facts would you rather have if what concerns you is the identity of the Messiah?

Perhaps from the standpoint of omniscience each fact wears an infinite implicatory richness upon its sleeve, but evidential salience does not come about that way for human cognitive competence. The truth is, neither Van Til nor Notaro produce the slightest clue as to how to "properly understand" such a fact as "Galilean fishing boats are worth more than a shekel" as providing absolute proof of God's existence! For what it is worth, it is a fact that in certain of my moods I think the Van Til-Notaro view is just plain silly. Now does this fact prove the existence of God with absolute validity? The Van Tillian response is: If it does not, "no fact ever will." Notaro (Van Til) owes us an account—an epistemological account—of the reasoning process by which a finite human intellect may arrive at the all-important "proper understanding" of such facts, and this they cannot do. All we get are remarkable generalizations about facts in general.

(2) Putting aside the pious sounding rhetoric of Notaro and Van Til, the doctrine that every fact is equally evidential (for Christian theism) is a strange doctrine indeed. It is precisely because the creature indwells a **causally stable and causally uniform** spatio-temporal environment that certain extraordinary and unusual phenomena have a **greater** evidential value (with regard to God and his working) than ordinary happenings. This is not to say that "ordinary happenings" cannot also be remarkable and importantly evidential, but ordinary happenings provide a setting, a kind of epistemic **background noise**, so to speak, against which extraordinary happenings (miracles), in their striking salience, are set off in relief to serve as evidence par excellence.

"Fourth," Harold went on, "note the actual content of Jesus's words in this passage. He says that *if* the inhabitants of Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom had had the miracles to witness that the inhabitants of Korazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum were privileged to witness, *then* the former would have repented—indeed, Sodom would not have been destroyed but would yet