

TABLE TALK

Official Publication of the LMS-USA

...these words... shall be upon your heart; you shall
teach them... and talk of them... Deut. 6:6,7



February 2015

Vol. 22 No. 1

Apologetics

a·pol·o·get·ics the branch of theology having to do with the defense and proofs of Christianity (*Webster's New World Dictionary*).

Apologetics traditionally denotes the reasoned defense of the Christian religion against intellectual objections, the attempt to establish certain elements of that FAITH as true or, at least, not demonstrably untrue. (Harvey, Van A., *A Handbook of Theological Terms*)

Acts 1:8 records the commission given to the apostles by our Lord. ". . . you will be My witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth." They were to give witness to all the world of their Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and to the Gospel (i.e., the message of Salvation which He, through His life, death, and resurrection, has made possible for all).

What was true for the apostles is also true for all who have come to faith in Christ. Peter, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, informs his readers that they "should always [be] prepared to make a defense (APOLOGIAN) to anyone who asks you for a reason for the hope that is in you" (2 Pet. 3:15).

What was true for Christians in Peter's day, is true for Christians today. We are to be ready and willing to not only *share* the good news of the Gospel, but to *defend*, to *prove*, that what we believe and share is actually true.

One might think of Peter and his Pentecost sermon (Acts 2) or Stephen in his speech that lead to his martyrdom (Acts 7); of Philip in his encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8); or of Paul at various times in his encounter with people in the book of Acts... and let us not forget our Lord in a number of his encounters with people in our Gospel accounts; these men *proved from Scripture*, that what they believed in, and what they proclaimed, was true. The Bereans knew how to 'prove' what was true and they were commended for it (Acts 17:11).

In this issue:

Page 2 - Pastor Mark Jeske helps us to understand how we might obey the admonition of Peter and be ready to share and defend our faith.

Page 3 - Norman L. Geisler shares with us the logical steps in the overall argument in defense of the Christian faith.

Page 4 - Pastor Tylan Dalrymple sets before us differing methods of apologetics



Paul contending for the faith in Athens (Acts 17).

Timeless Truths for Evangelism

1 Peter 3:15

by Mark Jeske

Be Prepared. As you look into the future, you know that in the months ahead you will have opportunities to share your faith. Think about what you might say. Can you summarize the Christian faith in a few sentences? Here is a simple four-key-word summary of the Bible's law-gospel message that you can keep in mind to help organize all the Bible facts you know:

1. *Sin:* Tell people how we are separated from our Creator at birth, that no human being can lift himself up to God's standards of holiness, that all people by nature are under God's curse.
 2. *Grace:* Tell people that God loves us anyway, that he sent his Son to take on human flesh like ours to live and die and rise in our place, that God pronounced the world not guilty because of Jesus.
 3. *Faith:* Tell people that all of these good things—forgiveness, peace, spiritual life now, life forever—flow into our lives personally as we believe in God's wonderful promises and that the power and ability to believe are gifts that come from God through his Word and sacraments.
 4. *Works:* Tell people that the Spirit of God who comes to live in believers now enables them to live for God, that believers see God's ways as a delight and find joy in conforming their will to his will.
- *Give the reason for the hope that you have.* When you talk to people, you don't have to argue with them, struggle to make the perfect sales pitch, try to make God's ways logical or reasonable, be clever, or take

the burden of converting them on yourself. Just tell the truth. Just tell what happened, and tell how you know these things - the Bible tells me so. Just help people find the Bible's message for themselves and let loose the power of the Spirit. The reason for the hope is timeless and powerful and elegantly simple: the Bible!

- *Be gentle.* Nobody can stand evangelism that comes from an aggressive, pushy "know-it-all." Nobody can stand someone who talks all the time. In fact, the first principle in effective evangelism is just to listen; ask questions; let the person tell you his or her story.
- *Show respect.* Nobody can stand an evangelist who puffs up his own denomination by ridiculing other Christian groups. There is a time and place for careful discussion of issues of disagreement among Christian church groups, but a conversation with a fallen-away Christian or non-Christian is not it. Respect is also of huge importance when communicating Christ across cultures. People will be more inclined to open up to your message if they feel respected, that they and their culture have worth in your eyes. It is important to lift up Jesus Christ, not your own culture or even your church's traditions.

