

According to Copleston's interpretation of Scotus, "being belongs primarily and principally to God, and . . . creatures are to God as *mensurata ad mensuram, vel excessa ad excedens* [=the measured are to the measure, or the surpassed are to the surpassing]." But Scotus also insists that "analogy itself presupposes a univocal concept, since we could not compare creatures with God as *mensurata ad mensuram, vel excessa ad excedens*, unless there was a concept common to both. . . . Even those masters who deny univocity with their lips really presuppose it. If there were no univocal concepts, we should have only a negative knowledge of God, which is not the case" (Copleston 2: 505).

If this interpretation of Scotus is correct, he evidently anticipates Hartshorne's position that "whatever the qualifications, some abstract feature or *ratio* is implied, and this common feature must not be denied if anything is to be left of the analogy."

22 October 1996