

(p.165).

But why, exactly, is the theological doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God at stake? The answer for Van Til is that if there is *any point at all* where the content in man's mind is identical with the content in God's mind, then *in principle* man would be able to fathom the entire mind of God! And if that were so, God's being *would be* comprehensible to man, thus canceling the most important implication of the Creator-creature distinction: humans cannot *be* God with respect to knowledge. This progression in Van Til's thought goes far to explain why evidentialists are regularly accused of a lack of basic orthodoxy and even blasphemy by Van Til purists.

To return to the philosophical expression of Van Til's fundamental point, an absolute ontological difference between God and man is supposed to entail an absolute epistemological difference between God and man. Expressed as this high abstraction, the problem faced by Van Til is how to make sense of the possibility of *communication* between God and man—the possibility of the divine-human *sharing of information* at any level. But as impressive sounding as the compact reasoning of the foregoing paragraph might sound, there are crucial biblical data it ignores, not the least of which are those concerning the *fit* of these extremely abstract categories onto the actual earthly ministry of Jesus. Needless to say, perhaps, I disagree with the chain of inferences guiding Van Til's thought (as will become evident throughout "The Defeasible Pumpkin"). Van Til's logical jump from "levels of existence" to "levels of knowledge" strikes me as philosophically speculative and not biblically concrete, nor even a valid inference in its purely speculative character.

Linus [pp. 58-61] and Pig Pen (Harold) [pp. 80-87] will later challenge the soundness of this whole line of Van Tillian reasoning *as applied to Jesus* (Jesus is a wonderful test case for Van Til's notions because Jesus is both fully man and fully God—epistemically so, one would think), but here our only concern is an adequate handle on analogicity as a pervasive property of human reasoning *given* what Van Til says above. In passing we should note that even among the Van Tillians there has been sharp controversy on this (that is, the inference from an absolute difference in *levels of existence* between God and man to an absolute *qualitative* difference in *levels of knowledge* between God and man). Jim Halsey