

revelation. The only difference between him and Kierkegaard was that he maintained that there was a double indirectness in revelation, while Kierkegaard spoke merely of a single indirectness.

Our answer to the assumption that God is timeless and spaceless goes back to Immanuel Kant. The definition of the infinite adopted by Kant is incorrect. One infinite does not necessarily annihilate another. There can be one line which theoretically travels infinitely in two directions, but there can also be other lines which do the same and yet do not impinge upon the infinity of the first. In fact there can be any number of infinite lines which do not touch upon the infinity of others. Kant's is therefore incorrect. He defined God's infinity quantitatively, when he ought to have defined it qualitatively. The Shorter Catechism gives a fine example of this point.

Q. What is God?

A. God is a spirit, infinite eternal and unchangeable in his (1) being, (2) wisdom, (3) power, (4) holiness, (5) goodness (love), (6) justice, (7) truth.

There are seven infinities and none impinges upon or annihilates any of the others since they are all qualitative in nature.

I thank God for Dr MacRae's constant warnings especially in chapel talks, that liberalism might, in some years, even take over a sound theological seminary. The old Neo-orthodoxy introduced by Karl Barth, and fought against for some thirty or forty years by orthodox conservatives, is again being advocated. In his recent book, *After Fundamentalism* (Harper & Row, 1983), Bernard Ramm, a leading Baptist apologist, has argued that evangelicalism needs to return to Barth in order to solve its own problems. A careful study of his book reveals that he, like so many others, has not seen the Kantian problem mentioned above which lies behind Barth's problem and has failed both to analyze and to answer it in a scholarly way. The Southern Baptist seminaries are already in a crisis over the doctrine of verbal inspiration and the infallibility of the Bible and because of this the whole great denomination is in extreme turmoil. Never has there been a day when the Church of Jesus Christ needs solid work more in contemporary theology than today. A great danger faces this generation of conservative evangelical students, who need to be content to rest simply and rejoice in the superb apologetic efforts of such men as Dr Allan A. MacRae and Dr J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.; they should recognize that what they have received from these men is in God's grace, a challenge and a charge to dedicate their own lives and abilities to the field of contemporary theology.

Just before I left farming to return to studies in 1935, I asked God if he would give me the privilege of answering the attacks on the faith of young theological students which had devastated my life and driven me out to the farm in the first place. Years later, when lecturing in contemporary theology at Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, Mississippi, this prayer came to my mind as I found myself engaged in the task of the evangelization of the intellectual. God was indeed answering my plea as he led me to analyze and answer the problems of such men as Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, Marshall McLuhan, Edgar Cayce, Herbert Marcuse, Angela Davis, the Eastern Mystics, and many others. But the groundwork for