

## A BRIEF REPLY TO RICHARD A. PURDY

Norman L. Geisler\*

I have only two brief points to make. First, most of the questions raised<sup>1</sup> have already been addressed in other writings of mine with which Richard Purdy shows no familiarity. See *The Roots of Evil* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981); "Man's Destiny: Free or Forced?", *Christian Scholar's Review* 9/2 (1980) 99-120; "Avoid . . . Contradictions: A Reply to John Dahms," *JETS* 22 (1979) 55-66; "Avoid All Contradictions: A Surrejoinder to John Dahms," *JETS* 22 (1979) 149-160; *Syllabus on Christian Apologetics* (Norman L. Geisler, 1978); "God, Evil, and Dispensationalism," *Walvoord: A Tribute* (ed. D. K. Campbell; Chicago: Moody, 1982) 95-112; "The Missing Premise in the Cosmological Argument," *Modern Schoolman* 56:31-45 (1978).

Secondly, Purdy's overall argument is fallacious. It goes like this: (1) Norman Geisler insists that Christianity is based on theism. (2) Geisler's argument for theism fails. (3) "On Geisler's own admission, then, Christianity has fallen."

As we have answered his objections elsewhere, Purdy has by no means shown that our argument fails. But it is clear that even if the arguments by a given theist fail, it certainly does not follow that theism (and, thus, Christianity based on it) has failed.

\*Norman Geisler is professor of systematic theology at Dallas Theological Seminary in Texas.

<sup>1</sup>R. A. Purdy in *JETS* 25/3 (1982) 351-358.