From The People's Bible: James, 1, 2 Peter, 1, 2, 3 John. Jude by Mark A. Jeske, p. 108-110 © 2002 Northwestern Publishing House. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

The 2015 Annual Convention
of the LMS-USA
Christ Lutheran, Chetek, WI
June 19-21

Apologetics, The Argument of

There are many types of apologetics. But according to classical apologetics, there are certain logical steps in the overall argument in defense of the Christian faith. Since each step is treated in detail in other articles, only the logic of the argument will be sketched here.

The Steps.

The overall argument in defense of the Christian Faith can be put in twelve basic propositions. They flow logically one from another:

1. Truth about reality is knowable.
2. Opposites cannot both be true
3. The theistic God exists.
4. Miracles are possible.
5. Miracles performed in connection with a truth claim are acts of God to confirm the truth of God through a messenger of God.
6. The New Testament documents are reliable.
7. As witnessed in the New Testament, Jesus claimed to be God.
8. Jesus' claim to divinity was proven by an unique convergence of miracles.
9. Therefore, Jesus was God in human flesh.
10. Whatever Jesus (who is God) affirmed as true, is true.
11. Jesus affirmed that the Bible is the Word of God.
12. Therefore, it is true that the Bible is the Word of God and whatever is opposed to any biblical truth is false.

The Application.

If a theistic God exists and miracles are possible and Jesus is the Son of God and the Bible is the Word of God, then it follows that orthodox Christianity is true. All other essential orthodox doctrines, such as the Trinity, Christ's atonement for sin, the physical resurrection, and Christ's second coming, are taught in the Bible. Since all these conditions are supported by good evidence, it follows that there is good evidence for concluding that orthodox Christianity is true.

And since mutually exclusive propositions cannot both be true, then all opposing world religions are false religions. That is, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, and other religions are false insofar as they oppose the teachings of Christianity. Therefore, only Christianity is the true religion.

Norman L. Geisler, Baker Encyclopedia of Apologetics (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1999), 36 & 37. Used by permission.

Differing Methods of Apologetics

by

Rev. Tylan Dalrymple

Introduction

Apologetics has nothing to do with “apologizing” as some might think when they hear the word. Rather apologetics comes from the Greek word in the New Testament “apologia.” This word simply means “to make a defense” or “give a reason.” The goal of apologetics is to persuasively answer honest objections that keep people from faith in Jesus Christ.

In 1 Peter 3:15 the word “apologia” appears thus, “but in your hearts honor Christ the Lord as holy, always being prepared to make a defense (απολογία) to anyone who asks you for a reason for the hope that is in you; yet do it with gentleness and respect.” In Philippians 1:15-16 Paul writes, “Some indeed preach Christ from envy and rivalry, but others from good will. The latter do it out of love, knowing that I am put here for the defense (απολογία) of the gospel.” These verses also explain why, like Paul, we are called to defend the gospel. It is not as though God needs us to defend Him.

Rather, God has freely chosen to “use” His servants for the task of defending the Word so they might learn perseverance and grow in love towards one another.

In physical battle there are various formations and strategies a good general might use. One strategy is not inherently better than another. However, there are particular methods that work better than others in certain situations. The same is true with apologetics. Those who commit to one strategy will sometimes encounter great success and other times find them-

selves trying to fit a square peg in a round hole. Furthermore, some approaches may not be necessary in all cases. For example, a classical approach to establish “theism” (the belief that there is a god) would be pointless when conversing with a “theist” (someone who already believes in a “god,” but not necessarily the God of the Bible.) In such a case the evidential approach that presents information about the person of Jesus would be more appropriate. Therefore, since all forms of apologetics are useful we are going to briefly discuss a sampling of major apologetic methods.

There are many different methods, but all approaches find their source in the following four to a greater or lesser degree. The four methods we will look at include Classical, Evidential, Presuppositional, and Feidi “faith based” apologetics. We will begin with the Evidential 1-step approach. We will compare and contrast the Evidential (1-step) approach to the other three methods.

