

between the kn. which the Son has of the Father, & the kn. men have of Him, The distinction is between the Son's original, immediate, all penetrating, & all comprehended kn. of the Father, & the derived, dependent kn. which men have thru. us, of the Son. But this does not detract from the kn. which men may have.

c. We must <sup>not</sup> misunderstand or misapply the terms analogous, analogical, & analogy in this respect. Our kn. is analog. but when we say this, we must use the word in the sense that kn. in us is analog. to kn. in God. This is // to saying that will in us is analog. to will in God, or goodness in us is analog. to goodness in God, or righteousness. All of this is true just because we are made in God's image.

We must not interp. this to mean that which we know is simply an analog. of the truth of God. Neither does it mean that our kn. of God is an analog. of God's kn.

Even when we say our kn. is analog., we are not saying enough to guard against the scepticism which has frequently intruded into the use of these expressions. What we must say is that our kn. is analog. to God's to kn. & thus guard the proposition against the interp. that which we know is simply an analog. of the truth, & not the truth itself, (cf. Thomwell: The Nature & Limits of our Kn. of God.)

## B. Sources of our Kn. of God.

### Intro.

a. The use of the word knowledge in this connection: This word, like the word "faith", is used in a subj. & obj. sense. Kn. may design the state of trusting, or that which we trust. Both of these senses belong to the total situation, in wh. kn. exists. Kn. presupposes a subject-object relationship. In this topic, we are speaking of cognitive apprehension, using the word kn. in the subj.