agree that if there were an explicit statement to or not to baptize our covenant children, the disagreement between these Christians on this matter would cease.

By way of another example, there are those who maintain that the practice of barring women from certain church offices is unscriptural. Yet we are all aware that Scripture nowhere states: "Qualified women shall be ordained as elders and deacons." And yet, even though they are aware of Paul's explicit statements about women in the churches of Corinth and Ephesus, some of these Christians infer that when all Scripture is taken into consideration, there is an adequate basis for admitting qualified women to these offices. Certain heroines of Scripture are noted as obviously having asserted some measure of authority over men. It is also contended, inferentially, to be sure, that the Pauline assertion that "in Christ there is neither male or female" at least opens up in principle the possibility for women in the offices cited. In the first century, Paul's statement was a radical one, to be sure, when placed against the backdrop of Greek, Roman, and Rabbinic notions about the ontological inferiority of women.

In summation, is there really a difference in principle between the position which denies extra-Psalmic hymns and instrumental music in divine worship and that which supports the ordination of women? It seems that if one group is to be judged as dead wrong, then why not the other also?

The value(s) of Inferential Theology ought to be catalogued, assessed, debated and published abroad. The ever-present danger of Inferential Theology is especially due to the Problem of Induction. (An intriguing question presents itself: Did Adam and Eve encounter the Problem of Induction before the Fall or is this problem a result of the Fall?)

Finally then, is Inferential Theology de rigueur or un grand péril? I see it as both. An analogue to it might be fallen man's sexuality: it is both necessary and perilous. Insofar as we have a penchant for systematization, Inferential Theology is necessary—for there is no obvious, well-structured system that leaps out at those who read the Scriptures. "Systems" are induced or inferred or drawn from the Scriptures, one hopes.

Part of the great peril of Inferential Theology is the proliferation of personalized theologies. This syndrome might be Corinthian: I'm of Paul/Cephas/Apollos/Christ; as well as modern: I'm of Aquinas/Luther/Barth/Hodge/Scofield et. al. The myriads of systematic theologies are perhaps explainable by some very obvious causes—different presuppositions about reality, different emphases about "the key" to Scripture; new information about philology, culture and history; and, finally a dissatisfaction with what others have done—e.g., Luke's edoze kamoi (Luke 1:3), "It seemed good also to me."

So let us continue our inferential endeavors—but humbly. At the same time, let us pray earnestly for systematic and related theologians,