

not show or express any sense of conviction, yet God tells us through Paul that intuitively the unsaved know this to be true, at the very time in which discursively they are denying it. This throws some light on the problem of method in apologetics.

The second question was that of the relation between TRUTH and human knowledge. We concluded that the unregenerate can know and do know many facts truly, even though they do not derive them from Special or General Revelation, and do not consciously think God's thoughts after Him. This suggests a Starting-Point and some Common Ground from which to work.

The third question was that of the relation between human reason and faith. We found these to be complementary, with faith as necessarily prior. This solution suggests our apologetic approach.

To illustrate the stress I wish to lay upon one of the five originally mentioned answers to the question "What is the Apologetic Task?" I should like to quote from Kenneth S. Kantzer's Forword to Warren C. Young's A Xn Approach to Philosophy:

"Too much of contemporary evangelical apologetics has foundered upon the rocks One school discovers in Xy the most satisfactory hypothesis to explain the phenomena of the universe. The unbeliever is the inadequate philosopher who looks at only part of the phenomena or fails to develop a theory that really explains. The Xn, on the contrary, takes into account all the facts of the world in which he lives and arrives at the only truly coherent philosophy -- Xy.

"The chief difficulty with this view, as Dr. Young ably points out, is that most Xns did not become philosophers first and then Xns. Rather they first become Xns and then philosophers. "Sophie the scrubwoman" did not wait for a solution to the problems of the one and many, causation, freedom and determinism, good and evil, and social ethics, before she entered into the certainty that Xy is true.

"Dr. Young on the other hand carefully avoids the pitfall into which have fallen many orthodox thinkers of our day. Xn faith, so they affirm, is primarily an act of the will and does not at all terminate upon the evidence. Such a blind faith, as Augustine pointed out long ago, leaves us mute when the question is asked, "But to which object ought we to accord faith?" If faith is reduced to blind willing, no answer can be given to the man who accepts another faith. . . In true Augustinian style, Dr. Young maintains that only by evidence can one distinguish a blind superstitious faith from an enlightened and reasonable faith."

What then is the apologetic task? I conceive that it is to