

dependency" has no tendency to imply the "no identity of content" doctrine. One can easily hold that one can be (totally) dependent on God for rational and perceptual competence, and that one's knowledge can be derivative of God's knowledge, *without* embracing Van Til's "no identity-no coincidence" theory.

But to continue, Van Til goes well beyond the above substitution when he introduces the property of analogicity as meaningfully *critical* for human reasoners—reasoners who must, per force, reason *exclusively beneath the ceiling!* Since Van Til insists that reasoning analogically is a *necessary* condition of knowing truly, it must be possible *to tell*, at least on some occasions, *whether* one has reasoned analogically. Yet according to Van Til, the ability to specify criteria would cancel the need to invoke analogicity in the first place. And why is that? Because to specify criteria entails a univocal access to at least some knowledge *as God knows it* in order to see whether one's own noetic holdings are indeed analogous of God's noetic holdings. That means we would have to have access *above* the ceiling in order judiciously to apply the analogy concept to our own thinking. But by the very nature of the case there can't be any human peeking above the ceiling, for above the ceiling (as I am using this metaphor) there is only knowledge as God knows it. The very idea of human access to the latter is an ontological impossibility on Van Til's reckoning, and things don't get more impossible than that! So Van Til has put the Christian in the impossible position of having to "reflect" God's knowledge while being systematically cut off from it.

Lucy wants to know whether I may be fussing over nothing since the Bible is surely the criterion for Van Til's analogicity. But my reply is that can't be right, for in complete independence of the Bible Van Til has *already* told us that his notion of analogicity absolutely forbids any identity of content between *anything* God has in his mind and *anything* man has in his mind. Predicated nuance is analogical across the board or not at all. That means the very rationality it takes to "rightly" exegete the Bible must be *antecedently* analogical of God's thought or else it is univocal and pagan.

Lucy is thinking: "Surely," she suggests, "Van Til allows that humans have at least a univocal handle on logical laws like that of contradiction, identity, and excluded middle. He's *got* to grant that there is