

did understand by his utterance! That is because the "no identity-no coincidence" doctrine is *symmetrical*. Regarding the prospect of communication, we must hold Van Til to his words: for *both* God and man "no identity" is *no* identity and "no coincidence" is *no* coincidence. So not only can't the disciples univocally entertain any of God's meaning; God can't univocally entertain any of the disciples' meaning! (Keep in mind that "univocal" simply means "same level meaning".)

Van Til's doctrine thus effectively renders divine-to-human as well as human-to-divine *communication* impossible so far as sameness of content meaning is concerned. And to boot (and ever so ironically), Van Til's doctrine of analogy implies that an omniscient God is *ignorant* of the disciples' *precise* understanding of him. But it's even worse than that, for we humans (even in Christ [!]) whatever the analogical meaning of *that* may come to) must then be as incomprehensible to God, concerning the content of our thought, as he is to us, concerning the content of his thought. Again, no coincidence is *no coincidence*; the unavoidable implication is that the symmetry of this noncoincidence cuts both ways, leaving God and man *mutually ignorant* of one another's thought.

Where are we, then, with respect to *meaning* coincidence? The relevant question all along has been whether the Father succeeded in communicating an intended content. The mere fact that the Father *knew* he accomplished this objective falsifies the necessarily symmetrical "no identity" thesis. The Father knew *precisely*, in his mind, the content the disciples took from his utterance! That in itself is full-blown semantic coincidence. The disciples, moreover, had in their minds *regarding this Jesus* that he was the Father's beloved Son with whom he was well pleased. And the moral to be drawn: one cannot deny *all* (content) meaning coincidence without absurdity.

(3) Identity with Regard to Understanding the Meaning of Mapping Language onto the World: Truth

The third semantic feature is truth. At first blush this may not seem to be a distinguishable semantic feature that is (in a logical sense) independent of reference and meaning. That this is the case will become clearer as we go, but I begin by asking the same style of question: Is there identity of understanding between the minds of the disciples and the mind