Evidential Apologetics or the 1 Step Approach

Evidential apologetics is considered a one-step approach because it strips away any theistic argument and jumps directly into the evidence favoring Jesus as Lord. The scientific approach and evidential approach are understandably linked. Occam’s exhortation that “we go to the mouth of the horse” typifies the one step method. Boa and Bowman point out that science and evidential apologetics are deeply linked, “The idea was essentially to fight fire

with fire-to show that the scientific approach to the Christian truth claims would vindicate their rationality.”¹ In his book, *Evidence for Faith*, John Warwick Montgomery uses an abundance of material and various authors linked to the ‘scientific’ approach. The first section of the book is entirely devoted to this kind of evidence. It is significant that chapter ‘2.1’ of the book is entitled, “*A Theistic Approach to Science*.”²

Montgomery and others believe the evidential approach to apologetics takes precedence over all other approaches. Montgomery wrote the following when defining apologetics in general, “But why speak of “*evidential apologetics*”? Is not such an expression redundant-indeed pleonastic? How could there be a defense of Christianity without the marshaling of evidence on its behalf? In the most profound sense, a “non-evidential” apologetic is a contradiction in terms, roughly equivalent logically to a “square circle.”³

Montgomery is not alone in his strong position regarding evidence. Gary Habermas aligns himself with Montgomery’s firm stance in saying, “Consequently evangelicals need to continue to offer arguments for both the historicity of the resurrection and the bodily nature of the appearances.”⁴ To say that evidence is ‘needed’ regarding the resurrection brings one back to Paul’s Statement in 1 Corinthians chapter 15. The simple fact that the resurrection happened in human history as recorded by scripture gives weight to the position of evidentialists like Montgomery and Habermas.

Even among evangelical Christians who embrace different levels of fideism (personal faith apologetic) there is a consensus that the Bible is the true Word of God. Those who emphasize a “personal

experience” with Jesus affirm the power of God’s Word. Evidential apologists like Josh McDowell agree that a personal experience with the Lord is necessary and then take this affirmation a step further. In addressing the historical reliability of scripture McDowell in his book, *Evidence Demands a Verdict*, devotes several chapters to the Bible and historicity. He even titles chapter five of his book “Jesus-A Man of History.”⁵ McDowell, Montgomery, and Habermas all solidly assert that *the God we experience exists outside of that experience*.

The evidential apologist goes straight to the evidence just as one would in a civil or criminal case in any courtroom. Montgomery applies this analogy to the 1-step apologetic, “What if a revelational truth-claim did not turn on questions of theology and religious philosophy-on any kind of esoteric, fideistic method available only to those who are already “true believers”-but on the very reasoning employed in the law to determine questions of fact.”⁶

The evidential apologist does not simply push this form of apologetic because it involves a single manageable step. Montgomery’s referring to ‘fideism’ above goes straight to the heart of the matter. Montgomery goes on to write, “The historic Christian claim differs qualitatively from the claims of all other world religions at the epistemological point: on the issue of testability.”⁷ Testability is something Montgomery emphasizes with the aim of pointing out the distinctive nature of the Christian faith. **If evidence is distinct to Christianity then the evidential apologetic is also distinctive to Christianity.** This is the dividing line for the evidentialist. While most of them acknowledge the validity of one or more of the other

apologetic methods (i.e. classical apologetics), they emphasize evidence because it is something they believe cannot be reduplicated in other religions. I think it is fair to say that evidential arguments will only lead to or away from Christianity. In other approaches, like classical apologetics, agreement may be reached concerning prerequisite philosophical points that have little to do with Christian doctrine. In other words, a second step must follow in all other apologetic arguments.

