

no common ground. That's his fundamental point: you must presuppose the triune God, and if you are simply going to say you can't prove anything, you must just presuppose, then why not presuppose Buddhism or Mohammedanism? Why should you presuppose Christianity?

My last, or next to the last year there, his nephew was in my class. I was giving archaeological evidence as to the accuracy of the Bible. Onee when I got into something that was a little involved, he raised his hand, and said, Why do we need to bother with all these evidences and things? After all we've got the philosophical argument, what more do we need?" It's not an argument at all. It's a denial there is any such thing as (an argument). He says you've got to have absolute certainty. You can't have anything that leaves the least possible area of question. It's interesting that Dr. Machen's little autobiography published about that same time, gave as one of the big things that influenced him in taking d- in his youthful days when he had some struggles with his faith -- was the state^{ment} of Dr. Warfield that it's like a man ready to cross the ocean and he's got to make the trip and there are two boats. One of them is a fine new ~~one~~ in excellent condition, with a highly trained crew. The other is a leaky boat full of rats, and a drunken captain. And the man says, I can't see this good boat as you ~~say~~ say, there might be a little flaw in it somewhere; there might be a tiny leak, you can't prove it's perfect, so I'm going to go on the rotten boat.

Now that's a probability argument if ~~there~~ there ever was one. But it's a fact. We cannot have absolute certainty. of things. The Lord gives us a conviction, yes. And we thank him for giving us the conviction, but logically you look at the evidences and you rule out certain things and you take certain things; you use the brain God has given you. And if you're not going to go to people and tell them to use the brain God has given them, and that if they will