

(whose interpretation has had Van Til's own blessing) has vigorously challenged the interpretation of John Frame. (Cf. John M. Frame, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God*, pp. 30-40, for Frame's side of things.) It has seemed to me that Halsey is quite obviously the better interpreter of Van Til's intent, and what I shall have to say will reflect Halsey's development of the issue in his review article, "A Preliminary Critique of Van Til: *The Theologian*," (*Westminster Theological Journal*, Fall 1976).

Given all the above, what then is the *meaning* of analogicity? I follow Van Til this far: our thoughts should be governed, *as much as possible*, by Scripture, as we "take captive every thought to make it obedient to Christ" (II Cor. 10:5b, NIV). I cannot imagine any devout Christian challenging Van Til on this. But Van Til has paid insufficient attention to his own view of the implications of the inherent ceiling on human rationality. There is, he reasonably claims, a fundamental limit beyond which human thought cannot go. The logic with which we are endowed, and with which we Christians seek to make all our thought captive to Christ, both limits and facilitates that glorious enterprise. We cannot transcend that ceiling for a better view (cf. Deut. 29:29 and Isa. 55:9).

Staying with the point about logic (i.e., rational structure), it is important to see that we come to Scripture *already* logico-linguistically endowed, and *all* our comprehension of, and rejoicing in, what God has revealed takes place *within* the basic enablings and constraints of that endowment. (There are, I think, affective and fundamental spiritual constraints too, and a complete account would have to acknowledge these as well.) Does Van Til have a problem with this? His dogmatic speculations about the character of the contrast between divine and human thought suggest, ironically, that he does indeed. Although no one has stressed such texts as Isaiah 55:9 as much as Van Til (God's thoughts and ways are "higher" than ours), he has introduced a technical term of *contrast and relationship* between human and divine thought that is nowhere given in Scripture.

Now if all he were up to were the substituting of the word "analogicity" for "the property of being totally dependent on an omniscient exemplar *as disclosed in Scripture*", there would be no problem—at least not that I can see. I hasten to add, however, that the notion of "total