

of the being. But, if names are said of God and creatures in a purely equivocal way, we understand nothing of God through those names; for the meanings of those names are known to us solely to the extent that they are said of creatures. In vain, therefore, would it be said or proved of God that He is a being, good, or the like.

Chapter 34

(1) From what we have said, therefore, it remains that the names said of God and creatures are predicated neither univocally nor equivocally but analogically, that is, according to an order or reference to something one.

(2) This can take place in two ways. In one way, according as many things have reference to something one....

(3) In another way, the analogy can obtain according as the order or reference of two things is not to something else but to one of them.

Thus, being is said of substance and accident according as an accident has reference to a substance, and not according as substance and accident are referred to a third thing.

(4) Now, the names said of God and things are not said analogically according to the first mode of analogy, since we should then have to posit something prior to God, but according to the second mode.

Thomas Aquinas asserts that there are two ways of knowing. God's knowing is qualitatively different from that of His rational creatures. There is no univocal element in these two ways of knowing. And yet terms applied to both God and men are not totally equivocal; there is an analogy. But again it is an analogy by proportion. For example, we may speak of God's goodness and also of man's goodness. Then God's goodness is in God as goodness is to God and man's goodness is in man as goodness is to man.

This sounds eminently reasonable; but unfortunately Thomas, by his denial of a univocal element, has reduced the analogy to equivocation. As Edward J. Carnell points out: "the very things that saves analogy from being sheer equivocation is its univocal element." Without at least one area of meaning common to the two applications of the one term, analogy is lost. Carnell, in his *Introduction to Christian Apologetics*, provides some examples of analogy to point up the need of at least one univocal element, as follows:

(1) "The mind is to the soul as the eye is to the body."

The univocal element in this analogy appears to be "light-admitting faculty" or "instrument of perception"

(2) "The foundation is to the house as the heart is to the organism."