

has chosen the Great Pumpkin.) Declare that your deity is creator of all things and enjoys *absolutivity* with respect to knowledge because of his supreme level of existence. Then draw the implication that all human knowing is at best *analogical* of the deity's knowing so that there is no identity of meaning between anything in the deity's mind and anything in a human mind. Stop. At this point, analogicity is fundamentally criterial for whether or not anyone knows "truly."

This criterion, however, is inherently the abolition of all criteria. When in place, it is complete license to run religiously and spiritually amuck, for not only is substantive content noncoincident, principles governing logical coherence (the law of contradiction, for example) are as well. That is because (1) the deity is the only true knower, (2) humans are absolutely dependent on the deity's knowledge for *their analogical knowledge*, and (3) the logic of analogicity necessitates, first and foremost, *the radical severance* of cognitive linkage between divine and human minds. In effect, analogicity is Van Til's metaphysical guarantee that there cannot be a *semantic* bridge between divine and human minds. I hasten to add that once the logic of analogicity is in place, no amount of pious language can be thrown at the resulting problem to alleviate it of the catastrophic consequence we have seen.

And what of the Great Pumpkin? Since we are forever cut off from criteria *to apply* the analogicity concept to this or that claim, Linus can easily help himself to it without fear of later refutation. Linus, like Van Til, knows what he knows, and what he knows he knows *analogically!* Or to put it another way, Linus's "special knowledge," like Van Til's, enjoys an utterly inscrutable "resemblance relation" to the deity's knowledge. And since this relation is inscrutable, hence not cognitively penetrable by way of criteria, there is simply no way to test it—*no way*, that is, either to confirm it or disconfirm it. Indeed, no refutation could count without itself being blessed with *inscrutable* analogicity! In a manner of speaking, to "analogize" your position is thereby to "immunize" it from criticism. Thus (once one's system is analogized) data can never interfere with cherished beliefs, whether you're a Christian theist, a Pumpkinologist, or an Elvis worshipper. Bliss!