

delete the little dog from the foreground in Constable's *Hay Wain*. Again, there is redistribution, as it were, and with the redistribution, a new gestalt. Gestaltic objectivity seems to be, indeed, a distinctive and special *kind* of objectivity—"better felt than telt." Gestaltic objectivity, on Hoover's reckoning, factors heavily into inductive objectivity in general, but is extremely resistant to complete verbal translation. Indeed, "a picture is worth a thousand words" is a wild understatement! The facts of gestaltic apprehension by themselves account for at least some cases of "formal inconclusiveness," thus again messing up rationalistic approaches to knowledge.

general theory of knowledge: a general, as opposed to a special, theory of knowledge, is a theory that characterizes *all* instances of human knowledge, not just everyday perception, or just scientific knowledge, or just knowledge of God. Van Til's theory is *general* in that it begins comprehensively with an alleged fundamental *contrast* between all God's knowledge and all of human knowledge. Thus it is even essential that one's knowledge of one's phone number be analogical in the same sense that one's knowledge of God is analogical.

geschichtlich: in German Neo-orthodoxy, pertaining to a level of history that is supramundane and spiritual rather than empirical in character. The adjective itself does not carry this meaning in ordinary German; it is rather a special use and is to be contrasted with the mundane history of *Historie*.

hardening of the heart: biblical expression for a *process* of increasing desensitization to God and his truth. A "seared conscience" would seem to be the end of the line in this process. The interesting question this poses for apologetics is how cognitive tolerance for the facts of redemptive history—i.e., their *import*—is eroded over time. [cf. Ps. 95:8; Heb. 3:8,15; 4:17; Pr. 21:29; Eph. 4:17-19.]

hermeneutic finitude: this is the ugly complement to the finitude of partial perspective. The latter states that it is impossible to provide a final-order logical *guarantee* that one has sampled *enough* data for one's conclusion (belief); hermeneutic finitude, on the other hand, consists in a person's inability to provide a final-order logical *guarantee* that the data he *has* sampled have been rightly interpreted or rightly construed. And again, this is not nearly as serious as it sounds. It does *not* mean that we seldom