

"O ye of little faith," said Linus with a certain smug repose. "The Great Pumpkin *always* shows, but his Halloween advents occur, as the German theologians would put it, in *Geschichte*—spiritual history, not in *Historie*."

"What's *that* supposed to mean?" growled Lucy, suspecting now that the 'Great Pumpkin Watch' was something less than the empirical test it was advertised to be.

"He means," explained Harold, "that The Great Pumpkin need not have a physical manifestation; it will rise over the pumpkin patch *in spirit*."

"Holy impumpkination!" blurted Patty (whom no one had suspected of a sense of humor).

\*\*\*\*\*

## VI

### Immunity to Empirical Critique: A False Start

The night wore on but somehow time flew. There was something fresh and engaging in Harold's way of talking. We rejoin the discussion as Harold attempts to identify both what is commendable about the presuppositionalists' motivation as well as what he regards as their theoretical Achilles Heel . . .

". . . and so I think it's important to acknowledge something worthy in what motivates the presuppositionalists before moving on. First and foremost, it seems to me, all of them (Van Til, Gordon Clark, Greg Bahnsen, Gary North, Rousas Rushdoony, Robert Reymond, et al.) want a method of defending the Christian faith that does not generate conclusions qualified by *probability*. Each of these writers feels to his depths that any reasoning from evidence on behalf of Christian truth that is less than *certain* is unworthy of the Gospel. To admit that one's conclusion is only *probable*, say these apologetes, is also to admit that your conclusion may be *mistaken*. Moreover, to say that, given the evidence, it is only probable that there is a God, or it is only probable that Jesus rose from death, or it is only probable that Scripture is God's word, is to pay insult to God's authority and the clarity of the manifold witness God has provided.