

Chart of Apologetic Approaches from Figure 1 in “Mapping Apologetics’ by Brian K. Morley

Fideism	Presuppositionalism	Reformed Epistemology	Experientialism	Pragmatism	Veridicalism	Combinationalism	Classical Apologetics	Evidentialism	Rationalism
Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics	Defining Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faith unsupported• Faith & reason don’t overlap• Or reason is beyond the mind’s grasp• Or the mind is too fallen	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Starting points are necessary presuppositions unprovable by independent evidence• No independently known facts• “Borrowed capital”• Autonomy is the problem• No common “notions”• Reasoning must be circular, deductive, indirect from Christianity• Transcendental argument• Range of presuppositionalists from Van Til to Frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Awareness of God (<i>sensus divinitatus</i>) is grounded in how we are made, and triggered• Christian faith a gift• Classical foundationalism too narrow• God is properly basic• Faith can exceed reasons	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Experience alone• Experience is only proof we can have or only proof we need	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Accept what works• Has wide variety of forms	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Givens + corroboration• Givens are known intuitively and certainly, can be corroborated• Universal givens can be known by all and constitute cognitive neutral ground• God is universal given• Special givens are known by Christians• Common ground = human needs, common experiences• No spiritually neutral ground• Eight kinds of “seeing”	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Christianity a hypothesis to be tested• Three aspect test:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rational (self consistent)• Empirical (fits relevant facts)• Existential (can be lived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prove theism, then Christianity• Prove theism using theistic proofs: cosmological argument, teleological argument, moral argument• Prove Christianity (same as evidentialists)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evidence points to Christianity• Theistic arguments useful but not necessary• Facts point to best interpretation• Prophecy and resurrection prove the Bible• Use universally accepted facts (Habermas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Absolute certainty• Start from indubitable point• Reason using deduction• Build up to worldview
Adherents	Adherents	Adherents	Adherents	Adherents	Adherents	Adherents	Adherents	Adherents	Adherents
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pascal• Kierkegaard• Barth	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Van Til• Bahnsen• Frame (modified key points)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Alvin Plantinga	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• C. S. Pierce• William James• John Dewey• Richard Rorty	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mark Hannah	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• E. J. Carnell• Gordon Lewis• Francis Schaeffer	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Norman Geisler• William Lane Craig• J. P. Moreland• R. C. Sproul• Richard Swinburne	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• John Warick Montgomery• Josh McDowell• Gary Habermas	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Descartes
Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms	Criticisms
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Subjective• Unbiblical	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amounts to fideism• Transcendental argument cannot prove the Christian God	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cannot rule out other beliefs like the Great Pumpkin	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Experiences must be interpreted	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What works ≠ truth• What works is vague	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Givens cannot rationally ground belief	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Three tests are unworkable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Main critics are presuppositionalists• There is no common ground• Must reason from Christianity	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Facts must be interpreted• Facts cannot point to their interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Indubitable starting points cannot lead to a worldview without adding along the way
Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point	Epistemological Starting Point
Faith	Presupposition	Immediate Awareness	Experience	Workability	Givens & corroboration	Three aspect test	Two-step argument	Facts pointing to interpretation	Deduction from certain starting point
Summary	Summary	Summary	Summary	Summary	Summary	Summary	Summary	Summary	Summary
No reasons or certainty; entirely subjective and volitional	No independent facts as reasons	Intuitions plus ancillary reasons	One type of evidence but subjective	One type of evidence that links internal and external	Internal givens and objective corroboration	Hypothesis tested internal to theory, externally with facts and existentially	Uses cosmos and order to prove interpretative framework (theism), then uses facts of history	Proves Christianity using many objective, independent existing facts	Certainty is absolute; nothing is subjective or volitional