic theology, I must preface my remarks by recording my very cordial agreement with Professor Campbell as to the importance of strictly adhering to the principle of induction in theology as in the other sciences. An incorrect generalization is liable to be the result of a too limited or imperfect induction. But after all this has been fully admitted, the question remains, Is the charge preferred by the Professor well founded? I might answer in the apt and eloquent words of Chalmers, "This antipathy to system in theology proceeds on the mistake of confounding the generalities of our systematic divines with the generalities of our old schoolmen, instead of which they ought to be considered as altogether of the same character with the generalities of modern science." (Institutes, Vol. I, page 39.) As the Prof. has given no proof that our theology is "scholastic," "deductive not inductive," except bare assertion, I quote the judgment of Chalmers in preference to any opinion of my own. Every enlightened man rejoices in the marvellous advance made in the other sciences in recent times; but which one of them has a better record than theology as regards compliance with the canons of induction? Dr. McCosh, ex-President of Princeton College, will, I am sure, be recognized as an authority on such a point; and what does he say as to observance of the principle of induction in the other sciences? His words are, "But a moment's reflection suffices to show that in most cases, I believe in all, we cannot find out all the facts." * * "Observation cannot reach all the facts and give us absolute certainty." And may I not add that very many of the so-called facts of natural science are resolvable into the personal testimony of an eye-witness; so that here again an element of a precarious