Presbyterians, whether Scottish, Canadian or American, is based on the classical apologetic of Hodge and Warfield.

Dr Buswell followed in the line of Presbyterianism. The Dutch Reformed theologians, such as Louis Berkhof in the United States and G. C. Berkouwer in Holland, accompanied by Cornelius Van Til at Westminster Theological Seminary, have followed Kuiper.

An extended dialogue developed between Dr Van Til and Dr Buswell. It went on for about eight to ten years. Dr Buswell defended and used the theistic arguments. At the same time, he agreed with Dr Van Til, and the presuppositionalists, that the theistic arguments along with biblical evidences are only probability arguments. Nevertheless, he maintained that both are useful. For example, he presented the cosmological argument in the following form. He wrote:

I suggest as a proper approach to the cosmological argument the proposition: 'If anything does now exist, then either something must be eternal, or something not eternal must have come from nothing.' The argument should then proceed to show that it is more reasonable (probable) to believe that something is eternal and that among the many hypotheses of eternal existence, the God of the Bible is the most reasonable, *the most probable eternal being*. ("Thomas and the Bible," p. 89)

While it is not our purpose to take up the debate mentioned above, we would point out that John's Gospel asserts the validity and value of probability arguments when the Apostle writes:

And many other things truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written that ye might believe Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that ye might have life through His name (John 20:30-31).

John's records of the seven miracles of Jesus -- turning water into wine; the nobleman's son healed; the healing at the pool of Bethesda; feeding the five thousand; Jesus walking on the water; healing of the man born blind; and the healing of Lazarus -- are probability arguments used by the Holy Spirit to authenticate the person of Jesus Christ.

Dr Buswell did a superb job in apologetics in his classes and in his books, *Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1963) and his introduction to philosophy. *Being and Knowing* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1960). He was an able and fearless defender of the Christian faith in the field of philosophy. He attended yearly conferences on philosophy and reported to us what he had experienced. I used to sit and wonder at his keenness and ability and wished I had been able to have had some courses in philosophy so that I could understand all that he said. Yet, there were significant fragments of truth which were to be of much help later on. It was because of what he said that I gained the confidence that I would never have otherwise had. The Christian theologian can and ought to hold his own in the field of philosophy. It was from him I learnt several absolutely basic principles and facts which were to be of tremendous value later on. For example, I found that I could understand and answer the problems faced by Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, and many others.

In this effort I was also helped by Dr G. C. Berkouwer who was an authority on Karl Barth. It was during my teaching in apologetics at Faith