tion of its ideas. If the theories of recent critics as to the formation and relationship of the component portions of the Old Testament be true, the view taken of the develop­ment of Old Testament theology must be very different from that formed on the supposition that the traditional theory is correct. And which theory is correct is a ques­tion of fact which can only be decided by dispassionate and thorough critico-historical investigation. So false readings must be distinguished from true, erroneous trans­lations from correct, and appropriate from inappropriate interpretations, which presupposes an adequate measure of linguistic, grammatical, and exegetical knowledge and skill. The religion of the Bible, however, is but one of a multitude of religions which have left traces of them­selves in documents, monuments, rites, creeds, customs, institutions, individual lives, social changes, &c.; and there is a theological discipline—comparative theology—which undertakes to disclose the spirit, delineate the character, trace the development, and exhibit the relations of all re­ligions with the utmost attainable exactitude. Obviously the mass of data which this science has to collect, sift, and interpret is enormous. They can only be brought to light and set in their natural relationships by the labours of hosts of specialists of all kinds. That hypotheses in this domain will for long arise and vanish with disappointing rapidity is only what is to be expected from its vast extent, the amount of its buried wealth, the gradual and fragmentary way in which its contents must be disinterred, the losses and changes which have occurred in the course of time, and the constant suggestion of fresh interpretations of ancient texts and new solutions of old problems which must come from unceasing discovery. Some theological disciplines, it must also be observed, presuppose others, and have consequently among their data the conclusions of those other disciplines. All doctrine, for example, founded on special revelation presupposes doctrine founded on general revelation ; all Christian theology must imply and incorporate natural theology. Christian dogmatics has to make use of the results of natural theology, Biblical theology, and comparative theology, and to raise them to a higher stage by a comprehensive synthesis which con­nects them with the person and work of Christ, as of Him in whom all spiritual truth is comprehended and all spiritual wants supplied. The conception of it prevalent until lately, as a system formed of generalizations and inferences from texts of Scripture, answers properly to no theological science, but much more nearly to Biblical theology than to Christian dogmatics.

When religious data have been ascertained, the materials of theological science have been obtained, but the scientific edifice itself has still to be constructed. The general truths involved in particular disclosures have to be evolved ; the laws of the development of phenomena have to be discovered ; elements have to be reached by analysis and comprehensive views by synthesis ; laws and facts, funda­mental and derivative principles, have to be exhibited in their natural organic connexion. This can only be done aright by right methods, and only by a variety of methods. No one-sided process can be appropriate or sufficient. The method must conform to the nature of the matter dealt with and to the end that has to be attained. Theo­logy includes a variety of sciences or disciplines, and these differ so greatly in character that they plainly cannot be studied aright if studied precisely in the same way. Some of them are more allied to criticism, others to history, and others again to philosophy. In some deduction can mani­festly have little place, while in others there is no obvious reason why it should not be largely used. There is no kind of science which, with its special processes, may not be called on to contribute to some department of theology.

There must be, therefore, in theology need and scope for a great variety of applications of method.

It is easy, however, to exaggerate the importance of acquaintance with the formal rules of method laid down by logicians. The theory of method must be preceded by practice—true theory by successful practice ; and the ablest practitioners are always only to a small extent guided in their practice by conscious reference to the rules of method prescribed by logicians. In theology, as in all other depart­ments of science, a man can only become an investigator by investigating. And whether he will become, through the practice of investigation, a successful investigator or not will depend far more on his general intellectual char­acter, his ingenuity, originality, tact, and sensibility, his familiarity with the relevant facts and with the researches which are really bringing new truths in his department to light, his perseverance and diligence, than on his know­ledge of what the theorists on method have taught as to its nature and requirements. Yet, of course, such instruc­tion as logical theory can give is not to be despised, but to be received and acted on with all due appreciation.

When the data of the theologian are before him as particular facts, it is obvious that he must so enumerate and classify, so analyse and generalize, so correlate and combine them, as to elicit from them the principles which they imply, before either his procedure or results can be properly characterized as scientific. In other words, a method which starts from particulars must, in order to be scientific, be largely inductive. But in theology, as in all other departments of knowledge, the only induction which is of any value is more than any mere summation or combination of facts. This is not the place for a discussion of the nature of a true induction ; but on any view it must hold good that to understand aright what induction in theology is we must know what is implied in all that is comprehended in it,—the ascertainment and collocation of facts, the discrimination of their charac­teristics, the classification of them, the analysis of what is complex, the synthesis of what is partial, the tracing of uniform relations, the inferential act, &c. Much which would not be without interest or use, or even some degree of novelty, might be said on all these points. Numerous as have been treatises on theology, there has not as yet appeared a single earnest attempt to expound the nature of method in theology ; even the many works professedly dealing not only with the encyclopædia but with the methodology have, in reality, quite ignored theological method proper. The present writer can only here note the desideratum ; to supply it would require a special and lengthened discussion. The so-called methods of induction— the methods of agreement, of difference, and of concomitant variations—are as applicable in theology as in physical or mental science. They are not, properly speaking, processes of induction ; they are merely rules for testing inductions. Their value, of course, is not thereby lessened.

The theologian, not less than the physicist, must be on his guard against fancying that the validity or certainty of his inductions is to be estimated by the number of his instances. Many who have undertaken to prove the Divine existence by the cosmological and teleological arguments have made the fatal mistake of supposing that all that was needed was an accumulation of what they deemed ex­amples or illustrations of Divine wisdom. They have overlooked that what is, above all, necessary is to show the truth of the principles of causality and finality, and the legitimacy of those applications of them, which are involved in the cosmological and teleological arguments. They have spent their strength on what is easy, superficial, and indecisive, and had none left to deal with what is difficult, deep, and of vital moment. They have failed to