1-step and 2-step Apologetics

At the onset of this debate I find it necessary to admit that my favorite apologist is C.S. Lewis followed closely by G.K. Chesterton (if he can be labeled as such.) It seems transparent that in practice the evidential and classical apologetic are complementary. Boa and Bowman whom author a book entitled, *Faith Has Its Reasons*, explain using the terms inductive and deductive, “First, evidentialism is primarily inductive, rather than deductive, in its logical form. Inductive arguments reason from as many facts, or data, as can be mustered to a conclusion that is shown to be supported in some way by facts.”⁸ The authors go on to say, “by contrast, deductive arguments such as those favored in classical apologetics, reason from as few facts, or premises, as needed to a conclusion that is shown to follow from the facts.”⁹

The way Boa and Bowman contrast classical and evidential apologetics picks up on a subtle, but important distinction. Something further to consider is the difference in the initial evidence used. The distinction between step one of the evidential apologetic and step one of the classical is sometimes significant. Examining a few

different apologetic arguments from each side reveals a trend in the first step of each.

The evidential apologist’s first step often involves grouping of several ‘facts’ that would immediately put a non-Christian on the defensive. My fellow Confessional Lutheran, Montgomery, compares his approach to that used in a courtroom with a judge and jury. The problem is that in apologetic arguments *our* jury is generally biased before the trial ever begins. **Our jury members may well be like Neo-Nazis hearing evidence presented in a case where the defendant is Jewish.** However, this does not change the reality or soundness of the evidence presented. It simply means that the first step of the evidential model will generally be met with *illogical* bias.

There are other reasons to favor the classical method. I have personally encountered people who will spit back historical ‘facts’ to counter those I used to defend scripture. Upon further research I have generally found these facts to be unfounded. The problem is that our conversation does not allow me the time or place to review false bits of evidence that contradict my own. I am positive that Montgomery and other evidentialists encounter this problem less frequently due to their vast knowledge of the historical evidence. In other words, they do not need to do the ‘second step’ of looking up the counter evidence as often as I do.

The first step for the classical apologist involves a subtle, but important difference. The initial argument of the 2-step model is often less difficult for the non-Christian to come to terms with. (I say less difficult because postmodernists will disagree simply because *something* is trying to be asserted.) The means by which the classical

apologist begins to engage the non-Christian is both the strength and weakness of the method. For example, C.S. Lewis will often begin with a claim that may even please the ears of someone with their defenses up, "The moralities accepted among men may differ though not, at bottom, so widely as is often claimed-but they all agree in prescribing a behavior which their adherents fail to practice."¹⁰ I believe that very few atheists or agnostics would argue Lewis's point here.

In the above example Lewis moves on to deduce that, "All men alike stand condemned, not by alien codes of ethics, but by their own, and all men therefore are conscious of guilt."¹¹ From this point he deduces a moral law that is approved of and disobeyed, which circles back to the first point. The end result for Lewis is that this moral law is either "illusion or revelation."¹² As can be seen by this example, the classical apologist slowly moves from general evidence to a logical point. In terms of Biblical counseling the classical method allows the apologist to gain some amount of 'participation' with the person they are appealing to. As stated earlier...this strength is also a weakness.

Two weaknesses in the classical (2-step) apologetic are apparent. The 2-step approach means taking the time to affirm points of an argument that are not exactly the main point. This means taking time that may or may not be available during a conversation. By contrast, the one step approach goes "straight to the mouth of the horse" and even shaves it with Occam's razor. This clean cut approach is not an option highly deductive arguments allow for.

Secondly, the 2-step approach requires a bit of mental fortitude. The starting point of the argument

can quickly become the main point. Even though someone may agree with the premise, the agreement itself could lead in an undesirable outcome. G.K. Chesterton uses a premise in his book *Orthodoxy* that compares fairy tales to reality. He uses fairy tales to colorfully describe the law of non-contradiction. "We in fairyland (who are the most reasonable of all creatures) admit that reason and that necessity. For instance, if the Ugly Sisters are older than Cinderella, it is (in an iron and awful sense) necessary that Cinderella is younger than the Ugly Sisters. There is no getting out of it. Haeckel may talk as much fatalism about that fact as he pleases: it really must be. If Jack is the son of a miller, a miller is the father of Jack."¹³ Once again the strength of such a premise is its weakness.

