

God's knowledge and creaturely knowledge. Van Til strenuously insists that creaturely knowledge is rooted in an essentially inscrutable *resemblance* relation that he calls analogy.

A metaphysical interest in knowledge, however, can have only a tangential bearing, if any bearing at all, on the epistemological issue of *acquiring* knowledge by the process of reasoning to conclusions from data.

**evidentialism:** school of apologetics that stresses the nonbeliever's rational accountability to the evidences for the truth of Christianity. Involved in this accountability is the legitimacy of the (inductive) logic of learning.

**evidential threshold:** an inherently person-variable line which marks the point where, *for an individual*, the evidence for a truth-claim is completely convincing. The individual in question would not be able to *honestly* deny that truth-claim. Below the line the subjective force of the evidence is regarded (by that same individual) as inconclusive. The evidential threshold might also be called "the credulity threshold". With regard to the Gospel, hardening one's heart *raises* this threshold, while humility before the data and before God's revelation *lowers* it.

**evidential salience:** salience is simply perceived relevance, perceived supportiveness, for some state of affairs. Billowing black smoke is evidentially salient for the presence of a fire, for example. Salience, moreover, comes in degrees of strength.

**falsifiability:** a technical term introduced into the philosophy of science by Karl Popper. A given claim is falsifiable if and only if it rules something out—something that can be tested for. This doctrine says that if you are making a genuine fact-claim (a claim about how the world is in some respect), then this claim must also be inconsistent with other things that can be tested for. For example, if you say that it is raining hard outdoors, this claim possesses Popper's falsifiability because it is *inconsistent* with my going outdoors and staying dry without some protection from the rain. If I go outdoors and stay dry, your claim is falsified. The idea is that no claim to fact can be consistent with just *anything that could possibly happen*; so claims to fact must be vulnerable to cross-examination with regard to what they *rule out*; otherwise they are *factually* empty.