

Title	Remarks on "Analogy of inequality"
Sub Title	
Author	有働, 勤吉(Udo, Kinkichi)
Publisher	三田哲學會
Publication year	1958
Jtitle	哲學 No.35 (1958. 11) ,p.B8- B8
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	Abstract
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00150430-00000035-0698

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Remarks on "Analogy of Inequality"

Kinkichi Udo

An expression "analogy of inequality," *analogia inaequalitatis*, historically owes its denomination to Cajetan, who made a contribution to systematic development of a doctrine of analogy on the basis of Aristotelian-thomistic tradition, mentioning that an understanding of the doctrine is necessarily required in studies of metaphysics. Cajetan describes the nature of this analogy as following; things are said to be analogous by analogy of inequality when they have a common name, and the *ratio* indicated by the name is entirely the same, but unequally participated. It is clearly evident from the above mentioned that, for Cajetan, analogy of inequality consists in the unequal participation in the generic *ratio*, whereas Thomas Aquinas himself regards this type of analogy as one *secundum esse tantum*. Hence their disagreements as to the account for this analogy should not be only with a matter of terminology but of the very doctrine. Indeed, it is solely on the one hand, because of neglecting the distinction made by Thomas between *genus logicum* and *genus naturale*, because of missing the vital meaning of *esse* in Thomas' text on the other hand, that Cajetan considers this type of analogy to be entirely foreign to the nature of a true analogy. In this paper, contrary to Cajetan's exposition of this analogy, we attempt to clarify the reason why *analogia secundum esse tantum* can possibly be a true analogy and at the same time, must be analogy of *genus naturale*, that is to say, analogy of natural philosophy or physics, through an analysis of the meaning of *esse* in Thomas.