

finitude of partial perspective: with respect to rational investigation, human beings are limited by the dimensions they inhabit, by time constraints on sampling data, by mobility (including prosthetic mobility) in getting *to* data, by the sheer physics of examining the ultra small, by astronomical distances, and by the bluntness of human sensory modalities and data-gathering tools. For local and middle-sized concerns we are extraordinarily clever and epistemically resourceful—by far and away the smartest animals on the planet. But given our perspectival limits—some absolute and others only relatively limiting—there is a type of *guarantee* for our considered opinions that is impossible: we cannot provide a logical guarantee that the sample of data for any given empirical truth-claim is *extensive enough* to rule out our being wrong about that truth-claim. That sounds far more serious than it is. This finitude does *not* rule out knowledge! What it does is rule out an absolute *meta-order* guarantee—an absolute proof run from the perspective of omniscience.

first- and second-order knowledge: first-order knowledge, as Linus introduced this concept, is *mere knowledge*—justified true belief consistent with human epistemic competence. Second-order knowledge, were it possible, would be *justified* justified true belief, where the italicized "justified" would be a proof constructed from the perspective of omniscience.

formal (in)conclusiveness: formal conclusiveness may be thought of as the elimination of probability by the completeness of the data offered in support of a belief, verdict, or conviction. Formal *inconclusiveness*, on the other hand, is the case when there are *gaps*—sometimes trivial technical gaps—between logical completeness of the data *as stated* and the conclusion drawn therefrom. On Hoover's reckoning (though not on the rationalist's reckoning), the existence of a gap is *not* a necessary indication of ignorance of one's conclusion. The *technically* incomplete data may yet *demand a verdict*.

gestaltic comprehension: the discernment of wholes—e.g., faces, landscapes, music, spiritual blessing, etc. In a *gestalt* the nuance of the part is curiously *distributed*. Imagine painting a mustache and goatee on the Mona Lisa! Her entire visage is changed, not just the affected parts. Here is a better illustration: just add a prominent mole to her face; even that special touch is *distributed* thus changing the look of the whole. Or . . .