

Wednesday, May 25, 2011

The Argument from the Unity of Knowledge

I am now settling into my new life in SE Asia. So far it has been as bountiful an adventure as one could hope. With the house back home rented out and all my financial obligations State-side met, I am free to assimilate myself into a new culture, lifestyle and experience.

For now, I thought I'd throw out a question to consider about presuppositionalism. Readers are welcome to post their thoughts from whatever perspective you may have. My life is unpredictable now so I don't know when I'll be able to chime in on the matter myself. But I'm eager to gather more input on this issue as it pertains to presuppositional apologetics.

In an essay titled [If Knowledge Then God: The Epistemological Theistic Arguments of Plantinga and Van Til](#), apologetic theorist James Anderson presents a rendition of an argument which he attributes to Cornelius Van Til, which appears as follows:

- [1] If no one has comprehensive knowledge of the universe, then no one can have any knowledge of the universe.
- [2] Only God could have comprehensive knowledge of the universe.
- [3] We have some knowledge of the universe.
- [4] Therefore, God exists. (Op. cit., p. 20)

Anderson calls it "the argument from the unity of knowledge," though it's not clear whether Van Til called it this. Now I have a number of criticisms of this argument, and I find it wholly unpersuasive because of some serious flaws. But I'm curious what others think of its persuasiveness, whether or not they think it compels the conclusion it is intended to defend.

Please offer your own thoughts, positive or negative, in the comments section. At some point in the future I hope to present my own reaction to it.

by Dawson Bethrick

Labels: [Theistic Arguments](#)

posted by Bahnsen Burner at [5:00 AM](#)