

make the teaching of Scripture quadrate with a set of philosophical opinions." Metaphysics and Theology have quite different starting points, and differ considerably in their methods. The metaphysician derives his materials from consciousness and observation—the theologian from authority, from "Thus saith the Lord."

While, however, Theology submits itself to authority, it does not forfeit its claim to be regarded as scientific, for it attempts more than simply an analysis of the documents in which the Christian faith is contained. "It seeks to give the sense of many passages in one proposition, and to put its proposition together so as to bring out their mutual relations—so that one may cause its light to shine upon another. Nor is good and necessary inference forbidden, nor obviously legitimate logical process proscribed, for this were not to avoid rationalism, but to imply the abnegation of reason"

"The exposition of Scripture precedes the attempt to construct a system of Biblical doctrine. The work of the interpreter must be finished before that of the Theologian begins."

The lecturer having dwelt upon this at some length, noticed various classes of speculatists and systematic writers in Theology, who either rejected or did not sufficiently recognize this dependence of systematic Theology upon the interpretation of Scripture, such as Deists, Rationalists, Socinians, Broad School men. After having shown how each of those classes erred in this respect, some remarks were made upon works of sound Theology, which are sadly disfigured by the inaccurate use of Scripture which characterizes them, passages of the Word of God being often adduced in support of statements with which they have scarcely anything to do. Modern Theological writers, it was said, are not so guilty of this, though occasionally they still err in the same way.

After expressing his confidence that systematic Theology will still derive benefit from the progress of exegetical study, without needing to be entirely recast, the lecturer concluded in the following terms:—"Let no one understand us to teach that a good knowledge of interpretation is all that is necessary to secure sound and vital Theology. It is quite conceivable that Biblical criticism and exegesis in all that pertains to them should be carried to great perfection, and yet very essential pre-requisites to theological science be wanting. There must be spiritual life in order to the maintenance of sound doctrines in the successful cultivation of Theology. If the deepest and strongest forces of the moral nature are wrongly conditioned, and tend in a wrong direction, they cannot be restrained and conducted aright by any knowledge of the letter of Scripture. For we must have observed that the same unbelief and irreligious feeling which deteriorates systematic Theology, prevents also the interpretation of Scripture, so that Biblical scholarship *alone*, will no more preserve in its purity and integrity the one than the other. Let us, therefore, not forget that unless the mind is under the teaching of the Holy Ghost we may be left at once to deal unfaithfully with Scripture in the exposition of it, and to exhibit an edifice of theological doctrine composed of materials which shall be all consumed in that day of trial and revelation which is to come."—(The above brief abstract we take from the columns of the *Globe*.)

We rejoice to say that the attendance this session is more than usually large. A number of students who have finished their literary course, some in University College, and some elsewhere, have entered the first Theological Class, while a very large number are in the preliminary department, under the Rev. G. P. Young. The entire number in the Theological de-