

principled way to choose between them? Not presuppositionally, for both Charlie Brown and Linus (1) eschew empirically based arguments ending in probability, (2) both "presuppose" what they are then concerned to exhibit by rational discourse, (3) both insist that their apologetic results are apodictic, or absolutely certain, and (4) available to both is the claim to "analogical reasoning" which at once, and rather mysteriously, tidies up any logical mess encountered. We will take a somewhat extensive and, I trust, fair look at Van Til's "analogical reasoning" in just a moment.

Well, glancing up I catch myself having "turned up the volume," which is hardly the whisper I had intended. But then, when the stakes are high, there is some Lucy in us all. Part of my excitement is that at the end of the present tunnel (I, of course, have already seen how the story ends) there is light that looks remarkably like common sense—biblical common sense by which believers in Jesus Christ are competent to provide good and compelling reasons for believing that the Bible is God's inerrant word and for the truth of the Gospel!

Since it is Van Til's presuppositionalism that afflicts the thought processes of Charlie Brown and Linus, we next need to ask what a *Van Tillian* criteriology for knowledge ascription might look like. And to anticipate, I will say that it looks mighty strange. But we have yet to discuss one essential ingredient for that particular "knowledge recipe": *analogicity*. To put it ever so concisely, analogicity is the certainty securing feature of Van Til's apologetic. But what, pray tell, is analogicity?

[3]

**Analogical Rationality:  
A (Strong, Fair, Pale) Reflection  
of God's Rationality?**

"Analogicity," for Van Til, names a vital *relation* between human knowing and divine knowing. To the best of my knowledge, Van Til never uses the noun form, "analogicity," but I think it will further the interests of clarity if we have a name for the *property* a line of reasoning has if it is analogical. The noun "analogy" really won't do for this purpose, and although "analogousness" might serve, I prefer the less standard "analogicity" to name the mysterious property we are about to consider.