

impumpkination (a re-embodiment, only in the stuff that pumpkins are made of) and of enjoying eternal roots in the pumpkin patch Hereafter, Brown wanted Linus to forsake such idolatry and accept the teachings of the historic Christian faith. Brown had no problem, really, regarding the faithful witness part, but he was mightily perplexed when it came to mixing logic and truth in the apologetics part.

"Good grief!" exclaimed Brown. "From the standpoint of presuppositionalism, how does one *rationally* discredit the Pumpkin without *rationally* discrediting Christianity? The sword seems to cut both ways!"

*[And indeed it does. To compress the issue insanely, the sheerly rational issue comes to a tight focus in this question: How does one know when one's believing is analogical of divine truth? Since "analogicity," on presuppositional reckoning, is a metaphysical property of apologetic discourse and not a logical feature of either an argument's structure or strategy, there is no way to answer that question. Is Linus's presupposed Great Pumpkin analogical of divine truth or is Brown's presupposed God of Christian theism? You can't approach this question from the standpoint of empirical evidence, for that would instantly mire you in the probabilistic swamp from which Van Til et al. seek to deliver us. How then do we decide between Brown's presupposition and Linus's? Answer: whichever presupposition enjoys analogicity. And which one is that?]*

*Well, for starters, it won't do to say that at least one of them must be analogical of divine truth, for we have absolutely no reason (no logical and no empirical reason) to suppose that either presupposition enjoys this (thus far) mysterious status. Second, analogicity by its very nature comes in degrees: X may be strongly, moderately, or only weakly analogical of Y—or X may bear no analogy to Y whatsoever. The Van Tillian analogicity relation, after all, is a species of resemblance relation (see the epigram on the very first page of the Introductory Essay where Van Til uses the word "replica" to convey his meaning), and resemblance comes in degrees. The point is this: if we rule out all a posteriori criteria by which to test strengths of analogy we*