play in the weighting of the data? Does the concept of the progress (or unfolding) of revelation affect the relative value of the data? Do N.T. data supersede O.T. data in value? Are the data found in the "didactic portions of the New Testament epistles" crucial? Does the question of literary genre affect the relative value of the data?

In developing mental constructs that attempt to make sense of or render intelligible the biblical data, is the process one of forming and testing small models (those that render intelligible the biblical data pertaining to single doctrines), then forming and testing intermediate models (those that render intelligible the biblical data pertaining to the relationships of individual doctrines), and then forming and testing large models (those that render intelligible the biblical data pertaining to the relationships of doctrinal clusters)? As the conceptual "nets" become larger and larger, and capture more and more data, is each increase in size of the construct paralleled by an increase of subjective certitude? Or is the greatest certitude actually found at the small model level, where construction is closest to the biblical data?

How does Montgomery's personal/artistic/subjective level actually function in forming and testing theological constructs? Does it contribute anything positive to the process? Or does it serve mainly as a reminder of our human involvement in and contribution to our constructs, and of the coloration our finiteness and sinfulness (even as redeemed children of God) add to the models we propose?

How does Montgomery's sacral/holy level actually function in forming and testing theological constructs? Does it contribute anything positive to the process? Or does it serve mainly as a check and a reminder -- a check against our tendency to absolutize our cherished theological sub-creations, and a reminder of the incomprehensibility of God and the sinfulness that remains in us even as we attempt to grasp God's truth?

4. The contribution of Arthur F. Holmes

In Arthur F. Holmes' article, "Ordinary Language Analysis and Theological Method", published in the *Bulletin of the ETS*, summer, 1968, Holmes asserts that deduction and induction are insufficient to explain what goes on in systematic theology. He says:

> Theology seems to me to involve hermeneutical assumptions and pre-understandings, the selection of materials, the choice of some preferred materials in interpreting others, the adoption of guiding hypotheses, the use of models, the gradual hesitating construction of conceptual maps.

Holmes proposes that "concept formation means adducing models and developing constructs," and says that "theology is mapwork that explores the logical layout of the models adduced from Scripture." Models are adduced and conceptual or logical maps constructed.