

of God's revelation and thereby makes it indirect. The only way man can therefore have truth is by 'demythologization' -- namely, by taking off the time-space wraps which man has put upon revelation, as he received it from God, and thereby unearth the truth.

At this point some of our readers may say, "You have led us into a very deep philosophical problem. That is not our field of study." I agree that it is difficult, but I cannot agree that it is a field of study for which only the orthodox Christian apologist is responsible. It is the concern also of all who claim to be scholars and defenders of the Bible as the divinely inspired, infallible Word of God.

I remember a statement made by Dr MacRae which has encouraged me ever since the Lord guided me into the field of apologetics. He remarked: "We have faced and been able to answer so many questions which have been raised in modern Old and New Testament studies that we are certain that, though many questions still remain to be solved, we shall finally find the answers to these also." This admonition and encouragement and the careful methodical scholarly approach demonstrated in his class lectures together form a solid basis for the study of biblical apologetics.

I did not consciously choose the field of apologetics. I was precipitated into it first by the crisis which I went through for eight years during my farming experience, and then, twenty years later, when the renowned Dr G. C. Berkouwer, at the Free University in Amsterdam, Holland, suggested I write my doctoral dissertation on Paul Tillich. In order to do so, I had to train myself in the field of philosophy since Tillich based his theology upon the Eastern Mystical view of a timeless-spaceless monistic God and used Hegelian dialectic to describe the unfolding of Being or God to form triadically the Trinity and to explain the origin and existence of the world and man.

This was the point at which what I learned from Dr MacRae coalesced with that which I had received from Dr Buswell. Both Dr MacRae and Dr Buswell are admirers of Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield, the two greatest Presbyterian theologians who taught at Princeton Theological Seminary. Hodge and Warfield were classical apologists: they believed and taught the value and use of both biblical evidences and the theistic arguments for apologetics. In contrast, Dr Abraham Kuiper, founder of the Free University in Holland, believed in and taught what is called pre-suppositionalism. He maintained that apologetics was the last and the least of the theological disciplines. He reasoned that since both theistic arguments and biblical evidences produce only probability arguments, they are worthless and probability cannot rise above chance.

It is interesting and important to note that B. B. Warfield disagreed with Kuiper. He wrote the introductory chapter for *Fundamental Apologetics* (Columbia: Richmond Press), a book written by Francis Robert Beattie, a Southern Presbyterian, in 1902. Warfield faulted Kuiper in a very gracious but able manner, pointing out that saving faith was really built upon apologetics. Kuiper failed to grasp what Warfield was saying. This was the first open conflict between the classical apologetics of Princeton and American Presbyterianism, and the presupposition apologetics of Abraham Kuiper and the Christian Reformed Church. Our heritage, as