

conclusion still might be false. *Formal*: simply the characteristic that the evidence is not connected to the conclusion by way of a *deductive entailment* relationship. On this latter construal, the evidential apologete need *not* concede that there is *reasonable* doubt about the conclusion. *Formal probability* indicates a *formal* gap between evidence (*as stated*) and conclusion, *not* necessarily a *material* gap that remains distressingly open to intuitive discernment. To put it another way (to use Josh MacDowell's expression) a *formally probabilistic* argument in behalf of some claim may nevertheless involve "evidence that demands a verdict" in favor of that claim!

probative: affording proof or evidence.

prosopagnosia: neurological deficit resulting in inability to recognize faces.

radically contingent (turf): facts that are utterly (or radically) contingent in Van Til's parlance, are facts (generously so called) without any principle of connection among them. An empirical domain (e.g., the turf at the *Transcendental Bowl*) that is radically contingent, therefore, lacks any principle by which it can be understood. Its "particulars" cohere neither by causal forces nor by implicatory connections. There are no principles of relatedness by which to make sense of such a domain. Therefore, in *Transcendental Football* (section [8] of the Introductory Essay) one must first "score a touchdown" in order to epistemically credit the existence of a field of play.

qualitative distinction: this is in contrast to a *quantitative* distinction. Van Til insists that God's knowing differs from human knowing not only in quantity, but also in its finest grain nuance—that is to say, *qualitatively* as well. Overlap of divinely and humanly discerned *meaning* is thus rendered conceptually impossible. So, for example, what God understands by our proposition, "Jesus is coming again," is *qualitatively (hence unspecifiably) distinct from what we understand it to mean*.

"real world" evidence: a coined expression to indicate evidence that does not overstep, or go beyond the reach of, a human being's created competence to discern evidential connections and evidential salience.