

true statements from false; I am speaking, only, of our deep intuitive requirement for, and general competence to appreciate, language-world *correspondences* between statements and the states-of-affairs in the world which those statements affirm. More particularly, I am concerned with the divine and human understanding of what this requirement *means*.

Lucy fears that she may be getting lost in a thicket of words, so here is the vital point I wish to make: the semantic coincidence I am seeking to clarify is the *co-understanding* of the Father and the disciples concerning the use of language to make assertions. In both divine and human minds there is at least this twofold understanding: (1) there is a profound difference between saying of a linguistic assertion that it is true and saying of that same assertion that it is false, and (2) this difference is appreciated by *both* God and man to consist in whether or not a given assertion aptly maps onto the reality it seeks to assert. (By the metaphor of mapping I do not intend some kind of exact isomorphism between the structure of language and the realities language may be used to capture—as, for example, in the philosophy of the early Wittgenstein. I deliberately leave the mapping metaphor vague—as befits a metaphor, it seems to me—and I use it interchangeably with the notion of correspondence.)

Let's now bring a sharp focus to this issue in terms of Van Til's "no identity-no coincidence" doctrine. The most convenient way to do this, I think, is to see what Van Til's doctrine implies when we predicate "is true" of the Father's utterance to the disciples. Independently of the truth question, we have already established univocal reference and at least some univocal content meaning; now, with reference to Jesus, did the Father share with the disciples *a mutual regard* for the assertion made about Jesus *to be true*? Consider the following statement:

The Father's message to the disciples [that Jesus is his beloved Son with whom he is well pleased] *is true*.

The brackets are intended to clarify our single focus on the truth-value of "true" as applied to the Father's message. Now wonder with me what it could possibly mean to say that there would be *no* identity of meaning between the understanding of the Father and the understanding of the disciples concerning what is predicated in this statement. [And again, what is predicated is that the Father's message *is true*!] Keep in mind also