What is asserted by Chesterton is basically beyond *logical* refutation. A problem arises when people can't get past the fairy tale. It is possible that some people simply refuse to admit logic into their life even though they daily depend on it...we call them postmodernists. The evidential apologetic, that does not require a second step into reality, would more directly force the issue with a person who supposedly admits contradiction. In their section on evidential apologetics Boa and Bowman point out, "Even people who openly endorse postmodernism and argue for relativism do not live consistently with this philosophy-especially when it conflicts with their self-interests."¹⁴ The evidential apologetics appeal to 'facts' in reality directly attacks the inconsistency of relativism...although there is nothing to keep the classical apologist from doing the same.

The simple 'fact' is that classical and evidential apologetics complement one another. God has entered into history personally and

physically. Here the Trilemma of Lewis in the classical approach meets the evidentialist in a unified front. The liar, lunatic, or Lord question posited by Lewis complements any evidence brought forth to prove the Lordship of Christ.

Reformed, Fideist and Cumulative case Methods

Evidential apologetics is most closely linked to the classical approach. This does not mean the 1-step approach only overlaps the classical. The evidential approach also overlaps the **reformed and fideism apologetics**. Reformed apologetics may also be called presuppositional apologetics. A primary proponent of the presupposition approach is Cornelius Van Til. The key concept in Van Til's apologetics is the recognition that God is autonomous and human beings are not. The human mind believes itself to be autonomous due to the fact that it has suppressed God and the revelation of himself at all points of existence (total depravity.) Van Til writes, "In his being, knowledge, and will God is self-contained. There is nothing correlative to him. He does not depend in his being, knowledge, or will upon the being, knowledge, or will of his own creatures. God is *absolute*. He is *autonomous*."¹⁵ It is enough to say here that an apologetic based on the autonomy of God works in a process. One must first deconstruct the rational or feeling based autonomous nature of "natural human beings" and then present to them the view of the Christian. To do this is to *presuppose* God's autonomy within the bounds of a creator to creature relationship. Our knowledge as creatures is to be thought of as derivative rather than self-contained. This creates what Van Til calls a consistent apologetic and theology.

The application of the apologetic amounts to tearing an unbeliever's world in two. The field is plowed so the gospel may be planted. The process of plowing involves turning up the earth. This is a laborious and sometimes painful process. Inevitably, it means showing someone that creatures randomly placed on earth as the product of random natural processes have no ultimate meaning or purpose. Thus, life has no meaning without God.

On the other hand, Fideism is an apologetic based on personal faith experience. This method is most commonly understood in the context of personal testimony. Fideism is a real and legitimate presentation of one's faith. The problem with fideism (as an apologetic) is its inherent subjective nature. To give a personal testimony for our faith is powerful to a person who can relate to the individual, but will not wake up the person who is blinded by self.

Those who hold to Reformed and Fideist approaches tend to be more exclusive in their approach. In other words, a particular apologetic, like Van Till, may not admit an overlap with other methods...despite the possibility for one. **Van Til separates facts and their meaning based on one's presupposition, "For the factness of the fact is to any mind that deals with (it) that which he takes (it) to mean. It is *his meaning that is the fact to him*."**¹⁶ **Montgomery counters such an argument, "Even though the truck bearing down on you *could* be explained away in innumerable different fashions (e.g., it is a figment of your imagination), if you don't jump out of its path, you will be pronounced *irrational (if not dead)*."**¹⁷ Van Til claims that we have colored goggles cemented to our face before coming to faith. Is it ironic that those with the col-

ored goggles cemented to their head and those who have removed these goggles would interpret a speeding car coming at them the same way...in all but a few cases? The postmodernist would probably die if he or she lived out their philosophy. Strictly speaking, it seems the non-believer would by necessity also die due to the inability to interpret facts. The extreme version of Reformed apologetics plainly cannot find 'common ground' with the evidentialist.

The extreme versions of the Fideist and Reformed apologetic by their nature are exclusive. A more moderate understanding of each of these approaches allows for integration. *Each* apologetic method emphasizes a *real* truth. That truth becomes a perversion when it is emphasized *independent* of the other approaches. This does not mean that one approach can't be given emphasis, but it does mean that this emphasis cannot completely exclude the other approaches without becoming a mere echo of the truth it is linked to. Lewis explains this kind of perversion, "What purports to be new systems or (as they now call them) 'ideologies', all consist of fragments from the *Tao* itself, arbitrarily wrenched from their context in the whole and then swollen to madness in their isolation, yet still owing to the *Tao* and to it alone such validity as they possess."¹⁸ It is evident that each method has at its root the Word become flesh. All parts of the body must be 'at least' acknowledged.

