Investigative Competence within a Causal Order:
The Biblical & Common Sense Alternative
to Transcendental Speculation

We have seen that Van Til's metaphysics of knowledge introduces an inscrutable condition for all creaturely reasoning and knowing. I have also somewhat darkly suggested that Van Til's reasoning about the status of human knowing carries unwelcome implications for the epistemic situation with Jesus Christ, for he was *both* man and God. As applied to Jesus, I think the analogy doctrine implies a strictly bifurcated mind (within the thought processes of the historical Jesus) in which there would have to be *two* radically incommensurable ways of structuring knowledge (one divine and the other human) *neither of which can fathom the other*.

This question can be asked too: If our omnipotent God can become human—take on the *same flesh* as we ourselves who are saved by Jesus's sacrifice ["univocal" flesh, so to speak]—why can't God also share some *same level meaning* within the constraints of the linguistic structures that he himself created? If, however, we accept Van Til's doctrine of *absolutely* different levels of divine and human existence, then the very logic of this acceptance would seem to preclude that God could become a man. The question I raise is whether God can violate "the radically different ontological levels of divine and human existence" to literally take on *our* humanity on *our* level of existence. Given what Van Til has had to say about these levels, I don't see how he can escape this kind of difficulty regarding the Incarnation of Christ. It seems to me that both with respect to the cerebrally facilitated knowing of the earthly Jesus, and with respect to the Incarnation itself, Van Til's speculations do not bode well for orthodox Christology.

Continuing, at the foundational level on which we have been addressing the human knowledge situation, I think there is only one sound alternative to Van Til's "philosophical theology of knowledge." The section [7] title concisely indicates this alternative. To make its meaning clear it is useful to accent the emerging contrast (among the alternatives) by reviewing the problem of infinite data alluded to earlier. Harken back with me, then, to that still undischarged debt to the reader announced in section [3]. There the topic was how a finite mind could know anything within a