

and a copy of *De Revolutionibus* has found its way into your hands. Let's say that you have read it through with a fair amount of comprehension. However, Ptolemaic astronomer that you are and devout disciple of Martin Luther, your rather swift reaction is passionately to reject Copernicus's heliocentrism. (Luther came to view Copernicus's position with abhorrence.) Your reasoning is somewhat as follows: (1) Ptolemaic astronomy has the same line-of-sight predictive power as the Copernican system, (2) earthbound observation provides no visual evidence of the elaborate movements required by the Copernican model (the earth rotating on its own axis while orbiting the sun), (3) the Copernican system is contrary to common sense—the complex double movement of the earth is very hard to believe in terms of everyday experience, (4) retrograde planetary movement, on the Copernican system, is *mere appearance* and that is hard to swallow, (5) Scripture, using the language of geocentric appearance, makes the earth God's crowning creational achievement and soteriological focus, so (6) the earth, and not the sun, is surely at the cosmic center of things.

How might a disciple of Copernicus dissuade you? It would be worse than idle to resist the Copernican by an attempt to "sanctify" your Ptolemaic convictions with Van Tillian considerations. It simply won't do to *presuppose* the superiority or truth of Ptolemaic astronomy. Moreover, pronouncing Ptolemaic astronomy to be analogical of God's truth is in the end simply vacuous. Van Til's "epistemology" is here, as in locating one's children, *methodologically* irrelevant, and it is equally irrelevant whether one favors the Ptolemaic approach or the Copernican. Whatever you *do*, and whatever your *reasoning*, in order to weigh the pros and cons concerning the two competing astronomical systems, analogicity cannot offer the slightest cognitive or methodological clue to the solution. How could it? It is but the speculation of a curious metaphysical *status* of human knowledge *if* such knowledge should happen to exist. It is, moreover, speculation governed by selective attention to some theological and philosophical ideas (e.g., the definition of the Incomprehensibility of God and the abstract philosophical notion of absolute disparity between levels of existence) while ignoring others (e.g., the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ and the fundamental requirements of *linguistic* communication).

Our imagined Copernican is of course limited to considerations