Again, the idea that all four methods are somehow linked does not mean that they all can be perfectly united. In practice such a system incorporating all four approaches would be somewhat impractical. Everyone would have to be an apologetic 'Pharisee' to attempt such a full systematic integration. I say everyone because

scripture tells us, "But in your hearts set apart Christ as Lord. Always be prepared to give an answer to everyone who asks you to give the reason for the hope that you have. But do this with gentleness and respect"(1 Peter 3:15) Everyone must engage in some form of apologetic when called upon to do so, but they cannot be expected to devote all their time to some grand systematic method lest they relinquish other important duties the Lord has appointed them to do. We are *different* parts of the same body. Perhaps our apologetics should be selected to complement whatever role we are already fulfilling.

Stopping short of 'fully' systematizing different apologetic methods does not negate the possibility of *customized systematic* integration. Boa and Bowman comment that most apologists already integrate other methods with their own, "What we are advocating here is not something radically new; we simply encourage apologists to do consciously and systematically what many if not most apologists already do."¹⁹ These authors do not believe in some kind of all encompassing apologetic, "Rather than seek a unified theological and apologetical system that assimilates all four approaches into one "super-approach," it may be more realistic and fruitful to adopt one of the four and broaden it in light of the other three."²⁰

So how does one maintain a given apologetic approach without neglecting the others? The evidential approached compared and contrasted here serves as an excellent model. As stated above, extreme adherence to a given apologetic approach simply will not integrate well. However, a tendency to pick up on obvious links between approaches is a functionally appropriate starting point. The classical apologist Norman Geisler uses

documented historical evidence to defend the following question from a Islamic scholar, “Does the Christian belief of crucifixion and blood sacrifice appear in any religion apart from pagan creeds or the early Greeks, Romans, Indians, Persians, and the like?”²¹ Geisler gives a definitive response, “The answer is a clear “Yes.” It is the very heart of historic Judaism, as even a casual acquaintance with the Old Testament reveals.”²²

The ability to integrate apologetic methods most often comes about naturally through the flow of a conversation. It is fair to say that all four apologetic approaches must fit into every apologetic model to a greater or lesser extent. We must have some kind of presupposition, rational, and evidential criteria to argue anything. *A personal relationship* with the creator of the world can and must broaden our apologetic as well. **Likewise, ‘rational’ is necessary because a point cannot be proven illogically.** A lack of *evidence* for any given topic seems to coincide to a “faith without works.” The knowledge that God is the reason for reason itself (*presupposition*) is fundamental to knowing the limited nature of every argument. We can only know imperfection by having some sort of idea of perfection. This does not entail actually *comprehending* perfection, but it does mean *apprehending* it.

The Reformed apologetic based on presuppositions is a necessary element that must develop at some point in the life of every believer. God *is* at the root of everything that exists. The problem with this approach is not the ‘what,’ but the *how*. To know and have a personal relationship with the true creator of the world is an undeniable advantage in all endeavors. It is absolutely necessary unto salvation. The issue lies in the argument

above relating to perfection. Lewis addresses total depravity in the same manner the reformed theologian relates the infinite to the finite. We cannot comprehend God, but we can apprehend Him. Regarding total depravity Lewis writes, “I disbelieve that doctrine, partly on the logical ground that if our depravity were total we should not know ourselves to be depraved, and partly because experience shows us much goodness in human nature.”²³ The Lutheran theologian would disagree with the first part of his statement and partially agree with the second.

It happens sometimes that the work of the Holy Spirit through the Word often begins before *people* realize it has begun. **It seems possible that applied rational thought may make one aware of the limitations of rational thought.** The application of reformed apologetics takes on a very classical flavor. The breakdown of other systems of thought is a system of thought unto itself. Furthermore, evidence can be used for Christianity and *against* anything that is not Christian. Evidence shows postmodern relativism to be impractical when applied to everyday life situations. Simply using evidence to point out a contradiction fits into both the classical ‘and’ Reformed apologetic systems.

