

efforts to and within a causal order, and that it is that causal order that grounds all rational inquiry into empirical data. But we have gotten far ahead of ourselves. Back now to the burning bush.

Briefly, Yahweh gives Moses three signs (miracles) to perform in order to authenticate his message: a rod that turns into a snake and then back again, a hand that turns leprous and then instantly heals, and Nile river water that turns to blood when poured onto dry ground. Perhaps there is a special symbolism that goes with each sign, but that will not be my focus. I want to pay attention, rather, to the elements of the dialogue between Yahweh and Moses as these signs are introduced.

First, the signs are given to aid belief—to authenticate Moses's message as genuinely from Yahweh. Second, they authenticate a message that establishes a knowledgeable continuity (on the part of Yahweh) from the time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. One has only to think of the Covenant Yahweh made with Abraham in Genesis 15 and Yahweh's prediction of four hundred years of Egyptian slavery, after which Abraham's descendants would be delivered (Gen. 15:13-14). Isaiah's Principle says that a deity should be possessed of "time transcending knowledge," able, therefore, to tell us what the former things were, so that we may consider them and know their final outcome." Accordingly, God instructs Moses to tell the Israelites that he has promised to deliver them and that their deliverance is assured (Ex. 3:16-22). Third, God predicts that while the elders of Israel will listen to Moses, the king of Egypt will remain obstinate until he is overwhelmed by the wonders that God will perform (Ex. 3:19-21). This is the predictive side of time transcending knowledge. Isaiah's Principle affirms that a deity ought to be able to "tell us what the future holds." And fourth, the signs themselves are Yahweh's *doing something*: "Do something, whether good or bad, so that we will be dismayed and filled with fear."

There is a great deal else that could be said (cf. David P. Hoover, "For the Sake of Argument: A Critique of the Logical Structure of Van Til's Presuppositionalism," *IBRI Research Report* 11 [1882]); here I conclude with a final contrast between what, on Van Tillian terms, might have been expected from God at the burning bush and what actually occurred. When Moses said, "But suppose they don't believe you sent me," God's response was *not*: "Just who do you think is speaking here? My very words are *self-*