Closing Thoughts

Evidential apologists cannot be truly pushed away from any apologetic method. Even the Fideist must admit that Christ’s physical presence on earth and his bodily resurrection are necessary to faith. Boa and Bowman explain, “The crucial point here is that belief in the historicity of, say, the Resurrection is a *necessary* but not *sufficient* condition for faith.”²⁴ Boa

and Bowman affirm the often overlooked fact that Christianity must be personal and propositional.²⁵ Perhaps evidence and rational both point to paradox...and what points to the truth is as *necessary* as truth itself.

footnotes:

- ¹ Kenneth Boa and Robert Bowman Jr., *Faith Has Its Reasons* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2006), 140.
- ² John Warwick Montgomery, *Evidence for Faith Deciding the God Question* (Edmonton AB Canada: Canadian Institute for Law, Theology, and Public Policy, 2004).41.
- ³ John Warwick Montgomery, *Faith Founded on Fact Essays in Evidential Apologetics* (Edmonton AB Canada: Canadian Institute for Law, Theology, and Public Policy, 2001), x.
- ⁴ Gary R. Habermas, *The Recent Evangelical Debate On the Bodily Resurrection of Jesus: A Review Article*, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 33 No. 3S (1990), 37.
- ⁵ Josh McDowell, *Evidence that Demands a Verdict* (San Bernardino, California: Campus Crusade for Christ International, 1972)
- ⁶ John Warwick Montgomery et al., eds., *Evidence for Faith Deciding the God Question* (Edmonton AB Canada: Canadian Institute for Law, Theology, and Public Policy, 2004).319.
- ⁷ *Ibid.*, 319.
- ⁸ Kenneth Boa and Robert Bowman Jr., *Faith Has Its Reasons* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2006), 157.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 157.
- ¹⁰ C.S. Lewis *The Problem of Pain* (Harper Collins, 1996), 11.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, 11.
- ¹² *Ibid.*,11.
- ¹³ G.K. Chesterton, *Orthodoxy* (New York: Image Doubleday, 1959), 47.
- ¹⁴ Kenneth Boa and Robert Bowman Jr., *Faith Has Its Reasons* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2006), 164.
- ¹⁵ Van Til, Cornelius, *Christian Apologetics*. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing Company, 2003), 28-29
- ¹⁶ Cornelius Van Til, *Christian Apologetics*. (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R Publishing Company, 2003), 190.
- ¹⁷ John Warwick Montgomery, *Faith Founded on Fact Essays in Evidential Apologetics* (Edmonton AB Canada: Canadian Institute for Law, Theology, and Public Policy, 2001), 126-127.
- ¹⁸ C.S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man* (Harper Collins, 1944), 44.
- ¹⁹ Kenneth Boa and Robert Bowman Jr., *Faith Has Its Reasons* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2006), 493.
- ²⁰ *Ibid.*, 495.
- ²¹ Norman L. Geisler, *Baker Encyclopedia of Apologetics* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 1999), 145.
- ²² *Ibid.*, 145.
- ²³ C.S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain* (Harper Collins, 1996), 11.
- ²⁴ Kenneth Boa and Robert Bowman Jr., *Faith Has Its Reasons* (Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2006), 499.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, 490.

Table Talk
P. O. Box 31
Chetek, WI 54728

The LMS-USA is Lutheran Church body describing itself as *Biblical, Confessional, Evangelical, Liturgical and Congregational*. It is a Forum in which there is an on going discussion of theological issues and concerns among clergy and lay alike. The LMS-USA meets annually for a Theological Conference and this publication, besides carrying news of the Ministerium and Synod, functions also as a vehicle for this continuing dialogue.

lutheran
Ministerium and
LMSynod - USA
❖ A Synodical Forum by Subscription ❖

For information or to make
comment write:

President/Pastor, LMS-USA
2837 East New York St.
Indianapolis, IN 46201

Internet Contact:
revralphs@sbcglobal.net

To: