

Van Til's Illustrations, focusing on Apologetics

**Collated by
Steve Scrivener
*Version 1 March 2008***

Permissions

The works of Cornelius Van Til are used by the permission of The den Dulk Christian Foundation. The text is in Times New Roman font and is taken from *The Works of Cornelius Van Til, 1895-1987 [Logos] CD-ROM*," Eric H. Sigward, ed. (New York: Labels Army Co., 1997), used by permission. Text not in Times New Roman font has been added.

Abbreviations

Bold indicates the writings that have been checked for emphasis and their page numbers – the publishing date is given. The publisher is Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co. except where stated.

AMFS	<i>The Apologetic Methodology of Francis A. Schaeffer</i> , by Cornelius Van Til, Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary mimeo, no date
ATBG	<i>At the Beginning God</i> , An Interview with Van Til, Christianity Today, December 30, 1977
BTBP	Unpublished Manuscript, <i>Black Theology And Black Power</i> by Cornelius Van Til
C1967	<i>The Confession Of 1967: Its Theological Background And Ecumenical Significance</i> by Cornelius Van Til
CA	<i>Christian Apologetics</i> by Cornelius Van Til, first edition, 1976 (now in a Second edition, 2003 – retype set and lightly edited with an introduction and explanatory notes by William Edgar)
CAA	" <i>Calvinism and Art: Common Grace Does Not Solve All the Problems</i> ", Presbyterian Guardian 17/16 (Dec 1948): 272–74, by Cornelius Van Til
CC	<i>Christianity in Conflict</i> by Cornelius Van Til
CFC	<i>Case for Calvinism</i> by Cornelius Van Til
CPL	<i>The Christian Philosophy of Life</i> , In <i>Van Til: Defender of the Faith</i> , by William White, Jr., 201–233. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1979, by Cornelius Van Til
CGG	<i>Common Grace and the Gospel</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1972
CI	<i>Christianity and Idealism</i> by Cornelius Van Til
CMT	<i>Christianity in Modern Theology</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1972
CP	<i>Christian Philosophy</i> , by Cornelius Van Til, 1956
CTETH	<i>Christian Theistic Ethics</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1980
CTEV	<i>Christian Theistic Evidences</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1976
CTK	<i>Christian Theory of Knowledge</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1969
CVT	Cornelius Van Til
CVTAT	<i>Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought</i> by John Frame, 1995
DCC	<i>Defence of Christianity & My Credo</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1971 (This is Chapter 1 of RP)
DF1	<i>Defense of the Faith</i> (Edition 1, 1955) by Cornelius Van Til
DF3	<i>Defense of the Faith</i> (Edition 3, 1967) by Cornelius Van Til
DMT	<i>The Development of My Thinking</i> , a letter written to John Vander Stelt in 1968
ECE	<i>Essays on Christian Education</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1979
ET	<i>Evil and Theodicy</i> , dated March 31, 1923, by Cornelius Van Til Handwritten, two bound notebooks, WTS Archives
FH	"Foreword." <i>To For a Time Such as This: An Introduction to the Reformed Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til</i> , by Jim S. Halsey. Nutley, NJ: P&R, 1976
FR	Review of <i>Freedom and Restraint</i> , by Robert F. Campbell. Christianity Today 1/11 (Mar 1931): 14–15 by Cornelius Van Til
GA	<i>God and the Absolute</i> by Cornelius Van Til
GDT	<i>The Great Debate Today</i> by Cornelius Van Til
GH	<i>The God of Hope: Sermons And Addresses</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1978
HHE	<i>The Holy Human Empire (Uppsala)</i> , Presbyterian Guardian 37/9 (Oct 1968): 99–101, by Cornelius Van Til
ICG	<i>Intellectual Challenge of the Gospel</i> by Cornelius Van Til, 1980 (Originally published by The Tyndale Press, 1950 and now published by Westminster Discount Books)

- IST** *Introduction to Systematic Theology* by Cornelius Van Til, 1974 (now in a Second edition, 2007 – retype set and lightly edited with an introduction and explanatory notes, by William Edgar)
- IW** “Introduction” *To the Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, by B. B. Warfield, 1948
- JA** *Jerusalem and Athens: Critical Discussions on the Theology and Apologetics of Cornelius Van Til* edited by E.R. Geehan, 1971
- JGC2 *John Goes To College—Part Two*, The Presbyterian Guardian, 1940, Volume 8, Page 149ff by Cornelius Van Til
- NM *The New Modernism: An Appraisal Of The Theology Of Barth And Brunner* by Cornelius Van Til
- PA** *Paul at Athens* by Cornelius Van Til, no date [1954] (now published by Westminster Discount Books)
- PCS *The Purpose of a Christian School is . . . That Mankind Might Do Everything to God’s Glory*, by Cornelius Van Til, in *The Purpose of a Christian School*, edited by David B. Cummings, 115–30, Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979
- PDS** *The Protestant Doctrine of Scripture* by Cornelius Van Til, 1967
- RDL *Review of De Leer van God bij Augustinus*, by A. D. R. Polman, in Westminster Theological Journal 29/1 (Nov 1966): 94–102, by Cornelius Van Til
- RMT *Review of The Morals of Tomorrow*, by Ralph W. Stockman, in Christianity Today 1/11 (Mar 1931): 14–15, by Cornelius Van Til
- RNCL *Review of De Noodzakelijkeheid eener Christelijke Logica*, by D. H. Th. Vollenhoven, in The Calvin Forum 1/6 (Jan 1936): 142–43, by Cornelius Van Til
- RE *Reformed Epistemology* by Cornelius Van Til (typescript, not original handwritten manuscript)
- RP** *The Reformed Pastor* by Cornelius Van Til, 1971
- RPJD *Review of The Philosophy of John Dewey*, edited by Paul A. Schilpp, in Westminster Theological Journal 3/1 (Nov 1940): 62–73, by Cornelius Van Til
- RRF *Review of Reasoning Faith*, by T. C. Hammond, Christian Opinion 2/2 (Jan 1945): 54–56, by Cornelius Van Til
- RSF *Review of Science and Faith*, by Eric Rust, Calvin Theological Journal 3/1 (Apr 1968): 86–91, by Cornelius Van Til
- SCE** *Survey of Christian Epistemology*, by Cornelius Van Til, 1969
- SFS *Seeking for Similarities*, by Cornelius Van Til, The Banner 72/2076 (22 Jan 1937): 75.
- SMMT *The Search For Meaning In Modern Thought* by Cornelius Van Til
- TC *The Ten Commandments*, Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary, no date [1939], Syllabus, by Cornelius Van Til
- TRA** *Towards A Reformed Apologetic* by Cornelius Van Til (a survey of his major publications), privately printed, 1972
- US Unpublished Manuscript, *An Uncertain Sound* by Cornelius Van Til
- VTARA *Van Til: Apologetics Readings & Analysis* by Greg Bahnsen, 1995
- WIB** *Why I Believe in God* by Cornelius Van Til, Committee on Christian Education of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church, first edition, 1948 (second edition, 1976, is now published by Westminster Discount Books)
- WTR *The Will in Its Theological Relations*, Three bound notebooks, handwritten by Cornelius Van Til, 1924 (Van Til Papers, Westminster Theological Seminary Archives)

Introduction

Here is an A to Z of Van Til's illustrations, mainly focusing on apologetics, for you to enjoy. As John Frame says "Van Til did have a great knack for illustrations and slogans – reducing complex ideas to homely, familiar dimensions." He adds that "Van Til himself was quite aware that there is only so much that one can learn by slogans and illustrations; eventually there must be a role for careful analysis" (CVTAT 31). However now that John Frame and Greg Bahnsen have published their careful analysis of Van Til (in *Cornelius Van Til: An Analysis of His Thought* by John Frame and *Van Til: Apologetics Readings & Analysis* by Greg Bahnsen), there is a place for the gold dust of Van Til's striking and powerful illustrations being sieved from his writings.

Explanation of the format and organization used

The illustrations are in alphabetical order. Each heading summarizes the illustration in UPPERCASE text followed, by an explanation of the meaning(s) of the illustration, in lowercase text (unless the illustration summary needs no further explanation). These headings are usually based on Van Til's words themselves. Some illustrations could be just considered as just word pictures but they still merited including in the illustrations as they are suggestive and could easily be expanded into a fuller illustration (e.g. "arguing about air's existence" and "borrowed" or "stolen capital").

A summary list of all the illustrations headings can be found at Appendix 3.

In addition I have come across or been supplied with other illustrations that Van Til used in his lectures that are not in his writings, so I have given these at Appendix 1.

It should be noted that:

- The page number(s) have been added to the reference for Van Til's main writings (identified in bold under the Abbreviations above). Also for these quotes the emphasis that Van Til put in his text has added (this has not been included in the CD-ROM);
- Bible references have been added in square brackets where Van Til clearly quotes or alludes to a Scripture;
- Where necessary I have edited the passage to remove the reference to philosophers, philosophy or theological discussion that would not be understood by people without a philosophical or theological background;
- Occasionally I have added an explanation or note in square brackets;
- References to Calvin's *Institutes of the Christian Religion* have been added where these are not given, or where the *Institutes* is alluded to, because of the importance of Calvin's *Institutes* in Van Til's apologetic (see RP or DCC pages 4-24). I have used the Battles edition of the *Institutes* but have noted where Van Til has used the Beveridge translation if this is significant (the Battles edition was not published until 1960 so Van Til referred to the Beveridge prior to this);
- Some illustrations have been cross-referenced.
- **In Adobe the document, including all the illustrations, is outlined and is easily accessible under Bookmarks.**

How the illustrations were identified

Over 10 years ago I began keeping a list of Van Til's illustrations as I came across them. After the arrival of the Van Til CD-Rom I have been collating the text of Van Til's illustrations, slowly but surely, for about 10 years. They were identified from the following 21 writings of Van Til which are about apologetics or they have apologetic themes in them (though I have not yet finished checking all of the writings for illustrations).

ATBG
CA (chapters 1 and 2)
CGG
CFP
CTETH
CTEV
CTK (chapters 1 to 3 and 8)
DF1 and DF3
DMT
ECE
GH
ICG
IST
IW
JA
PA
PDS
RP Chapter 1 / DCC Chapter 1
SCE (Introduction and chapters 1, 8, 10 and 14 to 16)
TRA
WIB

The Van Til CD-ROM was used to check key words that arose from the above selections to look for other illustrations or variations of illustrations. Where a search gave a large number of "hits" (above 75 or so) I usually just looked at the results in DF3, IST and WIB and if it was an important word, such as autonomy, possibly also CGG, CTK (chapters 1 to 3 and 8), GH and JA. For reference a list of the words searched is given at Appendix 2.

Where the same illustration (and application of the illustration) appears in more than one book, which occurs quite often with Van Til (he was a good Dutch man who did not want to waste anything!), I either have usually given the quote from DF3 if it is there, or otherwise I chose what I thought was the most helpful one, or whichever I found first! However, for completeness, if there are variations in the illustration and/or application I have given these as well (and the different applications are given in the headings).

Your comments

If you have any you comments, corrections or additions (especially new illustrations), then please Email them to scriv@snmail.co.uk

1. AIR'S EXISTENCE BEING ARGUED ABOUT – antitheism presupposes theism, also see 28 and 42

Now, in fact, I feel that the whole of history and civilization would be unintelligible to me if it were not for my belief in God. So true is this, that I propose to argue that unless God is back of everything, you cannot find meaning in anything. I cannot even argue for belief in Him, without already having taken Him for granted. And similarly I contend that you cannot argue against belief in Him unless you also first take Him for granted. Arguing about God's existence, I hold, is like arguing about air. You may affirm that air exists, and I that it does not. But as we debate the point, we are both breathing air all the time.

WIB 3

2. APPLES SHAKEN OFF THE APPLE TREE AND THEN ASK WHETHER THERE MUST NOT HAVE BEEN SOME SORT OF SOMETHING THAT IS HIGHER THAN THE APPLES IN ORDER TO ACCOUNT FOR THEM – not looking for the meaning of man in the light of the revelation that comes from Christ directly revealed in Scripture, also see 76

What the evangelical Christian must do is to show that he who does not look for the meaning of man in the light of the revelation that comes from Christ directly revealed in Scripture is like one who shakes off all the apples of the apple tree, grubs out the tree, and *then* asks *whether* there must not have been some sort of something that is higher than the apples in order to account for them. This "some sort of something" or at most some sort of tree may, possibly or probably, tell us that it is an apple tree.

CTK 348

3. ARC OF A CIRCLE RELATES THREE POINTS TO ONE ANOTHER – facts are related to the plan of God, contrast 37

... the Christian holds that no fact will appear that could disprove the ultimacy of the fact of God, and therefore of what he has revealed of himself and his plan for the world through Christ in the Scriptures. We may illustrate this point by the example of a mathematician who finds that three points are related to one another by the arc of a circle. Then when he proceeds to draw the circle he follows a definitely "prescribed" course, even if he has made no mark on his paper yet. If it is the circle that relates the points, and if the circle exhausts the relation of the points, the mathematician cannot reasonably expect to find other points on a tangent to the circle that are nevertheless related to the points of the circle. Now we may compare the circle of the mathematician to the Christian concept of God. We hold that the meaning of any one finite fact is exhausted by its relation to the plan of God. Hence this same thing will hold to any two or three facts. And it follows that no other facts can stand in any possible relation to these facts unless they too are related to this one comprehensible plan of God. In other words, only Christian facts are possible. For any fact to be a fact at all, it must be what Christ in Scripture says it is.

SCE 8

4. ARCTIC ZONE OF ICE AND THE TROPIC ZONE OF HEAT SHALL NEVER MEET – logic, from chance, and facts shall never meet

Logic [from chance] is found in the arctic zone of everlasting ice and facts are found in the tropic zone of everlasting heat, and never the twain shall meet.

NM

5. ARMY FAILS IN SENDING A FEW INDIVIDUAL SOLDIERS TO WREST SOME ATOLL FROM A POWERFUL CONCENTRATION OF AN ENEMY'S FORCES – atomistic and piece-meal presentation of Christian theism has lost all power to challenge the non-Christian methodology; Neither Roman Catholic nor Arminian apologists atomistic theologies are in a position to challenge the natural man's atomistic procedure, compare 17, 20, 21, 118 and 124

It is of the essence of both the Romanist and the Arminian method of argumentation to agree with the non-Christian that individual propositions about many dimensions of reality are true whether Christianity is true or not. Neither Roman Catholics nor Arminian apologists are in a position to challenge the natural man's [1 Cor 2:14] atomistic procedure. Their own theologies are atomistic. They are not built along consistently Christian lines. Their individual doctrines are therefore not presented as being what they are exclusively by virtue of their relation to the main principles of the Christian position. Their contention that the Reformed faith is wrong in thinking of all things in the world as being what

they are ultimately in virtue of God's plan with respect to them compels the Roman Catholic and the Arminian apologist to admit the essential correctness of non-Christian atomism. And herewith they have at the same time lost all power to challenge the non-Christian methodology at the outset of its career. Instead they themselves become the victims of this method. Since the principles of their theology will not permit them to argue by way of presupposition, their own piece-meal presentation of Christian theism constantly comes to a sorry end. It is as though an army were sending out a few individual soldiers in order to wrest some atoll from a powerful concentration of an enemy's forces. There can be no joining of issues at the central point of difference, the interpretation by exclusively immanentistic categories or the interpretation in terms of the self-sufficient God, unless it be done by way of presupposition. And the Reformed apologist has a theology that both permits and requires him to do this.

DF3 122

6. ATOMIC BOMBS MUST BE PUT OVER AGAINST THE ENEMY CANNON ATTACKS – the system of truth in Scripture, that is systematic theology, is the best defense and attack; also see 7

... we should observe that just as a thorough knowledge of the system of truth in Scripture is the best defense against heresy, so it is also the best help for the propagation of the truth. This is but the other side of the former point. As an army well organized is not so likely to be overcome by a surprise attack and is not so likely to be shattered as an army poorly organized, so also an army well organized is better able to attack the enemy than an army poorly organized. Each unit will have the support and the protection of the whole army as it goes on to the attack. The morale will be better. When the enemy comes with cannon, we must be able to put atomic bombs over against them. When the enemy attacks the foundations, we must be able to protect these foundations.

IST 7

7. ATOMIC POWER AND FLAME-THROWERS OF A TRULY REFORMED METHODOLOGY WILL EXPLODE THE LAST STRONGHOLD OF THE NATURAL MAN; NUCLEAR STRENGTH APOLOGETICS, also see 6; The use of martial terminology; Point of contact, also see 36, 61, 71 and 108

7a. Deep down in his mind every man knows that he is the creature of God and responsible to God. Every man, at bottom, knows that he is a covenant-breaker. But every man acts and talks as though this were not so. It is the one point that cannot bear mentioning in his presence. ...

Romanism and evangelicalism, by failing to appeal exclusively to that which is within man but is also suppressed by every man, virtually allow the legitimacy of the natural man's [1 Cor 2:14] view of himself. They do not seek to explode the last stronghold to which the natural man always flees and where he always makes his final stand. ...

The truly Biblical view, on the other hand, applies atomic power and flame-throwers to the very presupposition of the natural man's ideas with respect to himself. ...

Only by thus finding the point of contact in man's sense of deity that lies underneath his own conception of self-consciousness as ultimate can we be both true to Scripture and effective in reasoning with the natural man. Man, knowing God, refuses to keep God in remembrance (Rom. 1:28).

DF3 94-5

7b. It is fatal for the Reformed apologist to admit that man has done justice to the objective evidence if he comes to any other conclusion than that of the truth of Christian theism.

As for the question whether the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] will accept the truth of such an argument, we answer that he will if God pleases by his Spirit to take the scales from his eyes and the mask from his face. It is upon the power of the Holy Spirit that the Reformed preacher relies when he tells men that they are lost in sin and in need of a Savior. The Reformed preacher does not tone down his message in order that it may find acceptance with the natural man. He does not say that his message is less certainly true because of its non-acceptance by the natural man. The natural man is, by virtue of his creation in the image of God, always accessible to the truth; accessible to the penetration of the truth by the Spirit of God. Apologetics, like systematics, is valuable to the precise extent that it presses the truth upon the attention of the natural man. The natural man must be blasted out of his hideouts, his caves, his last lurking places. Neither Roman Catholic nor Arminian methodologies have the flame-throwers with which to reach him. In the all-out war between the Christian and the natural man as he appears in modern garb it is only the atomic energy of a truly Reformed methodology that will explode the last *Festung* [fortress] to which the Roman Catholic and the Arminian always permit him to retreat and to dwell in safety. Note 3: The use of such martial terminology is not inconsistent with the Christian principle of love. He who loves men most will tell them the truth about themselves in their own interest.

DF3 104-5

8. AXE TO GRIND – men are sinners who want to suppress the truth in unrighteousness and will employ their reason for that purpose, also see 58 and 147; All men, including “open-minded” non-Christian scientists, are sinners whose deepest controlling motive is to fight for their purely man-centered interpretation and not to want to find God, their Creator and Judge, even though they cannot help being confronted with Him all the time and everywhere, compare 96 and 136

8a. We always deal with concrete individual men. These men are sinners. They have “an axe to grind.” They want to suppress the truth in unrighteousness [Roms 1:18]. They will employ their reason for that purpose.

DF3 84

8b. All sinners are covenant breakers. They have an axe to grind. They do not want to keep God in remembrance. They keep under the knowledge of God that is within them. That is they try as best they can to keep under this knowledge for fear they should look into the face of their judge. And since God’s face appears in every fact of the universe they oppose God’s revelation everywhere. They do not want to see the facts of nature for what they are; they do not want to see themselves for what they are.

DF3 200

8c. The Christian finds that his conscience agrees to the truth of the story. He holds that those who deny the truth of the story have an axe to grind. They do not want the story to be true; they do not want the facts to be what the story says they are. They ‘protest too much.’ And by protesting too much they testify, in spite of themselves, that their conscience does not tell them that the story is untrue. Their conscience tells them the reverse of what they say it does.

DF3 214

8d. It need be no matter of surprise to the Christian that non-Christian scientists are, at bottom, fighting for their purely man-centered interpretation even when they engage in “open-minded” and “neutral” description of facts. Scripture informs us that all men are sinners and seek in all that they do to suppress the basic truth of their responsibility to their Creator. They always have an “axe to grind.” To say this is not to charge men with a lack of the surface honesties and sincerities of civilized life ... It is only to be concerned with the deepest controlling motives of men and to interpret these motives in accordance with Scripture.

GH 242

8e. [The philosophers], with all men, are sinners and therefore have an axe to grind. They do not want to find God, their Creator. Though they cannot help being confronted with Him all the time and everywhere, they seek assiduously to suppress this revelation.

ICG 10

9. BALLOON, MEN WHO THINK THAT THEY CAN LEAVE THIS EARTH IN A BALLOON ARE BOUND TO RETURN TO EARTH SOONER OR LATER – optimistic theories of non-Christian ethics are bound to return to pessimism sooner or later

9a. All the optimistic theories of non-Christian ethics may be compared with men who think that they can leave this earth in a balloon. It is a contradiction in terms to think that one can leave this earth by earthly means and materials. Every balloon is bound to return to earth sooner or later. So every optimistic non-Christian theory of ethics is bound to return to pessimism sooner or later.

CTETH 62

10. BASEMENT OF YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE NEEDS TO BE SEEN FOR WHAT HAS BEEN GATHERING THERE – be critical of this your own most basic assumption, autonomy and self-sufficiency

Now in presenting all your facts and reasons to me, you have assumed that such a God does not exist. You have taken for granted that you need no emplacement of any sort outside of yourself. You have assumed the autonomy of your own experience. Consequently you are unable -- that is, unwilling -- to accept as a fact any fact that would challenge your self-sufficiency. And you are bound to call that contradictory which does not fit into the reach of your intellectual powers. ... And I am asking you to be critical of this your own most basic assumption. Will you not go into the basement of your own experience to see what has been gathering there while you were busy here and there with the surface inspection of life? You may be greatly surprised at what you find there.

WIB 12-3

11. BEADS, INFINITE IN NUMBER, TO BE STRUNG WITH NO HOLES AND INFINITE STRING – facts and laws of the world cannot be related if they are not created and redeemed by God in Christ; A scientific method not based on the presupposition of the truth of the Christian story has no foundation, and such science has an infinite number of unrelated particulars, having to relate with pure abstract logic, also see 13, 68, 100, 111, 119 and 140

11a. If the facts of the world are not created and redeemed by God in Christ, then they are like beads that have no holes in them and therefore cannot be strung into a string of beads. If the laws of the world are not what they are as relating the facts that are created and redeemed by Christ, these laws are like a string of infinite length, neither end of which can be found. Seeking to string beads that cannot be strung because they have no holes in them, with string of infinite length neither end of which you can find; such is the task of the educator who seeks to educate without presupposing the truth of what the self-attesting Christ has spoken in the Scriptures.

ECE 16

11b. In other words, it is the Christian's task to point out to the scientist that science needs to stand on Christ and his redeeming work if it is not to fall to pieces. Without Christ he has no foundation on which to stand while he makes his contradictions. A scientific method not based on the presupposition of the truth of the Christian story is like an effort to string an infinite number of beads, no two of which have holes in them, by means of a string of infinite length, neither end of which can be found.

PDS 2

11c. If then, ... science is to be saved from having to do with, on the one hand, an infinite number of unrelated particulars—like beads that have no holes in them and, on the other hand, having to do with pure abstract logic—like an infinitely long string which has no ends and certainly no end that can be found by man—then science must be saved by this very same man who does not understand himself and who never will understand himself.

PDS 17

11d. Without the biblical teaching with respect to God who through Christ is man's creator redeemer, man can only afresh exhibit his folly as a scientist, as a philosopher and as a theologian. Without the idea of God and his plan being realized through the work of Christ and his Holy Spirit, all is chaos. Unless one first accepts on authority the picture of the world and of all that is therein that is given us in Scripture, the scientist, the philosopher and the theologian are like a man who is trying to string an infinite number of beads, no two of which have holes in them.

BTBP

11e. To be sure, I must be all things to all men, but I establish men in their way unto death if I do not say to them, on the authority of Christ, that only if they repent of their sin will they have eternal life in him. Is this blind faith? On the contrary, it is the only basis man has on which he can stand, to know himself, to find facts of his world and learn how to relate them to one another. Without the Creator-God-Redeemer of Scripture the universe would resemble an infinite number of beads with no holes in any of them, yet which must be all be strung by an infinitely long string. Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For since in the wisdom of God, the world did not by its wisdom know God through wisdom [1 Cor 1:21].

ATBG 21

12. BEAMS UNDERNEATH THE FLOOR – presuppose God is underneath all things; Absolutely certain Theistic proof for God's existence, also see 53

12a. Says A. E. Taylor in discussing the question of the uniformity of nature, "The fundamental thought of modern science, at any rate until yesterday, was that there is a 'universal reign of law' throughout nature. Nature is rational in the sense that it has everywhere a coherent pattern which we can progressively detect by the steady application of our own intelligence to the scrutiny of natural processes. Science has been built up all along on the basis of this principle of the 'uniformity of nature,' and the principle is one which science itself has no means of demonstrating. No one could possibly prove its truth to an opponent who seriously disputed it. For all attempts to produce 'evidence' for the 'uniformity of nature' themselves presuppose the very principle they are intended to prove." (*Does God Exist?* London, 1947, p.2.) Our argument as over against this would be that the existence of the God of Christian theism and the conception of his counsel as controlling all things in the universe is the only presupposition which can account for the uniformity of nature which the scientist needs. But the best and only possible proof for the existence of such a God is that his existence is required for the uniformity of nature and for the coherence of all things in the world. We cannot *prove* the existence of beams underneath a floor if by proof we mean that they must be ascertainable in the way that we

can see the chairs and tables of the room. But the very idea of a floor as the support of tables and chairs requires the idea of beams that are underneath. But there would be no floor if no beams were underneath. Thus there is absolutely certain proof for the existence of God and the truth of Christian theism. Even non-Christians presuppose its truth while they verbally reject it. They need to presuppose the truth of Christian theism in order to account for their own accomplishments.

DF3 103

12b. I was brought up on the Bible as the Word of God. Can I, now that I have been to school, still believe in the God of the Bible? Well, can I still believe in the sun that shown on me when I walked as a boy in wooden shoes in Groningen? I could believe in nothing else if I did not, as back of everything, believe in this God. Can I see the beams underneath the floor on which I walk? I must assume or presuppose that the beams are underneath. Unless the beams were underneath, I could not walk on the floor.

TRA 1-2

13. BEATING THE AIR – to appeal to the law of contradiction, or to facts, or to a combination of these, apart from the relation that these sustain to the totality-vision of either the believer or the unbeliever, is to beat the air and fails to present the challenge of the Christian position at all, also see 111; We who are saved by grace need not beat the air, for there is for us a true synthesis of all things in Christ which we offer to all men; The non-Christian, not working on the foundation of creation and providence, when talking about musts in relation to facts is beating the air, also see 11, 68, 100 and 111

13a. He [the self-authenticating man] assumes that pure contingency or change is the matrix of all the material of all possible knowledge. He takes for granted that the facts to which he is about to apply his hypotheses cannot have been created by God and cannot be controlled by God. He thinks that the very possibility of progress in scientific knowledge requires the exclusion by assumption of the whole Christian story. The self-authenticating man assumes that only in terms of his totality-vision can law and fact come into fruitful union with one another.

It appears then that if there is to be any intelligible encounter between the Christian and the non-Christian, it must be in terms of the two mutually exclusive visions that each entertains. To appeal to the law of contradiction and/or to facts or to a combination of these apart from the relation that these sustain to the totality-vision of either, the believer or the unbeliever, is to beat the air. It is well to say that he who would reason must presuppose the validity of the laws of logic. But if we say nothing more basic than this, then we are still beating the air

The ultimate question deals with the foundation of the validity of the laws of logic. We have not reached bottom until we have seen that every logical activity in which any man engages is in the service of his totality-vision.

CFC

13b. To appeal to “logic,” that is to the “law of contradiction,” or to “experience” and “facts” as such, is worse than merely confusing. It is these categories themselves that are in dispute. To argue about a position as being “in accord with logic” and as being “in accord with fact” is to beat the air and thus to fail to present the challenge of the Christian position at all. Really to challenge men with the truth of Christianity is to deal with logic and with facts, showing that the two have their relevance on Christian presuppositions alone.

CMT

13c. Now then, we who are saved by grace, we who have by the Spirit of God been born from above, need not beat the air. There is for us a true synthesis of all things in Christ. And we may offer this Christ to all men that they too with us might escape the futility and the absurdity, the immorality and the blasphemy, of seeking to synthesize what by their very sinful act they are all the while destroying. The task of educators who do not educate in and unto Christ is like the task of Sisyphus as he rolled his stone to the top of the hill only to see it roll down again.

ECE 16

13d. When the non-Christian, not working on the foundation of creation and providence, talks about *musts* in relation to *facts* he is beating the air.

DF3 206

14. BLACK CAT IN THE CLOSET IS ASSERTED AND COUNTERED WITH MAYBE THAT’S RIGHT SINCE NOBODY KNOWS – an unbeliever says perhaps God exists since nobody knows what is in the “Beyond,” but the God of Scripture cannot live in the realm of Chance

If I assert that there is a black cat in the closet, and you assert that nobody knows what is in the closet, you have virtually told me that I am wrong in my hypothesis. So when I tell Mr. Black [an unbeliever] that God exists, and he responds very graciously by saying that perhaps I am right since nobody knows what is in the “Beyond,” he is virtually saying that I am wrong in my hypothesis. He is obviously thinking of such a God as could comfortably live in the realm of Chance. But the God of Scripture cannot live in the realm of Chance.

DF3 243-4

15. BLIND: VALLEY OF THE BLIND – man is blind to the plain evidence for God and man does not believe in Him; Everybody wears colored glasses (see 58)

If the God of Christianity does exist, the evidence for Him *must* be plain. And the reason, therefore, why “everybody” does not believe in Him must be that “everybody” is blinded by sin. Everybody wears colored glasses. You have heard the story of the valley of the blind. A young man who was out hunting fell over a precipice into the valley of the blind. There was no escape. The blind men did not understand him when he spoke of seeing the sun and the colors of the rainbow, but a fine young lady did understand him when he spoke the language of love. The father of the girl would not consent to the marriage of his daughter to a lunatic who spoke so often of things that did not exist. But the great psychologists of the blind men's university offered to cure him of his lunacy by sewing up his eyelids. Then, they assured him, he would be normal like “everybody” else. But the simple seer went on protesting that he did see the sun.

So, as we have our tea, I propose not only to operate on your heart so as to change your will, but also on your eyes so as to change your outlook. But wait a minute. No, I do not propose to operate at all. I myself cannot do anything of the sort. I am just mildly suggesting that you are perhaps dead, and perhaps blind, leaving you to think the matter over for yourself. If an operation is to be performed it must be performed by God Himself.

WIB 8-9

16. BORROWED OR STOLEN CAPITAL, OR A JACKDAW PLUMING ITSELF WITH STOLEN FEATHERS – non-Christian scientists and philosophers, and even modernism, have discovered much truth and unbelievers produce marvelous works of art, in spite of their fundamental assumption of a chance universe, because of the truths they have stolen and borrowed from Christianity, including that the world is made and controlled by God, and deep down they know this, also see 93; The prodigal flourished for a while with his father’s substance; If the non-Christian had to live by his own capital he would choke forthwith and Whirl would be king

16a. Non-Christian investigators of nature are as successful as they are because they work with stolen capital.

IST 84

16b. Is it not true that unless the world is controlled by God, there could be no science?

... I account for the non-Christian’s scientific accomplishments by virtue of the fact that in spite of his principle of Chance, he is borrowing, without recognizing it, the Christian ideas of creation and providence.

DF1 354

16c. ... you will use [common grace] ... to help explain how even unbelievers in spite of their basic covenantal allegiance to Satan, do produce marvelous works of art. Is it because of common grace that unbelievers are not always fully conscious of their own basic principle? Is it because they are not fully conscious of their own principles that they least express their hostility to ours? And is it when they seem least hostile to our principle of covenant obedience that they do their best work as artists? I suppose that you will add that in any case, even when unbelievers are most expressive in their hostility to God, their work may still be exceedingly beautiful, so completely self-frustrative are all the efforts of Satan and his servants in this world. The unbeliever must borrow, or rather steal, his capital from the believer. Thus do all the works of unbelieving artists always testify against the unbelief of their creators in lesser or in greater degree ...

CAA

16d. In Calvinism more than in any other form of Protestantism the message of Christianity is clearly presented is a challenge to the wisdom of the world. The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] must not be encouraged to think that he can, in terms of his own adopted principles, find truth in any field. He must rather be told that, when he finds truth, even in the realm of the “phenomenal,” he finds it in terms of principles that he has “borrowed,” wittingly or unwittingly, from Christianity. The fact of science and its progress is inexplicable except upon the presupposition that the world is made and controlled by God through Christ and that man is made and renewed in the image of God through Christ.

16e. The presupposition of all intelligible meaning for man in the intellectual, the moral and the aesthetic spheres is the existence of the God of the Bible who, if he speaks at all in grace cannot, without denying himself, but speak in a self-contained infallible fashion. Only in a return to the Bible as infallibly inspired in its autographa is there hope for science, for philosophy and for theology. Without returning to this Bible, science and philosophy may flourish with borrowed capital as the prodigal flourished for a while with his father's substance. But the prodigal had no self-sustaining principle [Lk 15:11-16]. No man has till he accepts the [infallibly inspired Scripture] that Warfield presents.

IW 68

16f. The Christian claims that non-Christians have made and now make many discoveries about the true state of affairs of the universe simply because the universe is what Christ says it is. The unbelieving scientist borrows or steals the Christian principles of creation and providence every time he says that an "explanation" is possible, for he knows he cannot account for "explanation" on his own. As the image-bearer of God, operating in a universe controlled by God, the unbeliever contributes indirectly and adventitiously to the development of human knowledge and culture.

JA 17-18

16g. If the unbeliever then points to the fact that non-Christian scientists and philosophers have discovered many actual "states of affairs," I heartily agree with this but I must tell him that they have done so with borrowed capital. They have done so *adventitiously*. The actual state of affairs about the entire cosmos is what the Bible says it is.

JA 91

16h. Modernism is as the jackdaw pluming itself with feathers stolen from Christian theism.

RMT

16i. The apparent success of modern science should not blind us to the fact that the whole structure is built upon sand. The success of modern science, we believe, is due to the fact that it really works with borrowed capital. If there really were brute facts, there would be no science. There can be no brute facts. All facts are, as a matter of fact, created and controlled by God. So too the mind of man is created by God. There are real universals in the world because of the creation of God. Even the mind of sinful man can see something of this in spite of his sin. Hence, though built upon a metaphysic which is basically false, the science of the non-Christian may reveal much of truth. When the prodigal son left home he was generous with his "substance." But it was really his father's substance that he expended [Lk 15:11-16].

CTEV 69

16j. Science and teaching go on. But it is in spite of this non-Christian philosophy of education that they go on. Modern philosophy of education, like modern thought in general, has to live on borrowed capital. It has to live by the truths of Christianity or it could not even oppose Christianity.

ECE 63

16k. It must be demonstrated to the unbeliever that on his presuppositions there is no intelligibility in the procedure of science in which he has been so eminently successful. The prodigal son may serve as an illustration as to the reason why he is so successful; he employs the capital that he has not earned but has inherited from his father.

Modern science has to live from that which in its assumptions it negates. The Christian doctrine of revelation, of special and general revelation as interdependent, shows itself to be the only foundation of the possibility of science.

Thus it is also shown how the positive accomplishment of the non-Christian scientist can be used and enjoyed by the Christian. The non-Christian's own accomplishments testify against him. Every day that the prodigal spends another dollar he sees it is a dollar that has come from his father [Lk 15:11-16]. Surely he should state the facts as they are. Deep down in his heart, by virtue of the fact that in his own make-up he is revelational of God and due to the fact that he is surrounded by a universe that, with himself and in relation to himself, is revelational and nothing but revelational of God and of his plan, the unbeliever knows that his own view is wrong and that of the believer is right.

GH 240

16l. ... *in spite of* their basically false immanentistic assumption non-Christian scientists can and do convey much truth by means of their description of facts. If the basic assumption of non-Christian thought were true, Whirl would be king. The human mind itself would be the product of Chance. For nothing less than Chance is the alternative to the biblical doctrine of God's plan with respect to the universe. And on a Chance foundation there could be no description of facts. But the universe is not what the non-Christian assumes it to be. And precisely for this reason is it, that even

those who work with false assumptions can discover much truth about the facts of the world. No created mind can function in any field, even for the fraction of a second, without taking for granted the fundamental rationality of the universe and of the coherence of the human mind in relation to it. But the universe has no rationality and the human mind has no coherence within itself or in relation to the world except upon the presupposition of the truth of Christianity. So then the non-Christian scientist must live on “borrowed capital.” If he had to live by his own capital he would choke forthwith even as a scientist. To be sure, the non-Christian does not self-consciously borrow the Christian’s principles. Like the prodigal son, he lives on the father’s substance without owning this to be the case [Lk 15:11-16]. But as the prodigal was able to live and prosper *in spite of* being a prodigal so also the non-Christian scientist can describe the “uniformities of nature” in spite of his worship of Chance.

GH 243

16m. We readily allow that non-Christian science has done a great work and brought to light much truth. But this truth which science has discovered is in spite of and not because of its fundamental assumption of a chance universe. Non-Christian science has worked with the borrowed capital of Christian theism, and for that reason alone has been able to bring to light much truth.

CTEV 64

17. BOTTOMLESS PIT OF CHANCE, INTO WHICH THE UNBELIEVER WILL THROW ALL THE FACTS OF CHRISTIANITY (AND LOSE THEM); Need to present the philosophy of fact with facts, compare 5, 20, 21, 118 and 124

17a. Let us watch [the self-frustration of the traditional apologist] for a moment. Think of him first as an inductivist. As such he will engage in “historical apologetics” and in the study of archaeology. In general he will deal with the “facts” of the universe in order to prove the existence of God. He cannot on his position challenge the assumption of the man he is trying to win. That man is ready for him. Think of the traditional apologist as throwing facts to his non-Christian friend as he might throw a ball. His friend receives each fact as he might a ball and throws it behind him in a bottomless pit. The apologist is exceedingly industrious. He shows the unbelieving friend all the evidence for theism. He shows all the evidence for Christianity, for instance, for the virgin birth and the resurrection of Christ. Let us think of his friend as absolutely tireless and increasingly polite. He will then receive all these facts and toss them behind him in the bottomless pit of pure possibility. ‘Is it not wonderful,’ he will say, ‘what strange things do happen in Reality. You seem to be a collector of oddities. As for myself I am more interested in the things that happen regularly. But I shall certainly try hard to explain the facts you mention in accord with the laws that I have found working so far. Perhaps we should say that laws are merely statistical averages and that nothing can therefore be said about any particular event ahead of its appearance. Perhaps there are very unusual things in reality. But what does this prove for the truth of your view?’

You see that the unbeliever who does not work on the presupposition of creation and providence is perfectly consistent with himself when he sees nothing to challenge his unbelief even in the fact of the resurrection of Christ. He may be surprised for a moment as a child that grows up is surprised at the strange things of life but then when he has grown up he realizes that “such is life.” Sad to say the traditional Christian apologist has not even asked his unbelieving friend to see the facts for what they really are. He has not presented the facts at all. That is he has not presented the facts as they are according to the Christian way of looking at them and the Christian way of looking at them is the true way of looking at them. Every fact in the universe is what it is by virtue of the place that it has in the plan of God. Man cannot comprehensively know that plan. But he does know that there is such a plan. He must therefore present the facts of theism and of Christianity, of Christian theism, as proving Christian theism because they are intelligible as facts in terms of it and in terms of it alone.

But this is also in effect to say that the Christian apologist should never seek to be an inductivist only. He should present his philosophy of fact with his facts. He does not need to handle less facts in doing so. He will handle the same facts but he will handle them as they ought to be handled.

DF3 203-4

17b. For Mr. Black [an unbeliever], history is something that floats on an infinitely extended and bottomless ocean of Chance. Therefore he can say that *anything* may happen. Who knows but the death and resurrection of Jesus as the Son of God might issue from this womb of Chance? ...

Now the Evangelical [Mr. Grey] does not challenge this underlying philosophy of Chance as it controls the unbeliever’s conception of history. He is so anxious to have the unbeliever accept the possibility of God’s existence and the *fact* of the resurrection of Christ that, if necessary, he will exchange his own philosophy of fact for that of the unbeliever. Anxious to be genuinely “empirical” like the unbeliever, he will throw all the facts of Christianity into the bottomless pit of Chance. Or, rather, he will throw all these facts at the unbeliever, and the unbeliever throws them over his back into the bottomless pit of Chance.

17c. Whether the scientist be subjectivist or realist, so long as he does not start with the doctrine of creation and redemption of Scripture, all factuality is lost in a bottomless pit.

The only alternative there is to the creation and redemption of all factuality by God is the idea of Chance. And the idea of Chance is an ingredient in every form of scientific theory and in every form of philosophical theory not directly based on Scripture.

GH 234

17d. Following Kant, Kierkegaard has shown to evangelical followers of Bishop Butler that all their discussion of factual or historical evidence has no validity for the modern religious thinker. The evangelical may “prove” and prove again that the resurrection of Christ is a historical fact on the assumption that the unbeliever, knowing a historical fact when he sees one, will accept it for what it is. It is as though I were throwing baseballs for you to catch and you catch them all, allowing that they are really baseballs, but throwing them over your shoulder into the bottomless pit of pure contingency.

GDT

18. BRAKES TO THE CART THAT WAS RUNNING HEADLONG FROM THE MOUNTAINTOP TO THE ABYSS – common grace means that God has graciously restrained the evil heart of man and accounts for all the natural good that we see about us

The idea of Common Grace ... is this. According to the scriptures, the immediate and logical result of sin is death [Gen 2:16,17 and Rom 6:23]. But God has graciously put on the brakes to the cart that was running headlong from the mountaintop to the abyss. ... This accounts for all the natural good that we see about us—love of family, friendship, etc. This makes society and State possible. All these activities are therefore attributed to the grace of God and are not credited to man. Deep down in his heart every man is only evil.

ET

19. BRIDGE THAT IS FLOODED IS DRIVEN ACROSS – the trustworthiness of Scripture is based on their original infallible inspiration, though we cannot now see the original autographs

We may perhaps illustrate the difference between a doctrine of scriptural inspiration that holds to this notion of general trustworthiness and the doctrine of Scripture which holds to the infallible inspiration of the *autographa*, though it recognizes the fact that the *autographa* are not in our possession, by thinking of a river that sometimes overflows its banks. Suppose that we are seeking to cross such a river while the flood has gone so high as to cover the bridge. As far as the surface appearance is concerned, we cannot see whether there is a bridge. We have to drive in the water even while we are driving on the bridge. Yet, if there were no bridge, we should certainly not be able to cross that river. We can drive with comparative ease in water that is a few inches deep as long as we have a solid bottom under the water. What the idea of general trustworthiness without infallible inspiration does in effect is to say that it really makes no difference whether there is a solid bottom under us, inasmuch as we have to drive through water in any case. But we have seen that man needs absolutely authoritative interpretation. Hence, if the *autographa* were not infallibly inspired, it would mean that at some point human interpretation would stand above divine interpretation. It would mean that man were, after all, not certain that the facts and the interpretations given to the facts in Scripture are true.

Summing up [about verbal inspiration] then we note that: (a) the human subject was created by God so that it could, by virtue of that fact, be and originally was the perfect medium of the revelation of God; (b) even after the entrance of sin, the human subject remained metaphysically accessible to God so that God could, by virtue of that fact, insert an area of perfect interpretation into the world of false interpretation; (c) God actually did insert such an infallible interpretation, or there would be no true interpretation at all; (d) we are actually crossing the river of life on this bridge of infallible interpretation, even though it be covered (1) objectively, by the loss of the *autographa*, and (2) subjectively, by the inability of any sinner to interpret the truth perfectly to himself.

IST 153-4

20. BUILDING A THREE STORY HOUSE (compare 21) – the procedure in the apologetics of “Old Princeton” (traditional apologetics) is, the first story is built through reason by Roman catholic natural theology, the second by Evangelical protestants who hold to the Bible but who retain the idea of the autonomy, and the third story is built by Calvinists, who add their “five points” , compare 5, 17, 21, 118 and 124

Roman Catholic theology is built up from pre-fabricated sections. The first story is built by reason. Christians and non-Christians first together build a natural theology. They conclude that a god very probably exists.

The second story is built by Evangelical Protestants. They hold to the Bible but still retain the idea of the autonomy of reason to some extent.

The third story is built by Calvinists, who add their “five points” to the doctrines they share with the Romanists (theism) and to the doctrines they share with the Evangelicals against sacerdotalism.

This is the procedure involved in the Apologetics of “old Princeton.” According to it a natural theology is first built up in conjunction with, Romanism. Then the doctrines of Evangelicalism are proved with Evangelicalism against Romanism. Finally the five points are proved against both Evangelicalism and Romanism.

DF1 204-5

21. BUILDING A TWO STORY HOUSE (compare 20) – the first story of traditional apologetics is built by the natural man’s plans or blueprint (reason) and the second on faith (instead build apologetic argument based on Scripture, not autonomous and biased reason, and give facts, etc. in the light of Scripture), compare , compare 5, 17, 20, 21, 118 and 124

21a. Both [Warfield and Bavinck] view the place of Scripture as imbedded in their total outlook on life. They do not build the first story of their house by reason in order then to add a second story built by faith. Their outlook on life is a living whole. For convenience we speak of this total outlook on reality as a world and life view.

PDS 103

21b. The Christian holds his life and world view because God says it is true; the philosopher holds his life and world view because or in so far as he finds it to be true. Christianity is based on authority while philosophy is based on reason and ne’er the twain shall meet.

Roman Catholics have a way of escaping this dilemma. Broadly speaking their life and world view is built up of pre-fabricated materials. The first story of the house is moulded and patterned by reason. It is set upon a foundation that has also been tested by reason. The second story of the house is moulded and patterned by authority. This second story is set upon the first by force. By a good deal of twisting and wrenching it is made to fit onto the first. Looking from a distance one might think that the resulting edifice forms a fairly unified whole.

But on looking closely one sees that the second story has been badly damaged in order to make it fit onto the first. For the god whose existence is proved by reason is the sort of god that Aristotle believes in, namely a finite god. And a finite god is no god at all from the Christian point of view. It is no wonder that the God whose attributes are set forth by authority (the second story) is not the sovereign God of Scripture at all. He is a god already adjusted to the false requirements of a reason that thinks itself independent of Him.

Unfortunately many Protestants to a large degree follow the Romanist method of combining authority and reason.

... Does [the] procedure of Carnell’s differ from that of Rome? Not essentially. In both cases the foundation of the house is laid by reason apart from and prior to revelation. In both cases the second story is artificially and by main force made to fit onto the first. “Bring on your revelations! Let them make peace with the law of contradiction and the facts of history, and they will deserve a rational man’s assent.” (*An Introduction to Christian Apologetics*, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1948.)

CP

21c. The proper attitude of reason to the authority of Scripture, then, is but typical of the proper attitude of reason to the whole of the revelation of God. The objects man must seek to know are always of such a nature as God asserts they are. God’s revelation is always authoritarian. This is true of his revelation in nature no less than of his revelation in Scripture. The truly scientific method, the method which alone can expect to make true progress in learning, is therefore such a method as seeks simply to think God’s thoughts after him.

When these matters are kept in mind, it will be seen clearly that the true method for any Protestant with respect to the Scripture (Christianity) and with respect to the existence of God (theism) must be the indirect method of reasoning by presupposition. In fact it then appears that the argument for the Scripture as the infallible revelation of God is, to all intents and purposes, the same as the argument for the existence of God. Protestants are required by the most basic principles of their system to vindicate the existence of no other God than the one who has spoken in Scripture. But this God cannot be proved to exist by any other method than the indirect one of presupposition. No proof for this God and for the truth of his revelation in Scripture can be offered by an appeal to anything in human experience that has not itself received its light from the God whose existence and whose revelation it is supposed to prove. ...

Now the Roman Catholic is not committed to any such doctrine of Scripture as has been expressed above. He can therefore build up his apologetics by the direct method. He can, as has already been shown, to a large extent agree with the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] in his conception of both the starting point and the method of human knowledge. He can

therefore join the non-Christian in his search for the existence or non-existence of God by the use of reason without any reference to Scripture. That is, he and the natural man can seek to build up theism quite independently of Christianity. Then when the Romanist has, together with his friend the natural man, built the first story of the house to the satisfaction of both, he will ask his friend to help in building the second story, the story of Christianity. He will assure his friend that he will use the same principles of construction for the second story that they, have together employed in their common construction of the first story. The second story is, according to Rome, to be sure, the realm of faith and of authority. But then this authority is but that of the expert. Rome knows of no absolute authority such as Protestantism has in its doctrine of Scripture. Rome's authority is the authority of those who are experts in what they say are reported to be the oracles of God. These oracles receive their authoritative illumination from the expert interpreters of them, from the Pope first of all. ... So then the natural man need not really object, even from his own point of view, to the presentation of supernatural revelation as it is offered to him by the Roman Catholic apologist.

If the Roman Catholic method of apologetic for Christianity is followed then Christianity itself must be so reduced as to make it acceptable to the natural man. Since Rome is more than willing to grant the essential correctness of the starting point and method of the natural man in the "realm of nature" he cannot logically object to the conclusion of the natural man with respect to supernatural reality. The natural man need only to reason consistently along the lines of his starting point and method in order to reduce each of the Christian doctrines that are presented to him to naturalistic proportions.

As for the Arminian way of reasoning, it is, as already noted, essentially the same as that of Rome. The method followed by Bishop Butler follows closely that of Thomas Aquinas. According to Butler some of those who have no belief in or knowledge of Christianity at all have, none the less, quite rightly interpreted the "course and constitution of nature." The cave has already been lit up by means of light that was not derived from the sun. By the use of the empirical method those who make no pretense of listening to Scripture are said or assumed to have interpreted nature for what it really is. It is no wonder then that the contents of Scripture too must be adjusted to the likes of the natural man. He will not accept them otherwise. And Butler is anxious to win him. So he says to him: "Reason can, and it ought to judge, not only of the meaning, but also of the morality and the evidence, of revelation. First, it is the province of reason to judge of the morality of Scripture; i.e., not whether it contains things different from what we should have expected from a wise, just, and good Being; for objections from hence have now been obviated; but whether it contains things plainly contradictory to wisdom, justice, or goodness-to what the light of nature teaches us of God." (*The Works of Bishop Butler*, edited by W. E. Gladstone, New York, 1896, Vol. 1, p. 238.) Since even in the interpretation of "nature" the natural man must and does himself admit that he cannot allow everything, he can certainly, without compromising himself in the least, allow that what Scripture claims about "supernatural" things may *probably* be true. ...

It appears then that as Arminianism together with Roman Catholicism is willing to join the natural man in his supposedly neutral starting point and method, so also Arminianism is forced to pay for these concessions by having the natural man to some extent dictate to him what sort of Christianity he may or may not believe. If the natural man is given permission to draw the floor-plan for a house and is allowed to build the first story of the house in accordance with his own blueprint, the Christian cannot escape being controlled in a large measure by the same blueprint when he wants to take over the building of the second story of the house. ... Each time the Arminian presents to the natural man one of the doctrines of Christianity, the natural man gladly accepts it and then "naturalizes" it.

DF3 108-12

21d. When Mr. Carnell [a Mr. Grey—a Christian with an Evangelical apologetic method] instructs his readers "How Every Christian Can Defend His Faith," he first appeals to facts and to logic as independent sources of information about the truth of Christianity. Of course, he must bring in the Bible even at this point. But the Bible is brought in only as a book of information about the fact of what has historically been called Christianity. It is not from the beginning brought in as God's Word. It must be shown to Mr. Black [an unbeliever]: to be the Word of God by means of "facts" and "logic" Carnell would thus avoid at all costs the charge of reasoning in a circle. ...

Carnell ... says: "If you are of a philosophic turn, you can point to the remarkable way in which Christianity fits in with the moral sense inherent in every human being, or the influence of Christ on our ethics, customs, literature, art and music. Finally, you can draw upon your own experience in speaking of the reality of answered prayer and the witness of the Spirit in your own heart.... If the person is impressed with this evidence, turn at once to the gospel. Read crucial passages and permit the Spirit to work on the inner recesses of his heart. Remember that apologetics is merely a preparation. After the ground has been broken, proceed immediately with sowing and watering." (*Moody Monthly*, January 1950, p. 313.) ...

Of course, Mr. Black will be greatly impressed with such an argument as Mr. Grey has presented to him for the truth of Christianity. In fact, if Christianity is thus shown to be in accord with the moral nature of man, as Mr. Black himself sees that moral nature, then Mr. Black does not need to be converted at all to accept Christianity. He only needs to accept something additional to what he has always believed. He has been shown how nice it would be to have a second story built on top of the house which he has already built according to his own plans.

To be sure, the Evangelical intends no such thing. Least of all does Carnell intend such a thing. But why then does not the "Evangelical" see that by presenting the non-Christian with Evangelicalism rather than with the Reformed Faith

he must compromise the Christian religion? And why does he not also see that in doing what he does the non-Christian is not really challenged either by fact or by logic? For facts and logic which are not themselves first seen in the light of Christianity have, in the nature of the case, no power in them to challenge the unbeliever to change his position. Facts and logic, not based upon the creation doctrine and not placed in the context of the doctrine of God's all-embracing Providence, are without relation to one another and therefore wholly meaningless.

It is this fact which must be shown to Mr. Black. The folly of holding to any view of life except that which is frankly based upon the Bible as the absolute authority for man must be pointed out to him. Only then are we doing what Paul did when he said: "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?" (1 Cor 1:20).

DF3 227-230

21e. Surely then ... believers ... must make every thought captive to the obedience of Christ [2 Cor 10:5]. This must be done in the field of philosophy and in the field of science as well as in the field of theology. And one cannot really be fully subject to the Word of God in Christ in theology unless one is also subject to the same Word of Christ in all of his thinking. The whole personality of man, in every aspect of its expression, must submit itself to the revelation of God. There must be no more working up of philosophy in terms of the autonomy of man. There must be no more working in the laboratory in the interest of the development of science in terms of the autonomy of man. There must be no more natural theology that serves as a first story to the second story of a revealed theology. There must be no more appeal to the independent significance of the course of history, even in the interest of proving that Christianity is "true." There must be a frank admission that the basic view of man and of his work as created, redeemed and directed by the triune God is taken from Scripture as the final and finished revelation of God in Christ to sinners.

CC

21f. [There is a] consequence of a generally evangelical rather than a frankly Calvinistic Apologetic ... If we allow that the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] is not basically wrong in his interpretation of one dimension of life we cannot logically maintain that he is basically wrong in his interpretation of any dimension of life. If we allow the legitimacy of the natural man's principle of interpretation in things "phenomenal" we cannot deny the legitimacy of that principle when he seeks merely to extend it to things he calls noumenal. If physics can be rightly interpreted without God, theology can too. The non-Christian and the Christian have each of them a blueprint. The non-Christian's blueprint makes everything revolve about man as an end in himself, the Christian's blueprint makes everything revolve about God as an end in Himself. We must build the whole house of interpretation according to the one or according to the other. But an evangelical Apologetic seeks to build the first story according to the non-Christian's and the second story according to the Christian's blueprint. The second story is bound to suffer most from the adjustment that must be made.

Hammond ... hopes to attach the second story of revelation onto the first story of Reason. ...

He longs to have the second story of his house built according to the Christian's blueprint. But he is the victim of his own method. Desiring to see men make every thought captive to the Word of the one great Prophet, his method makes provision merely for a salute to the "prophets of humanity."

RRF

22. BUZZ-SAW: WHETHER A BUZZ-SAW WILL CUT IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION DEPENDS UPON ITS SET AND THE MAN OPERATING IT – reason is a keen tool but it functions wrongly in fallen man's set of sinful human personality, so an unbelieving person will certainly assume the position of judge with respect to the credibility and evidence of revelation, whilst a believer's reason has already been changed in its set by regeneration and cannot then be the judge

22a. ... according to Calvin, there is no "disturbance" in the nature of man as he comes forth from the hands of God. The "disturbance" has come in as the result of sin. Accordingly every one of fallen man's functions operates wrongly. The set of the whole human personality has changed. The intellect of fallen man may, as such, be keen enough. It can therefore formally understand the Christian position. It may be compared to a buzz-saw that is sharp and shining, ready to cut the boards that come to it. Let us say that a carpenter wishes to cut fifty boards for the purpose of laying the floor of a house. He has marked his boards. He has set his saw. He begins at one end of the mark on the board. But he does not know that his seven-year-old son has tampered with the saw and changed its set. The result is that every board he saws is cut slantwise and thus unusable because too short except at the point where the saw first made its contact with the wood. As long as the set of the saw is not changed the result will always be the same. So also whenever the teachings of Christianity are presented to the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] they will be cut according to the set of sinful human personality. The keener the intellect the more consistently will the truths of Christianity be cut according to an exclusively immanentistic pattern. The result is that however much they may formally understand the truth of Christianity, men still worship "the dream and figment of their own heart." (Calvin's *Institutes* I.4.1). They have what Hodge calls "mere cognition," but no true knowledge of God.

22b. To use once again the illustration of the saw: the saw is in itself but a tool. Whether it will move at all and whether it will cut in the right direction depends upon the man operating it. So also reason, or intellect, is always the instrument of a person. And the person employing it is always either a believer or an unbeliever. If he is a believer, his reason has already been changed in its set, as Hodge has told us, by regeneration. It cannot then be the judge; it is now a part of the regenerated person, gladly subject to the authority of God. It has by God's grace permitted itself to be interpreted by God's revelation. If, on the other hand, the person using his reason is an unbeliever, then this person, using his reason, will certainly assume the position of judge with respect to the credibility and evidence of revelation, but he will also certainly find the Christian religion incredible because impossible and the evidence for it is always inadequate.

DF3 81-2

23. CANCER DIAGNOSIS NOT WANTED BY MAN WITH CANCER, BUT GOOD DOCTOR SAYS AN OPERATION IS NEEDED; GIVE CORRECT DIAGNOSIS – man does not want to hear what he knows, that he is responsible to God, and the doctor will tell him he needs spiritual heart surgery; Compare 36, 80 and 143

23a. Deep down in his mind every man knows that he is the creature of God and responsible to God. Every man, at bottom, knows that he is a covenant-breaker. But every man acts and talks as though this were not so. It is the one point that cannot bear mentioning in his presence. A man may have internal cancer. Yet it may be the one point he will not have one speak of in his presence. He will grant that he is not feeling well. He will accept any sort of medication so long as it does not pretend to be given in answer to a cancer diagnosis. Will a good doctor cater to him on this matter? Certainly not. He will tell his patient that he has promise of life, but promise of life on one condition, that is, of an immediate internal operation. So it is with the sinner.

DF3 94

23b. The conception of man as entertained by modern thought in general cannot be assumed to be the same as that set forth in Scripture. It is therefore imperative that the Christian apologist be alert to the fact that the average person to whom he must present the Christian religion for acceptance is a quite different sort of being than he himself thinks he is. A good doctor will not prescribe medicines according to the diagnosis that his patient has made of himself. The patient may think that he needs nothing more than a bottle of medicine while the doctor knows that an immediate operation is required.

DF3 68

23c. Jesus tells Nicodemus, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). Shall I join blind men to see whether Jesus is right when he says "I am the light of the world"? [John 8:12] Shall the surgeon rely exclusively on the diagnosis the dying patient gives of himself? Did Jesus say to Lazarus that if he did his best he would give him a lift so that together they would get him out of his grave?

ATBG 21

24. CARBOLIC ACID POURED INTO WATER BOTTLES WITHOUT A CHANGE OF LABEL – retention of orthodox Christian forms but not theology

There is perhaps no instance of greater intellectual confusion to be found in the annals of human error than that of the retention of orthodox Christian forms by a purely naturalistic theology such as Modernism is. It is as though carbolic acid were poured into water bottles without a change of label.

NM

25. CARS GOING IN THE WRONG DIRECTION WITH WRONG SIGNS, SO AT THE SERVICE STATION WIPE OUT THE SIGNS AND TELL THEM THEY ARE GOING THE WRONG WAY THAT LEADS TO THE PRECIPICE – the Reformed apologist challenges his opponent to a duel of life and death from the start

The Reformed apologist throws down the gauntlet and challenges his opponent to a duel of life and death from the start. He does not first travel in the same direction and in the same automobile with the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] for some distance in order then mildly to suggest to the driver that they ought perhaps to change their course somewhat and follow a road that goes at a different slant from the one they are on. The Reformed apologist knows that there is but one way

to the truth and that the natural man is travelling it, but in the wrong direction. The service stations along the highway will service cars going in either direction. And as there are seemingly more cars going in the wrong direction than there are going in the right direction, the upkeep of the road will be supplied largely by those going in the wrong direction. Speaking together at one of these service stations, two travellers going in opposite directions may be in perfect agreement when they eulogize the turnpike on which they are travelling and the premium quality of gasoline which they are getting. But like Bunyan's Christian the Reformed apologist will tell his friend that the way he is going leads to the precipice. He points to the signs made by the builder of the road which all point the opposite way from that which his friend, the natural man, is going. And when the reply is made by the natural man that he has been very successful in his trip so far, and that he too has been following signs, signs which point in the direction in which he is moving, the Reformed apologist will wipe out such of these signs as are near at hand and will challenge his friend to wipe out any of the signs he has ignored.

DF3 113

26. CHAINS ABOUT THE NATURAL MAN'S NECK WHO SEES SHADOWS ONLY – from the ultimate point of view the natural man knows nothing truly

... *the absolute ethical antithesis* in which the "natural man" [1 Cor 2:14] stands to God ... implies that he knows nothing truly as he ought to know it. It means, therefore, that the "natural man" is not only basically mistaken in his notions about religion and God, but is as basically mistaken in his notions about the atoms and the laws of gravitation. From this ultimate point of view the "natural man" knows nothing truly. He has chains about his neck and sees shadows only. [Van Til is here referring to "Plato's famous allegory of the cave [in which] the dwellers of this cave had chains about their necks and on their legs. They saw nothing but shadows and attributed echoes to these shadows" DF3 86]

IST 26

27. CHILD ASKING WHETHER HE HAS PARENTS – doubting evidence and proof for God; Compare 125

27a. The whole universe is lit up by God. Scripture requires men to accept its interpretation of history as true without doubt. Doubt of this ... is as unreasonable as a child asking whether he has parents and, after looking at the evidence, concluding that he *probably* has!

RP 32-3

27b. For man to reflect on his own awareness of meaning and then merely to say that a higher power, *a* god, exists, is in effect to say that God does not exist. It is as though a child, reflecting upon his home environment would conclude that *a* father or *a* mother exist.

DF3 85

27c. When fallen man ... asks whether he is created in the image of God, his question is, in one sense, meaningless. Yet, in the last analysis, it is worse than meaningless. It is an insult to God. A child who asks *whether* his parents, with whom he has lived from birth, are his parents is not neutral in relation to his parents. He insults them. It is only as a covenant-breaker that man asks *whether* the triune God of Scripture exists.

CTK 263

27d. To all intents and purposes the "proofs" constitute an attack on the clarity of God's revelation in the created universe. A child in a home need not and cannot seek to *prove* the existence of his father. If he knows himself at all in any proper sense, this child knows himself as a child of his father. The prodigal son of the parable was what he was because he was constantly trying to make himself believe that he was not the son of his father [Lk 15:11-17].

CGG 215-6

28. CHILD ON FATHER'S LAP SLAPPING HIS FACE – Antitheism presupposes Theism (also see 1 and 42) because, the unbeliever, as a creature, needs God the creator and providential controller of the universe, in order to oppose this God; Even to negate Christ, those who hate Him must be borne up by Him; Unbelievers rejection of Christianity is based on Christianity

28a. Since the Christian must seek to win the non-Christian, it is he who should first be ready to think himself sympathetically into the position of the party he is trying to win. He therefore listens patiently to all the objections that

the non-Christian has against the Christian position. But he at once sees that all these objections rest upon one fundamental assumption, the assumption of man's ultimacy. And therefore the real question between the two positions has not even been touched unless it be asked upon what foundation the non-Christian can make his objections to Christianity intelligible. On what foundation rest the guns which he directs against the Christian position?

When this question is considered, it appears that this placement is the truth of Christianity itself. In other words, the non-Christian needs the truth of the Christian religion in order to attack it. As a child needs to sit on the lap of its father in order to slap the father's face, so the unbeliever, as a creature, needs God the Creator and providential controller of the universe in order to oppose this God. Without this God, the place on which he stands does not exist. He cannot stand in a vacuum.

ECE 89

28b. ... I believe that a Christian apologist must place himself for argument's sake upon the position of the non-believer and point out to him that he has to presuppose the truth of the Christian position even to oppose it. I saw a little girl one day on a train sitting on the lap of her "daddy" slapping him in the face. If the "daddy" had not held her on his lap she would not have been able to slap him.

JA 98

28c. Even to negate Christ, those who hate Him must be borne up by Him. A three year old child may slap its father in his face only because the father holds it up on his knee.

TRA 20

28d. I once saw a little girl sitting on her daddy's lap on a train, She slapped her daddy in the face. She could not have done so if she had not been held by her daddy on his knee. No one can even ask questions about God or deny his existence unless God, the Triune God of Scripture, is present to his conscience, however deep this conscience be covered over by his false attempts at an interpretation of life.

DMT

28e. The ultimate source of truth in any field rests in [Christ]. The world may discover much truth without owning Christ as Truth. Christ upholds even those who ignore, deny, and oppose him. A little child may slap his father in the face, but it can do so only because the father holds it on his knee. So modern science, modern philosophy, and modern theology may discover much truth. Nevertheless, if the universe were not created and redeemed by Christ no man could give himself an intelligible account of anything. It follows that in order to perform their task aright the scientist and the philosopher as well as the theologian need Christ.

CFC

29. COLORLESS SUIT OF NEUTRALITY WHICH SIMPLY COVERS A NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD GOD

To be "without bias" is only to have a particular *kind* of bias. The idea of "neutrality" is simply a colorless suit that covers a negative attitude toward God. At least it ought to be plain that he who is not *for* the God of Christianity is *against* Him.

WIB 7-8

30. COMMANDER OF A BATTLESHIP DOES NOT TALK MUCH ABOUT AREAS THAT HE HAS IN COMMON WITH AN ENEMY SUBMARINE, NOR DOES HE LEAVE ONE AREA OF THE ENEMY SUBMARINE UNMOLESTED – challenge the basic assumption of human autonomy at every point, compare 97

If, then, Christian believers want their faith to survive and if, not satisfied with that, they want every thought brought captive to the obedience of Christ [2 Cor 10:5], they must needs challenge the basic assumption of human autonomy that controls the various philosophers in all that they say. The commander of a battleship does not talk much about areas that he has in common with an enemy submarine. For it is with events that he deals. He therefore sends a depth charge at first sight of the submarine. Nor does he leave one area of the submarine unmolested. He cannot even do that. His own argument, once employed, is as it were, beyond his control. Christians, in challenging the basic assumption of modern philosophy and science, must deal with trees as well as with miracles. For if trees are what modern philosophy and science say they are, miracles cannot be what Christians say they are. ... It is therefore only if the basic assumption of modern philosophy and science is challenged at every point that it can be effectively challenged at any point.

To challenge the basic assumption of modern philosophy and science is to point out that on its basis experience runs into hopeless confusion.

CMT

31. COUNTING NEEDS A NUMERICAL SYSTEM AS A WHOLE TO TELL ONE NUMBER FROM ANOTHER – without the existence of God as a system there would be no probable relation between any set of facts

The point with respect to this matter of counting is that unless there were a numerical system as a whole we could not tell one number from another. If we are to add information to our store of knowledge, we need the system of knowledge in order to relate a new fact to the system of facts already known. ...

Without the existence of God as a system there would be no probable relation between any set of facts, none even between two facts.

CTEV 41-2

32. CRIMINAL WHO HAS COMMITTED HIGH TREASON – man’s response to revelation after the entrance of sin; Necessity for a special revelation and the work of the Holy Spirit to change man from this state of rebellion to a state of obedience

... if we include the original subjective condition of man in the very concept of revelation, we see that man was originally in possession of the truth and of a true reaction to the truth. It is this that is the basis for a proper concept of a point of contact for the gospel in the mind of the natural man [1 Cor 2:14]. Man’s condition after the entrance of sin is, therefore, not that of a poor innocent man, but that of a criminal who has committed high treason. Thus the necessity for a special revelation lies primarily in the subjective rebellion of man. The special revelation that must be given to man, if he is to be saved, must consist not only of the “objective” work of Christ in his death and resurrection, but also result in a subjective change from this state of rebellion to a state of obedience. The work of the Holy Spirit in granting regeneration to God’s people is therefore implied in the work of Christ. The presentation of an objective revelation, that is, a revelation outside of man alone, would in itself be worse than useless.

IST 111

33. DENTIST DRILLS TO THE NERVE OF THE MATTER – expose human autonomy and bias and say only the great Physician can make you see facts as they are, compare 34

I see you are yawning. Let us stop to eat supper now. For there is one more point in this connection that I must make. You have no doubt at some time in your life been to a dentist. A dentist drills a little deeper and then a little deeper and at last comes to the nerve of the matter. ...

For what you have really done in your handling of the evidence for belief in God, is to set yourself up as God. You have made the reach of your intellect, the standard of what is possible or not possible. You have thereby virtually determined that you intend never to meet a fact that points to God. Facts, to be facts at all—facts, that is, with decent scientific and philosophic standing—must have your stamp instead of that of God upon them as their virtual creator. ...

Nor do I pretend, of course, that once you have been brought face to face with this condition, you can change your attitude. No more than the Ethiopian can change his skin or the leopard his spots can you change your attitude. You have cemented your colored glasses to your face so firmly that you cannot even take them off when you sleep. Freud has not even had a glimpse of the sinfulness of sin as it controls the human heart. Only the great Physician through His blood atonement on the Cross and by the gift of His Spirit can take those colored glasses off and make you see facts as they are, facts as evidence, as inherently compelling evidence, for the existence of God. ...

The prodigal thought he had clean escaped from the father’s influence. In reality the father controlled the “far country” to which the prodigal had gone. So it is in reasoning. True reasoning about God is such as stands upon God as upon the emplacement that alone gives meaning to any sort of human argument. And such reasoning, we have a right to expect, will be used of God to break down the one-horse chaise of human autonomy.

WIB 15,17-18

34. DENTISTRY OF THE REFORMED APOLOGIST IS TO DRILL OUT AND REPLACE THE ENTIRE TOOTH DECAY OF CREATURE WORSHIPPERS – man is spiritually dead in sin and needs the light of Scripture and Christ, compare 33

34a. We have now, with our young pastor, looked into the various methods of defending Christianity. Our young

pastor has seen that cooperative efforts in presenting and defending Christianity are impossible for there is only one consistent Christianity and only one consistent defense of it. He has also noted the radical difference which exists between the world-views of Christians and non-Christians. In the following section, we shall attempt to illustrate these points in the form of a dialogue among two Christians—one Reformed and the other Arminian—and a non-Christian.

We have first the non-Christian, who worships the creature rather than the Creator. We shall call him Mr. Black. Mr. Black may be a very “decent” sort of man. By God’s common grace he may do much that is “good.” Even so he is, as long as he remains in his unconverted state, black in the sight of God.

On the other hand we have a representative of those who have, by the grace of God, become worshipers of the Creator-Redeemer, called Mr. White. Mr. White is far from what, judging him by his name, we should expect him to be. But he is washed in the blood of the Lamb [Rev 7:14]. *In Christ* he is whiter than snow [Is 1:18]. Mr. White is the Reformed Christian.

But, strangely enough, there is a third party, an Arminian, called Mr. Grey. Of course, *in Christ* Mr. Grey is as white as is Mr. White. Mr. Grey thinks that Mr. White is too severe in his evaluation of Mr. Black. Mr. Black is not all *that black*. It is not pedagogically wise to require of Mr. Black that he make a complete about-face. Surely no such complete revolution is necessary in the field of science and in the field of philosophy. Many of Mr. Black’s followers have valiantly defended the existence of God against materialism, atheism, and positivism. Even in theology many of these disciples of Mr. Black have sprung to the defense of God when he was attacked by the God-is-dead theologians. Mr. Grey, therefore typifies the Aquinas-Butler method of defending Christianity.

Let us now note the difference between the way Mr. White and the way Mr. Grey approach the unbeliever, Mr. Black, with the gospel of Christ.

Let us say that Mr. Black has a toothache. Both Mr. White and Mr. Grey are dentists. Mr. White believes in a radical methodology. He believes that Mr. Black should have all the decayed matter removed from his tooth before the filling is put in. Mr. Grey is a very kind-hearted man. He does not want to hurt Mr. Black. Accordingly, he does not want to drill too deeply. He will, therefore, take only a part of the decayed matter out of the tooth and then fill it.

Naturally Mr. Black thinks this is marvelous. Unfortunately, Mr. Black’s tooth soon begins to decay again. He goes back to Mr. Grey. But Mr. Grey can never bring himself to do anything radical. As a consequence he is never able to resolve Mr. Black’s toothache problem.

Let us now suppose that instead of coming to Mr. Grey, Mr. Black had gone to the office of Mr. White. Mr. White is radical, very radical. He uses the X-ray machine to diagnose Mr. Black’s condition. He drills deeply. All of the tooth decay is removed. The tooth is filled. Mr. Black never need return. This simple illustration points out a basic truth.

The Bible says that man is spiritually dead in sin. The Reformed creeds speak of man’s total depravity. The only cure for this spiritual deadness is his regeneration by the Holy Spirit on the basis of the atoning death of Christ. It is therefore by means of the light that Scripture sheds on the natural man’s [1 Cor 2:14] condition that Mr. White examines all his patients. Mr. White may also, to be sure, turn on the light of experience, but he always insists that this light of experience derives, in the first place, from the light of Scripture. So he may appeal to reason or to history, but, again, only as they are to be seen in the light of the Bible. He does not even look for *corroboration* of the teachings of Scripture in experience, reason, or history, except insofar as these are themselves first seen in the light of the Bible. For him, the Bible, and therefore the God of the Bible, is like the sun from which the light that is given by oil lamps, gas lamps, and electric lights is derived.

RP 36-38

34b. ... it may be said that the Reformed apologist *does* while the Romanist-evangelical apologist *does not* make the Creator-creature distinction basic in all that he says about anything. ...

Of course, the reason why the one type of apologetics *does* and the other *does not* wish to make the Creator-creature distinction basic at the outset of all predication is to be found in the differing conceptions of sin. The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] does not want to make the Creator-creature distinction basic in his thought. The sinner does not want to recognize the fact that he is a creature of God, and as such responsible to God, and because of his sin under the judgment of God. This is to be expected. But why should Christians who have confessed their sins to God, who have therefore recognized him as Creator and Lord, and especially why should evangelicals who confess that they hold to the Bible as their only infallible rule of authority, not wish to bring their every thought captive to the obedience of Christ [2 Cor 10:5]. In other words, how do you account for the fact that evangelicals carry into their theology and into their apologetics so much foreign material? It is, of course, because of their defective view of sin. In fact, their defective view of sin is itself of foreign origin. ...

To see clearly what is meant, think of a dentist. You go to him with a “bad tooth.” Does he take care of your tooth in two operations? To be sure, you may have to come back to have him finish the job. But it is one job he is doing. He takes all the decayed matter out before he fills the cavity. Well, Mr. Black [an unbeliever] is the man with the toothache, and you, as a Reformed Christian, are the dentist. Would you first convert him to Evangelicalism and then to the Reformed Faith? Then you would be like a dentist who would today take half the decayed matter out and fill the cavity, and tomorrow or next week take out the rest of the decayed matter and fill the cavity again. Or, rather, you would be like the dentist who takes part of the decayed matter out, fills the cavity, and then lets the patient go until a long time

later he returns complaining again of a toothache.

Indeed, it is no fun to have the dentist drill deep into your tooth. And it is the last and deepest drilling that hurts most. So Mr. Black is likely to feel more at home in the office of the “evangelical” dentist than in the office of the “Reformed” dentist. Will the latter have any customers? He is likely to fear that he will not. He is ever tempted, therefore, to advertise that he is cooperating with all good “conservatives” in all good dentistry, but that he has a specialty which it would be very nice for people to see him about.

DF3 224-6

35. DIVER DIVING OFF DIVING BOARD – immediate and temporary starting point are facts, whilst the ultimate starting point and foundation is God

As a help to clarification of this subject we may perhaps suggest a distinction between an *immediate* and an *ultimate* starting point. By an immediate starting point is meant the place where the knowledge of facts must begin. It is of course quite consistent with a theistic position to say that we must start with the “facts” as that term is understood ordinarily. Neither Augustine nor Calvin would have objected to saying that knowledge of self was their immediate and temporary starting point. But when the question of an ultimate starting point is raised the matter is different. In that case Augustine and Calvin would both have to say that their ultimate starting point is God. That is, they could intelligently think of their own non-existence but were unable to think intelligently of God’s nonexistence. The difference may perhaps be brought out by the analogy of a diving board. Suppose a diver was standing on the tip of a diving board and that all that he could see of the diving board was the very tip on which he was standing. Suppose further that all that he could see around him was water. Now if he should say that the very spot from which he was about to make his leap is his starting point he might mean either of two things. If we thought of him as unaware of the connection of the point on which he was standing with the foundation on which it rested he would be speaking of that particular spot as the permanent or ultimate starting point. On the other hand, if he were fully aware of the fact that the tip of the diving board is only a tip of a board that rests upon a solid rock under water, he might speak of that tip as a starting point but only as an immediate starting point. The real and ultimate starting point for him would be the foundation on which the whole diving board was resting. Similarly we may say that the question at issue is not that of what is the immediate starting point. All agree that the immediate starting point must be that of our everyday experience and the “facts” that are most close at hand.

SCE 120

36. DOCTOR MEETS TRUE NEED OF AN UNWELL MAN THOUGH THIS PATIENT DID NOT KNOW HOW GREAT HIS NEED WAS UNTIL HE MET THIS DOCTOR – through general revelation and the reaction to it the sinner shows some sense of need but by the gospel of Christ he sees the need of escape from eternal death, compare 23, 71 and 80; Point of contact, also see 7, 61, 71 and 108

... men do not know their need; they have only a vague sense of lack. However, seeing that the gospel not only makes an external offer, but also includes the work of the Holy Spirit with his regenerating power, men, through the gospel itself, see the need of escape from eternal death. When they see this they also see that Christ has supplied their need. Then Christ finds them, but then they have first become new creatures before they have realized this fact. To use an illustration from medical science, we may suppose that a man feels that there is something wrong with him, not thinking that it is serious at all. He goes to see his doctor because his appetite is somewhat low and his energy is waning. The doctor, to the man’s great surprise, tells him that he is a child of death because a fatal disease is rapidly eating him away. At the same time the doctor tells him there is a medicine that will cure him. The patient did not see that the medicine of the doctor met his need because he did not know how great his need was until he met this doctor.

Though we must be careful in the use of analogies we may say that through general revelation and the reaction to it the sinner as the patient shows some sense of need. He is something like the patient who knew that there was something wrong with him, and who was to that extent willing to have the doctor analyze him. The world is, as a matter of fact, under the curse of God and, in their suppressed sense of deity, men have knowledge of this fact, as they have of the fact that God is the creator of the universe.

IST 121

37. DRAWING CIRCLES IN A VOID – knowledge without bringing in a God, contrast 3

The only alternative then to bringing in a God who testifies of himself and upon whose testimony we are wholly dependent, is not to bring in God at all. And not to bring in God at all spells nothing but utter ruin for knowledge. In that case knowledge may be said to be reduced to the pass of drawing circles in a void.

SCE 202

38. DROPS OF WATER IN THE OCEAN WOULD BE INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM ONE ANOTHER BY THE NAKED EYE – without the presupposition of the truth of Christian theism no fact can be distinguished from any other fact

Christian theism must be presented as that light in terms of which any proposition about any fact receives meaning. Without the presupposition of the truth of Christian theism no fact can be distinguished from any other fact. ... even the mere counting of particular things presupposes a system of truth of which these particulars form a part. Without such a system of truth there would be no distinguishable difference between one particular and another. They would be as impossible to distinguish from one another as the millions of drops of water in the ocean would be indistinguishable from one another by the naked eye.

DF3 116

39. DROWNING MEN IN THE SEA CANNOT RIGHTLY DETERMINE WHETHER THE SHIP IS SEAWORTHY – critics of the inspiration of Scripture do not have the epistemological foundation on which to stand on, to raise their objection, also see 76 and 98

If science comes with facts that are supposedly inconsistent with such a high view [of the plenary inspiration of Scriptures as the work of the Holy Spirit making the Scriptures the very Word of God], Warfield could ask his critics to show him the epistemological foundation on which they stand when they raise their objection. Can they, on their foundation, even have any such thing as an intelligible philosophy of fact? Why did Warfield allow that those who are in fact drowning next to the ship on which he is sailing can rightly determine whether the ship is seaworthy? If those who raise objection to his high view of Scripture speak of contradictions that are found in it, he should ask them to show him the foundation in reality on which their philosophy of logic rests. If they answer that logic is logic and has nothing to do with reality, he can ignore what they say. If they say that the law of contradiction is not merely a formal law but determines what is possible or impossible in reality, he can show that only the truth of Christianity furnishes a foundation for the laws of logic. On any non-Christian basis, logic, to be effective in relation to reality, must reduce this reality to blank identity.

PDS 62

40. DWELLERS ON A LITTLE ISLAND DECLARE THEIR INDEPENDENCE AND CLAIM THAT THEY WERE THE ONLY PEOPLE ON THE FACE OF THE GLOBE, BUT THEY HAVE NOT VISITED THE WHOLE EXPANSE OF THE UNIVERSE – the evolutionist makes the universal negative statement, that there is no God, also see 106 and compare 88

... the evolutionist has to make and does make a universal negative conclusion on the basis of a little stream of experience. When he takes for granted that anything happens by chance, he really takes for granted that everything happens by chance. He thus negates God. He says in effect that there cannot be a judgment coming.

... how could the dwellers on a little island declare their independence and claim that they were the only people on the face of the globe, unless they had gone far and wide over the whole expanse of the universe?

JGC2

41. EGG FRYING: THE EGG DOES NOT HAVE TO JUMP INTO THE FRYING PAN OF ITS OWN ACCORD TO BE TELEOLOGICAL BUT MAN FRIES THE EGG SO THAT HE MAY BE WELL NOURISHED AND THUS ENABLED TO LIVE HIS LIFE TELEOLOGICALLY, THAT IS, TO THE GLORY OF GOD – the end of all created things exists in the mind of God before the things exist, including the frying of an egg

... the end of all created things exists in the mind of God before the things exist. God is not the *Vis a Terge* [force from behind] and the *Terminus ad Quem* [finishing point] to which the finite facts are vaguely drawn. In that case the egg would have to jump into the frying pan of its own accord if it were to be teleological. But if self-consciously created man takes the phenomena of the created world and manipulates them to the glory of God, it is quite possible to say that the category of teleology applies to the frying of the egg. The man fries the egg so that he may be well nourished and thus enabled to live his life teleologically, that is, to the glory of God. If things are thought of as organically teleological, all the debates about the relative areas of causation and teleology fall away. Nor need there then be any difficulty about their overlapping. God created all things. His providence is over all things. He leads all things to their intended goal. God's universal therefore precedes the facts and laws of the created universe. Before this background man can labor and do all things teleologically through Christ to the glory of God.

CTEV104-5

42. ELEPHANT WANTS TO WARM MORE THAN HIS NOSE, OR WANTS MORE THAN HIS NOSE/TRUNK IN THE DOOR/WINDOW – allowing the natural man that certain facts may be truly known apart from Christ leads to much more; Naturalism wants to know all facts without reference to God

42a. ... if one can say that he knows what the fact of sin means without the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit, he may as well say that he can know other facts without reference to God. In fact he may as well say that he can know any and every fact without reference to God. If one fact can be known without reference to God there is no good reason to hold that not all facts can be known without reference to God. When the elephant of naturalism once has his nose in the door, he will not be satisfied until he is all the way in.

SCE 77

42b. If one allows that certain facts may be truly known apart from God in Christ, there is no telling where the limit will be. It soon appears that the elephant wants to warm more than his nose. He will soon claim that the truths of the religious consciousness may also be known apart from Christ, and may therefore become the standard of what is to be accepted of the Bible.

SCE 207

42c. There would be no order in nature and no rationality of relationships to be found anywhere in the universe had not God made them. Therefore the possibility of science itself presupposes the truth of the Christian concept of God. When, then, the non-Christian scientist discovers truth, this is not because of, but in spite of, his own theory of being and of knowledge.

It is not difficult to see what happens if the Christian fails to challenge the wisdom of the world [1 Cor 1:20] in 'the order of nature.' If he keeps quiet, the proverbial elephant is given permission to push his trunk through the window! Soon the order of 'the supernatural' is adjusted to the order of nature as interpreted by the natural man [1 Cor 2:14].

ICG 9

43. EMPLACEMENT FOR GUNS – Antitheism presupposes Theism, also see 1 and 28; God is the all-conditioner; True reasoning stands upon God

... I contend that you cannot argue against belief in Him unless you also first take Him for granted. ... God is like the emplacement on which must stand the very guns that are supposed to shoot Him out of existence. ...

WIB 3

43a. [God] wants to be presented as the All-Conditioner, as the emplacement on which even those who deny Him must stand.

WIB 12

43b. True reasoning about God is such as stands upon God as upon the emplacement that alone gives meaning to any sort of human argument. And such reasoning, we have a right to expect, will be used of God to break down the one-horse chaise of human autonomy.

WIB 18

43c. ... the real question between the [Christian and the non-Christian] positions has not even been touched unless it be asked upon what foundation the non-Christian can make his objections to Christianity intelligible. On what foundation rest the guns which he directs against the Christian position?

When this question is considered, it appears that this placement is the truth of Christianity itself. In other words, the non-Christian needs the truth of the Christian religion in order to attack it.

ECE 89

43d. ... I believe that a Christian apologist must place himself for argument's sake upon the position of the non-believer and point out to him that he has to presuppose the truth of the Christian position even to oppose it. ... In his day Hitler wanted to shoot across the channel into London; to do so he needed emplacement for his guns.

JA 98

43e. There must be absolute truth if there is to be even the possibility of error. The sceptic therefore always refutes himself out of his own mouth; he must stand upon truth in order to have emplacement for the guns with which he attacks

the truth. He must stand upon the thing he would destroy.

IST 186

44. ENGINEERS CANNOT WORK ON AN UNDER RIVER TUNNEL, FROM EACH SIDE, WITHOUT AGREEMENT ON A GENERAL PLAN OF CONSTRUCTION – our general plan of construction is to challenge the wisdom of the world

Protestants should surely be to challenge the wisdom of the world [1 Cor 1:20] in every dimension. If it is not challenged in every dimension, it cannot be effectively challenged in any one dimension. If a tunnel is to be built under a river it may be wise to start from both sides of the river at the same time, but it cannot be wise to have two engineers working, each from one side, without agreement on a general plan of construction.

ICG 10

45. ESTATE OF GOD HAS LARGE OWNERSHIP SIGNS PLACED EVERYWHERE SO THAT HE WHO GOES BY, EVEN AT SEVENTY MILES AN HOUR, CANNOT BUT READ THEM; Inescapable general revelation, also see 49, 79, 103 and 114; Compare 60

You see, the God of Christianity ... says the world belongs to Him, and that you are His creature, and as such are to own up to that fact by honoring Him whether you eat or drink or do anything else [1 Cor 10:31] God says that you live, as it were, on His estate. And His, so that he who goes by even at seventy miles an hour cannot but read them.

WIB 8

46. EXHIBITING WARES IN A MUSEUM TO ONE ANOTHER (BY THE UNBELIEVER AND THE BELIEVER) WITHOUT AT THE SAME TIME DASHING FOR ONE ANOTHER'S THROATS – common grace does not deny the doctrine of total depravity

... to think of common grace as furnishing a sort of museum where the unbeliever and the believer may alike exhibit their wares to one another without at the same time dashing for one another's throats would be to deny the doctrine of total depravity. The unbeliever is not merely sometimes, but always and in his every endeavor a covenant breaker.

CAA

47. EXHIBITION HOUSE IN THE MIDST OF THIS WORLD SHOWING THE GLORIES AND SPLENDORS OF GOD – cannot ask *whether* God exists, as this world is full of the works of his hands

[Men] ... walk which is an exhibition house of the glories and splendors of God, full as it is of the works of his hands, and they ask, mind you, *whether* God exists.

CGG 131

48. EYES OR NOSES ARE NOT NEW FOR CHRISTIANS – Christians do not operate according to new laws of thought

I demur in agreeing with Kuyper that there is one logic if nothing more than formal reasoning is in view. ... my disagreement with Kuyper does *not* pertain to the question whether formally believers and unbelievers think according to the same logical laws. I do *not* maintain that Christians operate according to new laws of thought any more than that they have new eyes or noses.

My only criticism of Kuyper [is] to the effect that this concept of metaphysical sameness must again be supplemented with the concept of ethical difference. The non-Christian uses the gifts of logical reasoning in order to keep down the truth in unrighteousness.

But if we reason from the fact that there is one logic in the formal sense to the conclusion that sinners can and often do draw the right conclusions about God then we are back to the scholastic position. Kuyper has done much to liberate us from this. At this one point he was not fully true to himself.

DF1 296

49. FACTORY IN SINFUL MAN'S PERSON WHERE INNUMERABLE OPERATIONS OF GOD ARE – men have the knowledge of God within themselves, also see 79, 103 and 114

[Calvin's] primary purpose is to show what was available of the revelation of God to sinful man. He tells us what they should have known and should have done because of the revelation that God had given them. To quote again: "But herein appears the shameful ingratitude of man. Though they have in their own persons a factory [or workshop] where innumerable operations of God are carried on, and a magazine [or storehouse] stored with treasures of inestimable value ... instead of bursting forth into praise, as they are bound to do, they, on the contrary, are the more inflated and swelled with pride. They feel how wonderfully God is working in them, and their own experience tells them of the vast variety of his gifts which they owe to his liberality. Whether they will or not, they cannot but know that these are proofs of his Godhead, and yet they inwardly suppress them" (Calvin's *Institutes* I.5.4, [Beveridge translation –Battles alternative words added]).

And because of this great and beautiful display of the Creator in his created universe, Calvin holds it to be the basest ingratitude when men suppress within themselves the knowledge that they should have of God, if they would only look within themselves.

IST 88-9

50. FIRE IN A CAVE DISCOVERS REPTILES – the law brings to light the sins of the heart, compare 133 and 134

Sin exists therefore in the soul prior to consciousness [of a specific sin] and is awakened by the law. Rom. 7:8: "apart from the law sin is dead." The law acts upon the heart bringing to light the sins which are there as the sun thaws the ice of a marsh and brings to action the dormant hordes of insect life. "The fire in a cave discovers reptiles and stirs them but they were there before; the light and the heat do not create them. A beam of light piercing into a room reveals thousands of moats floating in the air, never before suspected."

ET

51. FISH ARE FREE IN THE WATER – man has freedom in the law of God as his native element (which he does not want), and man is free in the providence and plan of God, contrast 52

51a. ... herein exactly lies the character of sin, that he thinks to have rights absolutely of his own, that he does not wish to be lime in the hands of the potter. He wishes to be as God himself instead of being subject to the law of God, which had been placed in his very being as creature. He does not want to find his freedom in the law of God as his native element, as a fish is free in the water.

ET

51b. According to theism man lives and moves and has his being in an atmosphere of the law of God both for his body and for his soul. To live in this atmosphere meant his freedom as it means freedom to a fish to live in its native element.

TC

51c. ... the Reformed Faith ... affirms the comprehensive control of "whatsoever comes to pass" by the counsel of God. It also affirms human responsibility. Man is free and therefore responsible in all the aspects of his life because God controls whatsoever comes to pass. As a fish is free just because it is controlled in all its movements by its proper element, namely, water, so man as the creature of God is free within his proper element, namely, the all-inclusive providence of God.

TG

51d. now that [Augustine] has learned from the Christ of the Scriptures, he has come to see man's true inwardness, his true freedom as freedom in the Christ of the Scriptures. As a fish is free in water and a bird is free in air, so a creature is free within the plan of God.

RDL

52. FISH OUT OF WATER – "freedom" of thought outside of its proper place, which is the framework of creation, sin and redemption through Christ, is bound for self-frustration; Tyranny and chaos in being free from obedience to God and the requirements of the love of God, contrast 51

52a. Human thought is free only when it is restored to its proper place in the framework of creation—sin and redemption through Christ. Therefore it is true ... that Greek thought was controlled by their basic religious commit-

ment, and therefore bound for self-frustration. Thinking themselves free to follow the facts where they might lead, and thinking themselves true to the requirements of the laws of logic, the Greeks assumed uncritically, that is, religiously, that the facts are not created and controlled by God and that the logical function in man is not a gift of God. ... Thus the “freedom” of thought of the Greeks was no better than the freedom of a fish out of water. True freedom of thought is freedom to develop itself in relation to the order of the cosmos created and directed by God through Christ.

CTETH 211-2

52b. We would expect to be shown that except man moves in the medium of implicit obedience to God, and therefore to Christ and the Scriptures, he is as a fish on dry land. We would expect to be shown that tyranny and chaos are the twin monsters that face us if we do not face God. We would expect to be shown that we are slaves to sin if not slaves to Christ. We would expect to be shown that we are slaves to the word of the spirit of man if we are not obedient to the Spirit of the Word of God.

RMT

52c. When a fish tries to be free on shore or when a bird tries to be free under water then they, as it were, do what man has done by trying to be free from the requirements of the love of God. Seeking for this false freedom the sinner cannot help himself. But God, the triune God in Christ, and by the Spirit in his sovereign grace, reaches down to man to set him free.

RDL

53. FOUNDATIONS: TRANSCENDENTAL ARGUMENT SEEKS TO DISCOVER WHAT SORT OF FOUNDATIONS THE HOUSE OR STATUE OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE MUST HAVE, IN ORDER TO BE WHAT IT IS, BUT IT DOES NOT SEEK TO FIND *WHETHER* THERE IS A FOUNDATION, IT PRESUPPOSES THAT IT HAS ONE – definition of the transcendental method and argument, also see 12

A truly transcendental argument takes any fact of experience which it wishes to investigate, and tries to determine what the presuppositions of such a fact must be, in order to make it what it is. ...

Thus the transcendental argument seeks to discover what sort of foundations the house of human knowledge must have, in order to be what it is. It does not seek to find *whether* the house has a foundation, but it presupposes that it has one. We hold that the anti-Christian method, whether deductive or inductive, may be compared to a man who would first insist that the statue of William Penn on the city hall of Philadelphia can be intelligently conceived of without the foundation on which it stands, in order afterwards to investigate whether or not this statue really has a foundation.

SCE 10-1

54. FRESH AIR AND LUNGS GO TOGETHER BUT FIRE AND WATER DO NOT – agreement and disagreement of the Scriptures and regenerated reason

... [what is] “right reason”? Is it regenerated reason or non-regenerated reason ... ? Of course the Scriptures and regenerated reason agree as fresh air and lungs but the Scriptures and the non-regenerated reason agree as fire and water.

FR

55. FRICTION TO MAKE ADVANCES IN THE SLIPPERY HIGHWAYS OF INTERPRETATION IS MADE BY THE THEIST AND HE ALONE DOES NOT JUMP FROM ONE ICE LUMP TO ANOTHER IN THE MIDST OF A TORRENTIAL STREAM, HE ALONE DOES NOT TRY TO BREATHE IN A VACUUM – man as a finite rational personality must live by revelation alone

For St. Augustine human thought is primarily receptive and thereupon reconstructive. Man as a finite rational personality must live by revelation alone. His thought is not passive or inactive. In fact, true and fruitful activity exists only where true receptivity is found. No one but the Theist finds sufficient friction to make advance in the slippery highways of interpretation. He alone does not jump from one ice lump to another in the midst of a torrential stream. He alone does not try to breathe in a vacuum. God must be external and man must be temporal or there is no interpretation at all.

ECE 139

56. FULL-BUCKET, TO WHICH IS WATER IS ADDED – believing in an absolute, self-sufficient and self-contained God, plus that the created universe adds to the glory of God; To God nothing can

be added, yet everything in history adds to the glory of God; Everything happens in accordance with God's immutable plan yet prayer changes things; We deal with the incomprehensible and infinitely inexhaustible God so we run into mystery (things beyond our understanding); Apparent not real contradiction

56a. ... we have shown that the Christian and the non-Christian have opposite ideas about what is immoral or what is against our intellectual natures. Many idealists say outright that it is a contradiction in terms to say that one believes in an absolute God and also believes that the created universe adds to the glory of God. To them, this is as manifestly impossible and absurd as it would be to try to add water to a bucket that was already filled. Yet a Christian's contention is that this is not a self-contradiction, but something which is merely beyond our understanding. So again we conclude that the law [of non-contradiction] abstractly stated has no application, while, if taken concretely, the difference between the regenerate and the non-regenerate consciousness is at once of the utmost importance.

IST 40

56b. We argue that unless we may hold to the presupposition of the self-contained ontological trinity, human rationality itself is a mirage. But to hold to this position requires us to say that while we shun as poison the idea of the really contradictory we embrace with passion the idea of the *apparently* contradictory. It is through the latter alone that we can reject the former. If it is the self-contained ontological trinity that we need for the rationality of our interpretation of life, it is this same ontological trinity that requires us to hold to the apparently contradictory. This ontological trinity is, as the Larger Catechism of the Westminster Standards puts it, "incomprehensible." God dwells in light that no man can approach unto. This holds of His rationality as well as of His being, inasmuch as His being and His self-consciousness are coterminous. It follows that in everything with which we deal we are, in the last analysis, dealing with this infinite God, this God who hideth Himself, this mysterious God. In everything that we handle we deal finally with the incomprehensible God. Everything that we handle depends for what it is upon the counsel of the infinitely inexhaustible God. At every point we run into mystery. All our ingenuity will not aid us in seeking to avoid this mystery. All our ingenuity cannot exhaust the humanly inexhaustible rationality of God. To seek to present the Christian position as rationally explicable in the sense of being comprehensible to the mind of man is to defeat our own purposes. To do so we must adopt the standard of reasoning of our opponent, and when we have accepted the standard of reasoning of our opponent, we must rest content with the idea of a finite God.

To the non-Christian our position may be compared to the idea of adding water to a bucket that is already full of water. "Your idea of the self-sufficient ontological trinity," he will say, "is like a bucket full of water. To God nothing can be added. He cannot derive glory from His creatures. Yet your idea of history is like pouring water into the full bucket. Everything in it is said to add to the glory of God."

No Christian can answer this full-bucket difficulty in such a way as to satisfy the demands of a non-Christian epistemology. We can and must maintain that the Christian position is the only position that does not destroy reason itself.

CGG 9-10

56c. It may perhaps be said that much of the abstract reasoning of Hoeksema [denying common grace] comes from his failure to distinguish between Christian and non-Christian logic. We do not mean, of course, that the rules of the syllogism are different for Christians and non-Christians. Hoeksema refers to the idea of insanity, saying that sin has not made us insane. We may agree if he means merely that the unbeliever can follow the technical processes of intellectual procedure as well as, or often better than, the believer. But when he says or assumes that God's revelation in Scripture may be expected to reveal nothing which will be apparently self-contradictory, we demur. He attempts to "harmonize" the revealed and the secret will of God, prayer and the counsel of God. His efforts on this score would not be accepted by unbelievers. He cannot solve the full-bucket difficulty, a difficulty which they think lies at the heart of the Christian religion. To them the whole idea of a God who is self-sufficient and all-glorious precludes the idea of anything taking place in history that should glorify Him. That, they argue, is to add water to a bucket that is already full.

CGG 27

56d. God is full of glory in some such way as a bucket may be said to be full of water. At the same time, man, by his deed in history, by the exertions that proceed from his own choice, must seek to glorify God. That is as though he must add water to the bucket which he has himself said to be already full of water.

CGG 103

56e. A word must here be said about the question of antinomies. It will readily be inferred what as Christians we mean by antinomies. They are involved in the fact that human knowledge can never be completely comprehensive knowledge. Every knowledge transaction has in it somewhere a reference point to God. Now since God is not fully comprehensible to us we are bound to come into what seems to be contradiction in all our knowledge. Our knowledge

is analogical and therefore must be paradoxical. We say that if there is to be any true knowledge at all there must be in God an absolute system of knowledge. We therefore insist that everything must be related to that absolute system of God. Yet we ourselves cannot fully understand that system.

We may, in order to illustrate our meaning here, take one of the outstanding paradoxes of the Christian interpretation of things, namely, that of the relation of the counsel of God to our prayers. To put it pointedly: We say on the one hand that prayer changes things and on the other hand we say that everything happens in accordance with God's plan and God's plan is immutable.

The thing we are concerned about here is to point out that in the nature of the case there would have to be such a paradox or seeming contradiction in human knowledge. God exists as self-complete apart from us; he is all-glorious. Yet he created the universe that it might glorify him. This point lies at the bottom of every paradox or antinomy. We were in the nature of the case completely interpreted before we came into existence; the universal plan of God needed not to be supplemented by historical particulars and could not be supplemented in this way. The historical could not produce anything wholly new. This much we see clearly. God being what he is, it must be his counsel which acts as the indispensable and self-complete unity back of the finite one and many. The only alternative to saying this is to say that the historical produces the wholly new, and this would be to give up the basic idea of the Christian-theistic scheme, namely, the idea of God and of his creation and control of the universe. On the other hand the historical must have genuine significance. Or else why should God have created it? Prayer must be answered or God would not be God. The universe must really glorify God; that is the purpose of its existence. So we seem to have on the one hand a bucket that is full of water and on the other hand we seem to add water to this bucket which we claim to be already full.

DF3 44-5

57. GLASSES (ROSE-COLORED) / SPECTACLES OF SCRIPTURE – only see nature and general revelation aright through these, also see 57 and 115; To remove our “rose-colored glasses” of Scripture (contrast 58) would be to take the ground from under our feet

57a. Surely then it is only he who looks through the glasses of Scripture who can see the states of affairs for what they are.

CC

57b. Calvin ... compares special revelation with glasses through which general revelation must be read. [Calvin's *Institutes* I.6.1.]

CB

57c. With the spectacles of Scripture they [believers] now read with good effect the book of nature and of history.

PDS 120

57d. ... sinful man is incapable of reading God's revelation in nature aright, and the instinctive knowledge of God embedded in his very constitution is dulled and almost obliterated.

What is needed now is a special supernatural revelation objectively and a special supernatural illumination subjectively. The needed revelation is found in the Scriptures. It is a special revelation documented for the universal use of man. It serves as spectacles to enable those of darkened visage to see God. Of course the Scriptures do more than this. They not only reveal the God of nature more brightly to sin darkened eyes; they reveal also the God of grace. But in a larger sense this is the same; for it is the covenant God that is revealed anew to man. But man needs not only light, he also needs the power of sight. This spiritual sight is the result of the *testimonium Spiritus Sancti* [testimony of the Spirit].

WTR

57e. In the Scriptures, Christ tells us how he fulfills and restores the offices of prophet, priest, and king. How does Christ fulfill the office of a prophet? He does so, “in revealing to us, by his Word and Spirit, the will of God for our salvation.” (*Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Question 24.) In other words, he proclaims to us the truth pertaining to God, the world, and our deliverance from the consequences of our rebellion over against the lie of Satan. When Adam believed Satan instead of God, he made a league with hell. He became a partner with Satan in his effort to hold under, to repress in unrighteousness, the truth as it is in Jesus. But Christ undoes this damage by fulfilling the office of prophet. He reveals how the Father may be known. He bears witness to the truth of God's Word, and he commands all men to be reconciled to God. He opens up the way for us to be true prophets of God once again by revealing to us what we are to believe concerning God, his law, and the world he has placed us in. Looking at the world through the “spectacles” of God's Word, we are able to understand the world and our place in it from God's perspective. We are no longer prophets without a mantle, for Jesus commissions us to “go into all the world and preach the gospel.”

57f. Our Reformed pastor saw, therefore, that for Calvin the Christian lives above all by the authority of the Scripture message. If then a non-Christian should urge our pastor to take off his “rose-colored glasses” and look at the cosmos “with the naked eye of reason,” or should appeal to conscience to refute the interpretation of human experience as given in Scripture, our pastor knows that to do so would be to take the ground from under his own feet.

RP 34

58. GLASSES: COLORED GLASSES/SPECTACLES CEMENTED TO THE SINNER’S EYES, AND ALL IS YELLOW TO THE JAUNDICED EYE BUT THE REFORMED APOLOGIST SEEKS TO CHALLENGE THE NATURAL MAN TO TAKE OFF HIS COLORED GLASSES – all the facts and arguments presented to the unbeliever will be observed on the assumption that man is the final reference point of his own interpretation of human experience, and he cannot remove these glasses because he will not remove them; The natural man suppresses the truth, is blinded by sin and loves to be blind (also see 8 and 147) and therefore needs new light—regeneration by the Spirit; Contrast 57 and 100

58a. If then the human consciousness must, in the nature of the case, always be the proximate starting-point, it remains true that God is always the most basic and therefore the ultimate or final reference point in human interpretation.

This is, in the last analysis, the question as to what are one’s ultimate presuppositions. When man became a sinner he made of himself instead of God the ultimate or final reference point. And it is precisely this presupposition, as it controls without exception all forms of non-Christian philosophy, that must be brought into question. If this presupposition is left unquestioned in any field all the facts and arguments presented to the unbeliever will be made over by him according to his pattern. The sinner has cemented colored glasses to his eyes which he cannot remove. And all is yellow to the jaundiced eye. There can be no intelligible reasoning unless those who reason together understand what they mean by their words.

DF3 77

58b. Since the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] assumes the idea of brute fact in metaphysics and the idea of the autonomy of the human mind in epistemology, the Reformed apologist realizes that he should first challenge these notions. He must challenge these notions in everything that he says about anything. It is these notions that determine the construction that the natural man puts upon everything that is presented to him. They are the colored glasses through which he sees all the facts. Now Romanism and Arminianism ... to the extent that they do present the facts as they are, ... still do not challenge the natural man to take off his colored glasses. And it is precisely this that the Reformed apologist seeks to do. He will first present the facts for what they really are and then he will challenge the natural man by arguing that unless they are accepted for what they are according to the Christian interpretation of them, no facts mean anything at all.

DF3 147

58c. What then more particularly do I mean by saying that epistemologically the believer and the non-believer have nothing in common? I mean that every sinner looks through colored glasses. And these colored glasses are cemented to his face. He assumes that self-consciousness is intelligible without God-consciousness. He assumes that consciousness of facts is intelligible without consciousness of God. He assumes that consciousness of laws is intelligible without God. And he interprets all the facts and all the laws that are presented to him in terms of these assumptions. This is not to forget that he also, according to the old man within him, knows that God exists. But as a covenant breaker he seeks to suppress this [Rom 1:18]. And I am now speaking of him as the covenant breaker.

DF3 201

58d. ... Mr. Black [an unbeliever] is certain that he looks at life in the only proper way. Even if he has doubts as to the truth of what he believes, he does not see how any sensible or rational man could believe or do otherwise. If he has doubts it is because no one can be fully sure of himself. If he has fears it is because fear is to be expected in the hazardous situation in which modern man lives. If he sees men’s minds break down he thinks this is to be expected under current conditions of stress and strain. If he sees grown men act like children he says that they were once beasts. Everything, including the “abnormal” is to him “normal.”

In all this Mr. Black has obviously taken for granted that what the Bible says about the world and himself is not true. He has *taken this for granted*. He may never have argued the point He has cemented yellow spectacles to his own eyes. He cannot remove them because he will not remove them. He is blind and loves to be blind.

DF3 230-1

58e. Summing up our discussion as a whole we would stress the importance of looking at the common grace question as an aspect of our whole philosophy of history. And this requires for our day, it is our humble judgment, something of a reorientation on the question of Apologetics. Perhaps we may speak of a return to Calvin on this point. At least we hold it to be in line with his *Institutes* [e.g. I:6] to stress, more than has recently been done, the objective validity of the Christian reading of nature and history. Certainly no one would have hit upon the interpretation of nature and history that we as Christians have, if it had not been revealed by special grace. But this is primarily due to the fact that the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] is blind. We dare not say that nature and history lend themselves quite as well to the non-Christian as to the Christian interpretation. That the non-Christian may present a plausible view of nature is quite true. That it is impossible to convince any non-Christian of the truth of the Christian position, as long as he reasons on non-Christian assumptions, is also true. All looks yellow to the jaundiced eye. But for all this we would still maintain, and that, we believe, is essentially Calvin's view, that he who reads nature aright reads it as the Christian reads it.

CGG 94-5

58f. In defending Christianity, our Reformed pastor then realized that he must challenge the non-Christian to see himself in the light that Christ gives to men in Scripture. Our pastor knew, to be sure, that even this the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] cannot do, for he cannot, himself, remove his colored glasses. He needs, therefore, the operation of the Holy Spirit to regenerate him, to open his eyes so that he may see. He must be born again.

The natural man, says Warfield, needs new light—the Bible, and new power of sight—regeneration.

When the sinner has by God's grace in Christ received this new light and this new power of sight then he sees all things in their proper relationships.

RP 35

58g. If the God of Christianity exists, the evidence for His existence is abundant and plain so that it is both unscientific and sinful not to believe in Him. When Dr. Joad, for example says: "The evidence for God is far from plain," on the ground that if it were plain everybody would believe in Him, he is begging the question. If the God of Christianity does exist, the evidence for Him *must* be plain. And the reason, therefore, why "everybody" does not believe in Him must be that "everybody" is blinded by sin. Everybody wears colored glasses.

WIB 8

58h. The point is this. Not believing in God, we have seen, you do not think yourself to be God's creature. And not believing in God you do not think the universe has been created by God. That is to say, you think of yourself and the world as just being there. Now if you actually are God's creature, then your present attitude is very unfair to Him. In that case it is even an insult to Him. And having insulted God, His displeasure rests upon you. God and you are not on "speaking terms." And you have very good reasons for trying to prove that He does not exist. If He does exist, He will punish you for your disregard of Him. You are therefore wearing colored glasses. And this determines everything you say about the facts and reasons for not believing in Him. ...

I must make an apology to you at this point. We who believe in God have not always made this position plain. Often enough we have talked with you about facts and sound reasons as though we agreed with you on what these really are. In our arguments for the existence of God we have frequently assumed that you and we together have an area of knowledge on which we agree. But we really do not grant that you see any fact in any dimension of life truly. We really think you have colored glasses on your nose when you talk about chickens and cows, as well as when you talk about the life hereafter. We should have told you this more plainly than we did. But we were really a little ashamed of what would appear to you as a very odd or extreme position. We were so anxious not to offend you that we offended our own God.

WIB 11-2

58i. No more than the Ethiopian can change his skin or the leopard his spots [Jer 13:23] can you change your attitude. You have cemented your colored glasses to your face so firmly that you cannot even take them off when you sleep. Freud has not even had a glimpse of the sinfulness of sin as it controls the human heart. Only the great Physician through His blood atonement on the Cross and by the gift of His Spirit can take those colored glasses off and make you see facts as they are, facts as evidence, as inherently compelling evidence, for the existence of God.

WIB 17-8

58j. There are, therefore, only two kinds of philosophy. They are the immanence philosophy and the Christ-centered philosophy. The former makes man and the latter makes God as revealed in Christ through the Scriptures and as believed in through the regeneration of the Holy Spirit the final reference point of all predication. When they speak of God, when they speak of man, and when they speak of the world, these two positions speak each in terms of its own presupposition. The immanence philosopher wears colored glasses. In every word that he speaks he speaks in terms of what he sees

through these colored glasses. The Christian philosopher has by the Spirit had these glasses removed from his eyes.

CC

58k. To be sure, there is a sense in which it must be said that all men have all facts “in common.” Saint and sinner alike are face to face with God and the universe of God. But the sinner is like the man with colored glasses on his nose. The Scriptures tell us that the facts speak plainly of God. Rom 1.20, Rom 2.14–15 But all is yellow to the jaundiced eye. As the sinner speaks of the facts, he reports them to himself and others as “yellow.” There are no exceptions to this. It is the facts as reported to himself by himself, as distorted by his own subjective condition, which he assumes to be *the facts as they really are*.

RP 32

58l. The non-Christian scientist, then, carries with him, as his second nature, the assumption that man is the final reference point of his own interpretation of human experience. This assumption is like a pair of colored spectacles cemented to his face. It is in terms of this assumption that he *observes* the facts. It is in terms of this assumption that he forms his hypotheses with respect to the facts. And it is in terms of this assumption that he tests his hypotheses with other facts. It is but to be expected then that he will invariably describe the facts in such a way as to exclude the truth of Christianity.

GH 242

58m. Men of the world will insist that no fact can be what the citizens of the kingdom of God, speaking on the basis of the word of Christ, say that it is. The citizen of the kingdom of this world comes to the examination of any fact that stands before him by means of a philosophy of history that he has adopted in advance. The citizen of the kingdom of this world is the man with yellow glasses cemented to his eyes. He sees every fact that the citizen of the kingdom of God sees, but he sees them all as centering around man as the ultimate interpreter of them. He sees them as a man who stands on his head sees the facts but sees them topsy turvey.

CPL 215

59. GOBBLE-DE-GOOK – on the basis of the unbeliever’s methodology, of fate and chance, all facts would be gobble-de-gook (unintelligible)

59a. For Mr. Black [an unbeliever], history is something that floats on an infinitely extended and bottomless ocean of Chance. Therefore he can say that *anything* may happen. Who knows but the death and resurrection of Jesus as the Son of God might issue from this womb of Chance? Such events would have an equal chance of happening with “snarks, boojums, splinth, and gobble-de-gook.” God himself may live in this realm of Chance. He is then “wholly other” than ourselves. And his revelation in history would then be wholly unique.

In the very act of presenting the resurrection of Christ or in the very act of presenting any other fact of history Christianity, Mr. White [a Reformed Christian] would be presenting it as authoritatively interpreted in the Bible. He would argue that unless Mr. Black is willing to set the facts of history in the framework of the meaning authoritatively ascribed to them in the Bible, he will make gobble-de-gook of history.

DF3 242-3

59b. According to [Mr. Black - an unbeliever], every fact that he meets has in it the two ingredients: that of Chance and that of Fate, that of the wholly unknown and that of the wholly known. Thus man makes the tools of thought, which the Creator has given him in order therewith to think God’s thoughts after him on a created level, into the means by which he makes sure that God cannot exist, and therefore certainly cannot reveal himself.

When Mr. White [a Reformed Christian] meets Mr. Black he will make this issue plain. He will tell Mr. Black that his methodology cannot make any fact or any group of facts intelligible to himself. Hear him as he speaks to the unbeliever:

“On your basis, Mr. Black, no fact can be identified by distinguishing it from any other fact. For all facts would be changing into their opposites all the time. All would be gobble-de-gook. At the same time, nothing could change at all; all would be one block of ice. Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? [1 Cor 1:20] He clearly has. I know you cannot see this even though it is perfectly clear. I know you have taken out your own eyes. Hence your inability to see is at the same time unwillingness to see. Pray God for forgiveness and repent.”

DF3 245-6

60. GRAPES OF GOD’S VINEYARD TAKEN WITHOUT PAYING HIM ANY RENT – as God’s creatures a present attitude of not believing in him, is very unfair to Him; Compare 45, 46 and 96

... not believing in God you do not think the universe has been created by God. That is to say, you think of yourself and the world as just being there. Now if you actually are God's creature, then your present attitude is very unfair to Him. In that case it is even an insult to Him. ... You have taken the grapes of God's vineyard without paying Him any rent and you have insulted His representatives who asked you for it.

WIB 11-2

61. GROCERIES: MAN SAYS HE NEEDS MORE GROCERIES BUT THIS IS POISON WHEN IT IS THE BLOODSTREAM THAT ITSELF MUST BE CURED – sinner does not need natural answer but sin must be seen in the light of damnation and the cross; Point of contact, also see 7 ,36, 71 and 108

The point of contact with the sense of need found in the sinner is therefore not simply a matter of telling him that you have what he knows he needs. Here is a man who says that he needs some groceries. He goes to the store and the storekeeper does not have quite the brands that he wants. But he assures his customer that what he has, though the customer has never used it before, is “just what he wants,” in fact “just what he needs.”

In contrast with this the sinner says that he has not lived up to his own ideals of a good life. He fears that this may bring him evil consequence. Somehow reality visits “sin” with punishment, and, if sin is inherent in the race, if it is endemic in man, if sin is “original” sin, then he will welcome any alleviation any one may offer. How may he get rid of his “guilt complex?” By the doctrine of “original sin,” that is, by distributing his guilt over the whole human race? By making it therefore a natural something?

To men thinking in this fashion the message of the gospel comes with a quite different analysis of sin. It presents the sinner with a different meaning for every word he uses. It does so by setting man in a wholly different complex of relations. It offers him no way of escape except that of repentance before his Maker and Redeemer. “More of this sort of food” the Christian grocer says, is only poison to you. It is the bloodstream that itself must be cured. And that is beyond the power of any human doctor. Your sin is of such a nature as to need the Son of God and his death upon the cross for its removal. Its nature may be seen only in the light of what it takes for its removal. Do you own that you are rightly a child of eternal damnation? It is that from which Christ came to redeem you. That is what the Bible therefore says of sin. It is that which you must confess your sin to be. Till now you have done nothing of the sort.

With this basic contrast in mind it is then possible to speak in biblical fashion of the point of contact for the gospel in the sense of need found in the natural man [1 Cor 2:14].

CTK 55-6

62. GUNS: TRUE GUNS OF THE BELIEVER AGAINST THE WOODEN GUNS OF THE ENEMY – correctly formed theistic proofs are the truth against the enemies lies

If the Christian forms the proofs [of God's existence] theistically correctly, they are, to be sure, a weapon in his hand with which he may confirm himself and ward off the attack of the enemy. But then this defense and confirmation is on the ground that he has the truth and that his opponents trust in a lie. It cannot be said that at least the enemy has no better weapons; it must then be said that the enemy has wooden guns, while the believer has true guns. If theistically stated, the arguments do nothing but give the content of the revelation of God to man, and argue that it is the only reasonable thing to do for a human being to accept this revelation.

IST 199

63. HAMSTER CLIMBING ITS CIRCULAR STAIRCASE IN A CAGE – movement of man surrounded by meaninglessness; Stone rolled up a hill only to see it roll down again, also see 131

Man fears himself as surrounded by meaninglessness. In fact, underneath all he fears the wrath of God to come for his disobedience to his Creator. ...

Here, then, is the threadmill, movement and more movement, but movement more meaningless than that of a hamster climbing its circular staircase in a cage, movement as hopeless and useless as that of Sisyphus who over and over rolled a stone up the hill only to see it roll down again. Worse than that, it is the restless walk of a criminal in a death-cell, expecting moment by moment to receive his deserved punishment.

GH 125

64. HIGHWAY OF THE CHRISTIAN AND REFORMED FAITH IS NOT TO BE VEERED OFF FROM, AND WARN ONE ANOTHER NOT TO GO OFF THE HIGHWAY; Going astray about common grace; Do not veer off from election and reprobation are under the sovereign will of God

There lies before us the highway of the Christian faith. May we ever drive upon it, without veering either to the left or to the right. If the wheels of an automobile are out of line the car will gradually tend to run off the pavement. You cannot drive an automobile effectively with one wheel on the pavement and the other on the soft shoulder next to the road. Let us, in all kindness, warn one another not to go off the highway either to the left or to the right.

Going off to the right by denying common grace or going off to the left by affirming a theory of common grace patterned after the natural theology of Rome is to fail, to this extent, to challenge the wisdom of the world.

In neither case is the call of God to man made truly universal. In denying common grace we say, in effect, that God does not really call some men to repentance at all. In affirming a natural theology type of common grace, we fail to show that God calls all men everywhere and in all dimensions of life.

In neither case do we show man the full glory of the gospel and of the Christ, the Savior of the world.

Ye are my witnesses! [Is 43:10]

CGG 147

We ... cannot avoid taking note of a point of view sometimes advocated by those who are committed to the Reformed faith. I refer to the idea that reprobation rests ultimately upon the sin of man as the final cause. Reprobation is then said to be an act of punishment of God upon sin as committed by man. In this respect reprobation is said to differ from election. Election is said to proceed from God's eternal plan directly. But reprobation is not thus directly an act of the eternal plan of God. Reprobation is thus said not to be equally ultimate with election.

But surely, it is apparent that such a point of view leads us off the highway of the Reformed faith and tones down our witness to the world. The world needs the sovereign God of Scripture. Hence we must say that reprobation is not ultimately an act of justice with respect to the sin of man. It is rather an act of the sovereign will of God. The fully Biblical, and therefore fully Reformed, position is not reached till God in His sovereign decree is made the ultimate cause of all that comes to pass in this world through the deeds of men, whether these deeds lead to their final destruction or by God's grace to their final glory.

CGG 138

65. HOUSE OF MAN'S INTERPRETATION OF LIFE HAD TO BE BROKEN DOWN, AND THE BUILDING BLOCKS GATHERED COULD BE USED, ONLY TO PAUL'S TOTALLY NEW ARCHITECTURAL PLAN

65a. [Paul] pleaded for, and in the name of his Lord required of men, a complete reversal of their point of view in every dimension of life. The entire house of their interpretation of life had to be broken down. Many of the building blocks that they had gathered could no doubt be used, but only if the totally new architectural plan that Paul proposed were followed.

ICG 4

66. ICE CUBES ARE THE SAME SIZE BECAUSE OF THE ICE TRAY – in the world of science, the unbeliever will always see “raw stuff” ordered and arranged by himself by means of his logical activity, compare 88; Brute fact, compare 88 and 124

66a. ... the “facts,” that is the “objective” facts, if they are to become facts that have scientific standing, must be *patternable*. But to be patternable for the modern scientist these “facts” must be absolutely formless. That is to say they must be utterly pliable. They must be like the water that is to be transformed into ice-cubes by the modern refrigerator.

The scientist, even when he claims to be merely describing facts, assumes that at least some aspects of Reality are non-structural in nature. His assumption is broader than that. He really assumes that all Reality is non-structural in nature. To make a batch of ice-cubes Mother needs only a small quantity of water. But to hold the ice-cubes intact till it is time to serve refreshments, Mother must control the whole situation. She must be certain that Johnny does not meanwhile handle them for purposes of his own. So the scientist, if his description of even a small area, or of an aspect or a dimension, of Reality is to stand, must assume that Reality as a whole is non-structural in nature until it is structured by the scientist. The idea of brute, that is utterly uninterpreted, “fact” is the presupposition to the finding of any fact of scientific standing. A “fact” does not become a fact, according to the modern scientist's assumptions, till it has been made a fact by the ultimate definitory power of the mind of man. The modern scientist, pretending to be merely a describer of facts, is in reality a maker of facts. He makes facts as he describes. His description is itself the manufacturing of facts. He requires “material” to make facts, but the material he requires must be *raw* material. Anything else will break his machinery. The datum is not primarily *given*, but is primarily *taken*.

CGG 4

66b. Suppose you take the tray out of your refrigerator and fill it with water. Then you place a divider in the tray of water and return it to the refrigerator. When, after a while, you take the tray out of the refrigerator and the divider out

of the tray, you have ice cubes. Are you surprised because all the ice cubes are of the same size? Not at all. Your divider has seen to that. Similarly in the world of science, the unbeliever will always see “raw stuff” ordered and arranged by himself by means of his logical activity. He will never find any providentially controlled facts such as the Reformers saw everywhere about them. He will never hear about such miracles as the virgin birth of Christ or his resurrection from the dead. There could be no such things as the regeneration of men’s hearts by the recreating work of the Holy Spirit, or even providence.

RP 116

67. ICEBERG IS UNMOVED BY A MAN SWIMMING IN THE OCEAN AND PUSHING AGAINST IT, BUT EVEN IF HE DOES NOT NOTICE IT, THE MAN, NOT THE ICEBERG, IS MOVING – the man who rejects the traditional Protestant view gets nowhere in identifying himself, let alone saying anything intelligible about the world, God, or Christ, compare 149

We hold to our position, first, because it is revealed to us by the self-attesting Christ of Scripture; and, secondly, because we think that the only alternative to it is solipsism or pure subjectivism. The only alternate to our position, we are bound to think, is a man-centered interpretation of life. And we think that the man who stands at the center of neo-Protestantism can in no wise identify himself, let alone say anything intelligible about the world, God, or Christ. If the modern Protestant thinker first rejects and then refuses to return to the traditional Protestant view of things, it is not that he has found any facts to disprove this position or any logical reasons for saying that it is out of accord with the laws of human thought. Neither is it because he has found facts or logical reasons that even point to the intelligibility of his own position. If a man swims in the ocean next to an iceberg and wants to move it, he may push against it with all his might but, even if he does not notice it, it is he, not the iceberg, that is moving..

RP 200

68. IDLING OF A MOTOR THAT IS NOT IN GEAR – science, knowledge and facts are meaningless on the covenant breakers assumptions, also see 11, 13, 100 and 111, 119 and 140

68a. One shows that on [the covenant breakers] assumptions all things are meaningless. Science would be impossible; knowledge of anything in any field would be impossible. No fact could be distinguished from any other fact. No law could be said to be law with respect to facts. The whole would be like the idling of a motor that is not in gear.

DF3 207-8

69. ISLAND OF INDEPENDENCE – men seek to outwit God by their independence from God and seem to have emptied out the bottomless pit even though they have not yet succeeded in filling it up

... by the method of the description of the religious consciousness, men have explained that little spot of reality without any extraneous help. There is at the very least one little island that is quite independent of foreign invasion. There is at least this one spot where the creature and also the sinner may flee from the wrath of God, that wrath which claims that there is no escape in hell from it. And it is of very little logical significance whether one maintains the independence from God for this one little island or whether one maintains the independence from God for the whole universe outright, since each human being can at any rate make a little island for himself and in this way altogether outwit God who has threatened to cast in the bottomless pit all those who have sought for independence from Him. The psychologists of religion seem to have emptied out the bottomless pit even though they have not yet succeeded in filling it up.

PR

70. ISLAND OF RATIONALITY (MADE FROM ITSELF) FLOATING ON AN ABYSS OF UNRELATEDNESS AN OCEAN OF IRRATIONALITY – science making room for faith simply makes room for faith in the irrational; Rational-irrational dilemma, also see 72 and 145

70a. Kant limited science to make room for faith. But this limitation of reason does not make room for faith in any Christian sense of the term. It simply makes room for faith in the irrational. Such a faith is itself irrational. It makes room for the idea of an abyss of unrelatedness surrounding the floating island of rationality that men call science and philosophy.

CB

70b. Our little island of rationality ... rest[s] upon an ocean of irrationality and would therewith itself be irrational. The least bit of our rational experience presupposes the rationality of “the basis of the universe,” and the rationality is

gone if the “basis of the universe” is subject to change.

CI

70c. Phenomenalism builds up its island of rationality by taking dirt from its center and patching it on to its side, much as the Chicago lake front was built up gradually with dirt hauled into the water from the land. The difference is that the phenomenologists have no right to think of a bottom underneath the water into which they throw their dirt.

DF3 119

In a world of chance the would-be legislative ultimacy of the human mind meets with self-frustration. Why should not the little islands of rationality carved out by a chance-borne mind not be swallowed up by that chance from which all things come?

RPJD

71. JAILER CRIES OUT IN FASHIONABLE SUBURBS THAT HE IS OFFERING RELEASE FROM JAIL FOR ALL ITS RESIDENTS, BUT THIS FALLS ON DEAF EARS AS HE DOES NOT ANSWER WHAT THEY THINK THEY NEED – preachers of Christianity offering escape from the wrath to come, would be ignored unless the gospel offer also includes the work of the Holy Spirit with his regenerating power, men; Point of contact, also see 7 ,36, 61and 108

What Reformed theologians have meant by a point of contact should be carefully distinguished from ... [the] thought that man, in himself, knows what he needs and what he wants. ... This is the opposite of what orthodox theology means when it says that in the desires of men for the “supernatural” we have an indication of man’s need for God, and that God satisfies this need. Orthodox theology holds that the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] does not really know what he needs. He does not know that he is dead in trespasses and sins and therefore subject to the wrath of God [Eph 2:1-3]. How then could he say that Christ, who came to bring escape from eternal death, satisfies him? Suppose that a jailer were to go through one of the fashionable suburbs and cry out on its streets that he is offering release from jail for all its residents. As long as he would confine himself to the streets he might be thought of as having escaped from an insane asylum. If, however, he were to knock at every door, and in all seriousness say to the occupants of every house that he had come to bring them the great good news that they could now go free from jail, they would do all they could to have this jailer put in jail. So also when preachers of Christianity come to offer escape from the wrath to come, their message falls on deaf ears because men do not think that this offer answers their need at all.

It is true that things are not quite as simple in life as our analogy would seem to suggest. Christianity offers something for this life as well as escape from the wrath to come. For this reason men feel somewhat attracted to it even though they do not feel themselves under the curse of God. Yet, in the main, the analogy holds. The main thing Christ came to do for men is to bring them escape from eternal death and to reinstate them to the favor of God. On this point, men do not know their need; they have only a vague sense of lack. However, seeing that the gospel not only makes an external offer, but also includes the work of the Holy Spirit with his regenerating power, men, through the gospel itself, see the need of escape from eternal death. When they see this they also see that Christ has supplied their need. Then Christ finds them, but then they have first become new creatures before they have realized this fact. ...

Though we must be careful in the use of analogies we may say that through general revelation and the reaction to it the sinner as the patient shows some sense of need. ... The world is, as a matter of fact, under the curse of God and, in their suppressed sense of deity, men have knowledge of this fact, as they have of the fact that God is the creator of the universe.

It might be argued that, for safety’s sake, we should avoid altogether this matter of a point of contact. The danger that the orthodox view will be identified [with the view that man, in himself, knows what he needs and what he wants]. Why not, it will be asked, emphasize the truth that man does not know his basic need and let it go at that? To this we must reply that we must be faithful to the teaching of Scripture no matter how dangerous it may seem to us to be. We need not be wiser than Scripture.

IST 120-1

72. JANUS-FACED [two-faced, double-minded] COVENANT BREAKER WHO WALKS THE STREETS OF NEW YORK AND LONDON – man with his rationalism-irrationalism dilemma (, also see 70 and 145), the would-be autonomous man must be won for the gospel

There is nothing surprising in the fact that modern man is both utterly irrationalist and utterly rationalist at the same time. He has to be both in order to be either. And he has to be both in order to defend his basic assumption of his own freedom or ultimacy. ...

... the irrationalist may employ the rationalist or determinist to do battle for him in a field where he says he does not feel

at home.

In fact the ‘free man’ of modern non-Christian thought is Janus-faced. He turns one way and would seem to be nothing but an irrationalist. He talks about the ‘fact’ of freedom. He even makes a pretence of being hotly opposed to the rationalist. . . . he will boldly assert that what cannot happen according to logic has happened in fact. Then he turns the other way and would seem to be nothing but a rationalist. Surely, he says, the ‘rational man’ will accept nothing but what has intelligible meaning for him in accord with the law of contradiction. There must be coherence in experience. It is meaningless to talk about the ‘entirely single thing.’ But both in his irrationalist and in his rationalist features, the would-be autonomous man is seeking to defend his ultimacy against the claims of the Christian religion. If he is right as an irrationalist then he is not a creature of God. If he were a creature of God, he would be subject to the law of God. He would thus be ‘rationally related’ to God. He would know that he was a creature of God and that he should obey the law of God. If he is right as a rationalist, then too he is not a creature of God. The law that he then thinks of as above him, he also thinks of as above God; God and he are, for him, subject to a common law. If he were a creature of God, he would grant that what God has determined, and only that, is possible. He would then subject his logical manipulation of ‘reality’ to the revelation of God.

It is this Janus-faced covenant-breaker, then, who must be won for the gospel. It is he who walks the streets of New York and London. And no one but he does. All men are sinners; all are interested in suppressing the fact of their creaturehood. The irrationalist and rationalist have become friends in the face of their common foe. And this common foe is historic Christianity.

ICG 17-19

73. JUMPING FOR SAFETY FROM THE BURNING SHIP OF DETERMINISM INTO THE SEA OF INDETERMINISM ENDS IN DEATH IN EITHER CASE – consequence of appealing to the statistical character of natural laws in order to point out that science itself can allow for miracle

If we appeal to the margin of error and to the statistical character of natural laws in order to point out that science itself can allow for miracle, we jump for safety from the burning ship of determinism into the sea of indeterminism. Death will pursue us in either case. A scientific method that is based upon a metaphysic of chance must seek to destroy the Christian position which is based upon the metaphysic of God as the self-attesting self-conscious being with a comprehensive plan for all reality.

CTEV 61-2

74. LADDER RESTING ON PURE CONTINGENCY AND ITS TOP RESTS AGAINST THE FOG – the faith and fruit of liberal theologians, compare 148

Modern Protestant and modern Catholic theologians continue to profess their faith in a marvelous future of mankind. The church will be the vanguard of the society of good men. The point of union and communion of this new society is the Cosmic Christ, who has replaced the Christ of Paul. The members of this church, with the theologians leading, are climbing, what they call “Jacob’s Ladder.” The bottom of this ladder rests on pure contingency and its top rests against the fog.

GDT

75. LIFESAVER IS BOUND TO THE SHORE TO RESCUE OTHER PARTY – be shored to God (analogically) when we place ourselves on our opponents position; The for “argument’s sake” strategy

It will be seen that when we reason *ad hominem* or when we say that we place ourselves upon our opponent’s position [to show that their position involves self-contradiction] *we are still reasoning analogically*. We would not be reasoning analogically if we really placed ourselves upon our opponent’s position. Then we would, with him, have to reason univocally, and we would drown with him. We use the figure of drowning in order to suggest what it is that we really do when we say that we are placing ourselves upon someone else’s position. We may then compare ourselves to a lifesaver who goes out to save someone from drowning. Such a lifesaver must be bound to the shore to which he wants to rescue the other party. He may depend upon his power to swim, but this very power to swim is an invisible cord that connects him to the shore. Similarly, if we reason when we place ourselves upon our opponents’ position, we cannot for a moment do more than argue thus for “argument’s sake.”

SCE 205-6

76. LIGHT: GOD (AND HIS SCRIPTURE) IS THE (SUN)LIGHT FROM WHICH ALL OTHER LIGHTS (ELECTRIC BULBS, FLASHLIGHTS LANTERNS, CANDLES AND FIREFLIES) ARE DERIVED – the Christ of Scripture is the *Sun* from which all light derives; Facts are not independent witnesses, they do not speak for themselves

76a. Humanly speaking I see little future for the Reformed community unless they will begin with Christ-the Christ of Scripture-and regard Him as the *Sun* from which all light derives. The traditional view starts, as it were, with a candle, and searches for *a* sun.

DMT

76b. The Protestant doctrine of God requires that it be made foundational to everything else as a principle of explanation. If God is self-sufficient, he alone is self-explanatory. And if he alone is self-explanatory, then he must be the final reference point in all human predication. He is then like the sun from which all lights on earth derive their power of illumination. You do not use a candle in order to search for the sun. The idea of a candle is derived from the sun. So the very idea of any fact in the universe is that it is derivative. God has created it. It cannot have come into existence by itself, or by chance. God himself is the source of all possibility, and, therefore, of all space-time factuality.

CTK 12

76c. There is no appeal beyond Jesus' testimony to himself. How could there be? He is the Word that was in the beginning with God. He is the Word that was God. Before Abraham was I am: "All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men" (Jn 1:3-4). We are, in principle, like blind men in a cave unless we see all things in this world in the light of this Word. We cannot find out God by searching for him unless our search be carried on by means of the light that derives from him.

Suppose that on a sultry summer night you children catch a hundred fire flies, putting them in a glass jar. Suppose you then take this jar in a cave and in the cave you let them fly. Will you then ask each other *whether* perhaps there is a sun from which the light and heat that is in these fireflies comes? Surely, the fireflies are witnesses to the Sun. They are witnesses because there is in them no power to give light or heat except that which they have derived from the sun. No fact in this world can give independent testimony to the existence of God. "Shall he that planted the ear not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see?" (Ps 94:9)

GH 8-9

76d. Thus the Bible, as the infallibly inspired revelation of God to sinful man, stands before us as that light in terms of which all the facts of the created universe must be interpreted. All of finite existence, natural and redemptive, functions in relation to one all-inclusive plan that is in the mind of God. Whatever insight man is to have into this pattern of the activity of God he must attain by looking at all his objects of research in the light of Scripture. "If true religion is to beam upon us, our principle must be, that it is necessary to begin with heavenly teaching, and that it is impossible for any man to obtain even the minutest portion of right and sound doctrine without being a disciple of Scripture." (Calvin's *Institutes*, Bk. I, Chap. VI, Sec. 2 [Beveridge translation].)

What has been said so far on the subject of Scripture has dealt primarily with its place in Protestant doctrine. What bearing does this fact have upon the place of Scripture in Christian apologetics? And what bearing does it have upon the method of apologetics in general?

In the first place it must be affirmed that a Protestant accepts Scripture to be that which Scripture itself says it is on its own authority. Scripture presents itself as being the only light in terms of which the truth about facts and their relations can be discovered. Perhaps the relationship of the sun to our earth and the objects that constitute it, may make this clear. We do not use candles, or electric lights in order to discover whether the light and the energy of the sun exist. The reverse is the case. We have light in candles and electric light bulbs because of the light and energy of the sun. So we cannot subject the authoritative pronouncements of Scripture about reality to the scrutiny of reason because it is reason itself that learns of its proper function from Scripture.

There are, no doubt, objections that occur to one at once when he hears the matter presented so baldly. We cannot deal with these fully here. For the moment it is of the greatest importance that this simple but basic point be considered apart from all subsidiary matters. All the objections that are brought against such a position spring, in the last analysis, from the assumption that the human person is ultimate and as such should properly act as judge of all claims to authority that are made by any one. But if man is not autonomous, if he is rather what Scripture says he is, namely, a creature of God and a sinner before his face, then man should subordinate his reason to the Scriptures and seek in the light of it to interpret his experience.

The proper attitude of reason to the authority of Scripture, then, is but typical of the proper attitude of reason to the whole of the revelation of God. The objects man must seek to know are always of such a nature as God asserts they are. God's revelation is always authoritarian. This is true of his revelation in nature no less than of his revelation in Scripture. The truly scientific method, the method which alone can expect to make true progress in learning, is therefore such a

method as seeks simply to think God's thoughts after him.

When these matters are kept in mind, it will be seen clearly that the true method for any Protestant with respect to the Scripture (Christianity) and with respect to the existence of God (theism) must be the indirect method of reasoning by presupposition. In fact it then appears that the argument for the Scripture as the infallible revelation of God is, to all intents and purposes, the same as the argument for the existence of God. Protestants are required by the most basic principles of their system to vindicate the existence of no other God than the one who has spoken in Scripture. But this God cannot be proved to exist by any other method than the indirect one of presupposition. No proof for this God and for the truth of his revelation in Scripture can be offered by an appeal to anything in human experience that has not itself received its light from the God whose existence and whose revelation it is supposed to prove. One cannot prove the usefulness of the light of the sun for the purposes of seeing by turning to the darkness of a cave. The darkness of the cave must itself be lit up by the shining of the sun. When the cave is thus lit up each of the objects that are in it "proves" the existence and character of the sun by receiving their light and intelligibility from it.

DF3 107-9

76e. According to Butler some of those who have no belief in or knowledge of Christianity at all have, none the less, quite rightly interpreted the "course and constitution of nature." The cave has already been lit up by means of light that was not derived from the sun. By the use of the empirical method those who make no pretense of listening to Scripture are said or assumed to have interpreted nature for what it really is.

DF3 110

76f. He [the Reformed Christian] does not appeal to "experience" or to "reason" or to "History" or to anything else as his source of information in the way that he appeals to the Bible. He may appeal to experience, but his appeal will be to experience as seen in the light of the Bible. So he may appeal to reason or to history, but, again, only as they are to be seen in the light of the Bible. He does not even look for *corroboration* for the teachings of Scripture from experience, reason or history except insofar as these are themselves first seen in the light of the Bible. For him the Bible, and therefore the God of the Bible, is like the sun from which the light that is given by oil lamps, gas lamps and electric lights is derived.

DF3 226

76g. I would not pick up a lantern to help me find the sun, to see whether it exists. The whole notion of "light" is based upon our intimate acquaintance with the sun, day after day. Organically speaking, if the sun did not exist I could not be alive to look for it (given God's world as it is). Just so I use reason (induction, deduction, forms of implication) in full recognition that I discover truth by means of them because each individually, and all collectively, operate in *God's* world and therefore as part of the realization of his plan. To attempt to understand such abilities of man in using reason apart from what God has revealed about his plan would be, for the Christian, "unscientific."

JA 426

76h. The psalmist does not say that the heavens probably declare the glory of God; they infallibly and clearly do. Probability is not, or at least should not be, the guide of life. Men ought, says Calvin following Paul, to believe in God, for each one is surrounded with a superabundance of evidence with respect to him. The whole universe is lit up by God. Scripture requires men to accept its interpretation of history as true without doubt. Doubt of this is as unreasonable as doubt with respect to the primacy of the light of the sun in relation to the light bulbs in our homes. It is as unreasonable as a child asking whether he has parents and, after looking at the evidence, concluding that he *probably* has!

RP 32-3

76i. In short, our pastor noted that Calvin, with Augustine, would think of God as one thinks of the sun. All other lights in this world are derived from the sun. One does not first think of other lights as though they shone in their own power, in order after that to investigate open-mindedly *whether* the sun exists. So one cannot *first* think of the facts of the universe, and especially of the mind of man, as though they were possibly not God-dependent but self-sufficient as so many self-powered light bulbs, in order then to inquire whether God exists. One just does not look at light bulbs to find the sun. Knowledge of the sun must precede, and be the foundation of, light bulbs. So one does not look at creation to find a Creator, but rather the latter is the foundation of the former. Therefore true knowledge of creation demands a true knowledge of the Creator.

All the facts of the universe are of necessity God-created, God-dependent facts. Therefore men *ought* to see that God is man's Creator and his Judge. "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Rom 1:20).

76j. His God does not *probably* exist. His God does not *possibly* exist. He is not the reality corresponding to man's greatest thought. His nature does not "correspond to logic, that is, to the law of contradiction." His existence does not "correspond to fact."

To start from any or all of these propositions is to start from the bottom and work to the top; it is to say that the man resembles the child and that the Creator is like the creature. But you can only say that the man resembles the child, if you have first said that the child resembles the man. You do not prove that the sun exists by looking for it with an electric bulb. The very idea of an electric bulb is that its light is derivative, that it comes ultimately from the sun. Shall he that hath planted the ear not hear? [Ps 94:9] If even the derivative knows then surely the original does.

GH 227-228

76k. Finally a word must be said about the authority of Scripture. Here again our start may be made from the idea of the ontological trinity. The self-contained God is self-determinate. He cannot refer to anything outside that which has proceeded from himself for corroboration of his words. ... All the facts are through and through revelational of the same God that has made the mind of man. If then appeal is made from the Bible to the facts of history or of nature outside the Bible recorded in some documents totally independent of the Bible it must be remembered that these facts themselves can be seen for what they are only if they are regarded in the light of the Bible. It is by the light of the flashlight that has derived its energy from the sun that we may in this way seek for an answer to the question whether there be a sun. This is not to disparage the light of reason. It is only to indicate its total dependence upon God. Nor is it to disparage the usefulness of arguments for the corroboration of the Scripture that comes from archaeology. It is only to say that such corroboration is not of independent power. It is not a testimony that has its source anywhere but in God himself. Here the facts and the principle of their interpretation are again seen to be involved in one another.

IW 36-7

76l. To look at man and his work without doing so in the light of the revelation that God through Christ gives in the Bible is to turn off the light of the sun and to ask *whether* a sun exists and to look for it with a flashlight whose light is a derivative from the sun. What the evangelical Christian must do is to show that he who does not look for the meaning of man in the light of the revelation that comes from Christ directly revealed in Scripture is like one who shakes off all the apples of the apple tree, grubs out the tree, and *then* asks *whether* there must not have been some sort of something that is higher than the apples in order to account for them. This "some sort of something" or at most some sort of tree may, possibly or probably, tell us that it is an apple tree.

CTK 348

76m. The truth is that only he who sees the facts of the world in the light of God's redemptive revelation given through Christ, sees them for what they are. We may use our minds as flashlights with which to discover things, but these flashlights derive *all* their power of illumination from the sun.

SCE 224

77. LINOLEUM THAT HAS ITS FIGURE INDELIBLY IMPRINTED IN IT – cannot erase man's sense of his creatureliness and sinfulness, and the pattern of Christian theism in each fact, compare 128

77a. By nature all men seek to suppress the facts of their sinfulness and creaturehood. They cannot succeed in fully suppressing this truth. As you cannot mop the figure off the surface of an indelible linoleum so man cannot erase his creatureliness and sinfulness, try as he may.

CGG 180

77b. From the Roman Catholic and the Arminian point of view the question of methodology, like that of starting-point, is a neutral matter. According to these positions the Christian apologist can legitimately join the non-Christian scientist or philosopher as he, by his recognized methods, investigates certain dimensions of reality. ...

The Reformed apologist, on the other hand, would compromise what he holds to be of the essence of Christianity if he agreed ... For him the whole of created reality, including therefore the fields of research with which the various sciences deal, reveals the same God of which Scripture speaks. The very essence of created reality is its revelational character. Scientists deal with that which has the imprint of God's face upon it. Created reality may be compared to a great estate. The owner has his name plainly and indelibly written at unavoidable places. How then would it be possible for some stranger to enter this estate, make researches in it, and then fairly say that in these researches he need not and cannot be confronted with the question of ownership? To change the figure, compare the facts of nature and history, the facts with which the sciences are concerned, to a linoleum that has its figure indelibly imprinted in it. The pattern of such

a linoleum cannot be effaced till the linoleum itself is worn away. Thus inescapably does the scientist meet the pattern of Christian theism in each fact with which he deals. The apostle Paul lays great stress upon the fact that man is without excuse if he does not discover God in nature. Following Paul's example Calvin argues that men *ought* to see God, not a god, not some supernatural power, but the only God, in nature. They have not done justice by the facts they see displayed before and within them if they say that a god exists or that God *probably* exists. The Calvinist holds to the essential perspicuity of natural as well as Biblical revelation. This does not imply that a non-Christian and non-theistic interpretation of reality cannot be made to appear plausible. But it does mean that no non-Christian position can be made to appear *more* than merely plausible.

DF3 96-8

78. MASK OF THE NATURAL MAN'S AUTONOMOUS FALSE INTERPRETATION, THROUGH WHICH HE SEES HIS OWN REFLECTION IN THE MIRRORS OF THE SYSTEMS OF HIS PHILOSOPHY, MUST BE TORN OFF BY THE REFORMED APOLOGIST, also see 129; Appeal to what the natural man knows in his heart; Method of Reformed apologist; Both in preaching and in reasoning the Reformed Christian relies on the work of the Spirit as he tells men to do what they cannot do

78a. The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] at bottom knows that he is the creature of God. He knows also that he is responsible to God. He knows that he should live to the glory of God [1 Cor 10:31]. ... But he suppresses his knowledge of himself as he truly is [Rom 1:18]. He is the man with the iron mask. A true method of apologetics must seek to tear off that iron mask.

DF3 101

78b. It is fatal for the Reformed apologist to admit that man has done justice to the objective evidence if he comes to any other conclusion than that of the truth of Christian theism.

As for the question whether the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] will accept the truth of such an argument, we answer that he will if God pleases by his Spirit to take the scales from his eyes and the mask from his face. It is upon the power of the Holy Spirit that the Reformed preacher relies when he tells men that they are lost in sin and in need of a Savior.

DF3 104

78c. Both in preaching and in reasoning—and every approach to the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] should be both—the Reformed theologian will ask the sinner to do what he knows the sinner of himself cannot do. The Reformed Christian is often Reformed in preaching and Arminian in reasoning. But when he is at all self-conscious in his reasoning he will seek to do in apologetics what he does in preaching. He knows that man is responsible not in spite of but just because he is not autonomous but created. He knows that the idea of analogical or covenant personality is that which alone preserves genuine significance for the thoughts and deeds of man. So he also knows that he who is dead in trespasses and sins [Eph 2:1] is none the less responsible for his deadness. He knows also that the sinner in the depth of his heart knows that what is thus held before him is true. He knows he is a creature of God; he has been simply seeking to cover up this fact to himself. He knows that he has broken the law of God; he has again covered up this fact to himself. He knows that he is therefore guilty and is subject to punishment forever; this fact too he will not look in the face.

And it is precisely Reformed preaching and Reformed apologetic that tears the mask off the sinner's face and compels him to look at himself and the world for what they really are. Like a mole the natural man seeks to scurry underground every time the facts as they really are come to his attention. He loves the darkness rather than the light. The light exposes him to himself. And precisely this neither Roman Catholic or Arminian preaching or reasoning are able to do.

DF3 149

78d. The narrative with respect to Adam [Gen 3] shows clearly that all that man does, even in the simplest of daily activities, such as eating and drinking, he does either as a covenant keeper or as a covenant breaker. And the covenant that God made with man was ultimately mediated through Christ.

All men, since their fall in Adam, are born covenant-breakers. But only covenant-keepers know this to be true. They alone know this because they alone have been saved from their covenant-breaking attitude. They alone know that the heart of man is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked [Jer 17:9]. They alone know that the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] tries to keep from looking at himself in the light of the Christ of Scripture and that he does this in order to rationalize his own sin to others and, above all, to himself. The natural man is the man with a mask cemented to his face. The systems of philosophy that he constructs are like mirrors in which he sees his own reflection. When he talks about Being and non-Being, about potentiality and actuality, about the self and the not-self, he is always looking at his face through the mask of human autonomy.

The natural man becomes very angry when someone suggests to him that he take off his mask, or rather when

someone suggests to him that he allow Christ and the Holy Spirit to take off his mask.

GDT

78e. As Jesus was not worried about a point of contact with Lazarus, who was physically dead, so Paul is not worried about a point of contact with the Greeks who were spiritually dead. They may contrive all kinds of theories of reality, of knowledge, and of ethics, all of them based on the never criticized assumption, that man is not a creature of God and is not a breaker of God's ordinances, i.e., a covenant breaker before God. Paul will remove the masks from their faces and show them the truth about themselves.

GDT

78f. I speak from the conviction that what Paul said to the Greeks must be said to men today. The Greeks, together with all men fallen in Adam, were all their lifetime subject to the fear of death. They not only had not heard the gospel of Paul but they were holding under in unrighteousness the revelation of God within their own constitution and in the world about them. They had put a mask on their faces so they would not have to see, as they thought, the face of the creator-God. When they looked into a mirror they saw only the masks which they had cemented to their faces.

BTBP

78g. ... every ... non-Biblical thinker has cemented a mask to his face, with yellow glasses built into it. He never takes off this mask. Every proposition he makes about every detail of life, whether it be in the numerical, the geometric, the organic or any other dimension of life is a proposition that presupposes the totality picture that springs from the would-be-autonomous man who, in terms of his own principles, cannot even identify himself.

Such a man must be challenged to repentance with respect to the sin involved in every proposition he makes in every "modality," from arithmetic to "faith."

US

78h. When Paul and Barnabas came to Lystra and performed the miracle of the healing of the man unable to walk from birth, the inhabitants wanted to worship them as gods. They called Barnabas Jupiter and Paul Hermes because he was the chief speaker. Then Paul and Barnabas "rent their clothes and ran in among the people saying, Sirs why do ye these things? We also are men of like passion with you and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven and earth and the sea and all the things that are therein: Who in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways. Nevertheless he left not himself without witness in that he did good and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness. And with these sayings scarce restrained they the people, that they had not done sacrifice unto them. And there came thither certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium who persuaded the people, and having stoned Paul, drew him out of the city, supposing he had been dead" (Acts 14:14-19). ...

Paul knows only two classes of people, those who worship and serve the Creator and those who worship and serve the creature more than the Creator. ... Men must at all costs be shown the folly of worshiping the creature; the issue between the two types of worshipers must never be blurred.

In a sense, this story of Paul's preaching at Lystra may be taken as typical of his entire method and attitude when preaching the gospel to those who worshiped the creature. Creature worshipers he found everywhere he went, in the synagogues, in the market place, in the temples; among the religious and among the irreligious; among the educated and among the non-educated; among the Epicureans and Stoics as well as among the men of the street; among the naturalists and the supernaturalists alike.

Paul appealed to the heart of the natural man [1 Cor 2:14], whatever mask he might wear, and required of him that he repent from the vanity of creature worship to the fruitfulness of the worship of the "living God."

PA 1-2

78i. ... following Adam and Eve [the Greeks] sought to do without God; they had no place for God, the Creator, in their system of thought. They were sure that such a God as Paul preached did not and could not exist. They were therefore sure that Paul could not "declare" this God to them. No one could know such a God as Paul believed in.

But Paul knew that on the contrary, all men at bottom know God, the Creator. All men know that they are creatures of God, that they are law breakers. At bottom they know that their own systems, according to which God cannot exist, are rationalizations by means of which they seek to suppress the fact of their responsibility as creatures of God. Their own systems therefore could not satisfy them. Yet they would not, and as sinners could not, do without these systems. These systems were like masks which they had put on their faces not merely for "stunt night," but which they had put on so as never to be able to remove them. So they tried over and again to polish up and restyle these masks; there were face-liftings of various sorts.

79. MEASLES IN A BOY ARE FIRST INTERNAL BUT, THOUGH HE FEEL'S ABNORMAL, HE SAYS HE'S NORMAL TILL HE FINALLY ADMITS HE HAS THE MEASLES, WHEN HE CAN SEE THEM FOR HIMSELF – God's general revelation within the man persists in cropping up in spite of all that the sinner can do to keep it under, also see 49, 103 and 114

It does not mean that Christians and non-Christians are agreed on a certain thought-content with respect to God. They may, to be sure, be agreed in their formal statement of what they say about God. They may both say that they believe in a supreme being. But this does not imply that they have placed the same connotation in the word "supreme." What it does mean, then, is no more than the fact that God's general revelation within man persists in cropping up in spite of all that the sinner can do to keep it under. It is in spite of himself that man must recognize something of the revelation of God within him. This is his sense of religion.

Perhaps a homely illustration will help us to understand something of the matter. Suppose a boy has the measles. They are first internal, and the boy feels uncomfortable. He feels that there is something wrong with him; he feels "cranky." In short, he is abnormal. He insists, however, that he is feeling fine; that he is quite normal. Then the measles begin to appear on the skin, and he can see them for himself; yet he insists that there is nothing wrong with him. At last he reluctantly admits that he is not top-notch, and that he is not interested in football for the afternoon.

In some such way the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] feels that there is something wrong with his interpretations of life. Involuntarily there surges up within his consciousness the pressure of the testimony of the Spirit to the existence of God. He does his best to suppress this testimony; he seeks psychological explanation for it; if highly sophisticated and educated, he may succeed to a large extent in searing his conscience with a hot iron. If not highly sophisticated, he may express agreement with the idea that there is a God in a formal fashion; he may do the works of the law, and so seek to ease his conscience. But he will always be "persecuted" with the testimony of the Spirit to the revelation of God within him.

IST 194

80. MEDICINE BOOK – the Bible is our "medicine book by which we diagnose the unbeliever's disease and medication, , also see 155 and compare 23

80a. [We] make our diagnosis of the sophisticated as well as of the simple unbeliever by means of our "medicine book," the Bible.

When I talk to my sophisticated unbelieving friend I do not merely "soon discover" but rather "know in advance" that his "disease" is the same as that of my simple unbelieving friend. It is the disease of the "natural man" [1 Cor 2:14]. The symptoms are different but basically the disease is the same. The medication for both is the same. Both need to be told that they are in the way of death, that the wrath of God rests upon them and will abide upon them forever [Jn 3:36; Rev 14:10,11] unless they repent and believe the gospel [Mk 1:15].

AMFS

80b. The Bible is the only ultimate standard of truth. And therefore the analysis of man's sin and evil must be made by means of Scripture, as the "medicine book" by which men are to be judged.

CTK 43

81. MESSENGER BOY, SCOUT, WEAPONS AND FORTRESS IN WARFARE – an apologist is: a messenger boy to organize the different theological disciplines in this warfare for Christian theism as a whole, a scout to detect in advance the movements of the enemy, and one who wages offensive and defensive warfare, with the complementary weapons of philosophical of factual argument, from the fortress of Christianity that covers the whole earth, also see 144; Martial figures of speech because the place of apologetics cannot be very closely defined

There has been in the disciplines [of biblical studies systematic theology practical theology church history] a detailed and comprehensive statement of the truth. There has been in addition to that a defense of every truth at every point. Is there then no place for apologetics? It would seem so. Yet perhaps there may be the work of a messenger boy. Perhaps the messenger boy can bring the maps and plans of one general to another general. Perhaps the man who is engaged in biblical exegesis is in need of the maps of the whole front as they have been worked out by the man engaged in systematic theology. Perhaps there will be a more unified and better organized defense of Christian theism as a whole if the apologist performs this humble service of a messenger boy. Then too the apologist may be something in the nature of a scout to detect in advance and by night the location and if possible something of the movements of the enemy. We

use these martial figures of speech because we believe that in the nature of the case the place of apologetics cannot be very closely defined. We have at the outset defined apologetics as the vindication of Christian theism. This is well enough, but we have seen that each discipline must make its own defense. The other disciplines cover the whole field and they offer defense along the whole front. Then too they use the only weapons available to the apologist; namely, philosophical and factual argument. It remains that in apologetics we have no well-delimited field of operation and no exclusive claim to any particular weapon.

The net result then seems to be that in apologetics we have the whole field to cover. And it was this that was included in the analogy of a *messenger boy* and a *scout*. This does not imply that the messenger boy or the scout must leave all the work of defense to the others so that he would have nothing to do but carry news from one to the other. No indeed, the scout carries a rifle when he goes scouting in the historical field. Then too he may have to and does have to use the large stationary guns that command a larger distance.

We have just now employed the figure of a fortress or citadel. We may think of the apologist as constantly walking up and down on or near the outer defenses of the fortress. This will give the other occupants time to build and also enjoy the building. The others too must defend, but not so constantly and unintermittently. The apologist too must rest and must enjoy the peace of the fort but his main work is to defend and vindicate.

In this connection we must guard against a misuse that might be made of the figure of the fortress. It might be argued that this seems to put Christianity on the defensive. Is it not true that Christianity was meant to conquer the whole world for Christ? Yes it is. We have already said that *we think of Christian theism, when we think of Christianity. That covers the whole earth. If we can successfully defend the fortress of Christian theism we have the whole world to ourselves. There is then no standing room left for the enemy. We wage offensive as well as defensive warfare. The two cannot be separated. But we need not leave the fort in order to wage offensive warfare.*

CA 3-4

82. MILK BOTTLE: FILL IT WITH A POISONOUS WHITE LIQUID AND CALL IT MILK – new theology attaching new meanings to old, familiar words is highly dangerous to man

The casual reader of the new Confession may not readily see that it is founded upon a new and relativistic view of truth. Is he not told that the Confession of 1967 is based upon Christ and his reconciling work? Does not the new Confession appeal to the authority of Scripture? Does it not use the phraseology of the Bible and of the Westminster Confession?

Though we concede that the new creed and its new theology speak highly of both Christ and the Bible, we nevertheless contend that new meanings have been attached to old, familiar words. The whole question, accordingly, is one of reinterpretation. One may take a milk bottle and fill it with a poisonous white liquid and call it milk, but this does not guarantee that the poisonous liquid is milk. It may well be something that is highly dangerous to man.

Such is the case, we believe, with the new theology: It is an essentially humanistic theology which disguises itself as an up-to-date Christian theology.

C1967

83. MILLIONAIRE REDUCED TO POVERTY, BEGGING BREAD; THE ATTITUDE OF THE DROWNING MAN AT SEA STRETCHING FORTH HIS HANDS FOR MERCY AND SURE TO PERISH WITHOUT IT – a natural man must do what he resists to do, declare his bankruptcy

83a. ... I, as a natural man, have turned my back to God. I have set myself up as a standard of my life. The Holy Spirit must therefore turn me about. But I resist. I will not acknowledge that there is anything wrong with my standard of judgment. ... If you would offer the cross of Christ as an object upon which to speculate, I might listen. But the implication of the cross of Christ is that sin has touched the core of man's personality so that not one bit of him is left untouched. Hence you require of me that I get down from my pedestal as judge and let God judge me. It implies that I must repent and believe. To believe, that is the hardest thing in the world for the conceited heart of man to do. It implies a total reversal of one's attitude of mind. It implies an open declaration of bankruptcy which is hard for him to do who thinks he is rich and increased with goods. It implies the attitude of the millionaire reduced to poverty, begging bread. It implies the attitude of the drowning man at sea stretching forth his hands for mercy and sure to perish without it.

RE 33

84. MIRROR OF GOD'S GENERAL REVELATION – creation clearly reveals God which man knowingly obscures by sin

84a. The necessity of special revelation appears not only with respect to man's failure to know and react to *spiritual* things right, but also with respect to his inability to interpret "natural" things aright. Calvin brings out this point fully when, after laboring to show that God is marvelously revealed in his creation he inserts a chapter on "The Need of

Scripture, as a Guide and Teacher, in coming to God as a Creator.” He begins this chapter (*Institutes* 1, 6 [Beveridge translation]) by saying:

“Therefore, though the effulgence which is presented to every eye, both in the heavens and on the earth, leaves the ingratitude of man without excuse, since God, in order to bring the whole human race under the same condemnation, holds forth to all, without exception, a mirror of his Deity in his works, another and better help must be given to guide us properly to God as a Creator.”

IST 112

84b. In maintaining the essential clarity of all of the created universe as revelational of God’s existence and his plan Calvin is nothing daunted even by the fact of sin and its consequences. If there has been any “obscuration” in the revelation situation on account of sin this sin is in any case the fault of man. If in Adam, the first man, who acted for me representatively, I have scratched the mirror of God’s general revelation round about and within me, I know at bottom that it is I who have scratched it. Men ought therefore, says Calvin, to conclude that when some individual sin is not punished immediately it will be punished later. Their consciences operate on this basis.

DF3 195

85. MIRROR OF SCRIPTURE – only through the mirror of Scripture, as the authoritative Word of God which reports God’s work of redemption in Christ, can general revelation be seen for what it is and man see what he needs, also see 57 and 115

85a. Since man’s ignorance of God is blameworthy, this ignorance can be removed by nothing else than the redeeming work of Christ. Only Scripture as the word of Christ reports God’s work of redemption in Christ. Only through the mirror of Scripture, therefore, can general revelation be seen for what it is.

RP 9

85b. Natural revelation is perfectly clear. Men *ought* from it to know God and ought through it to see all other things as dependent on God. But only he who looks at nature through the mirror of Scripture *does* understand natural revelation for what it is. Furthermore, no one can see Scripture for what it is unless he is given the ability to do so by the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit. Only those who are taught of God see the Scriptures for what they are and therefore see the revelation of God in nature for what it is. To be taught of God is a “singular privilege” which God bestows only on his “elect whom he distinguishes from the human race as a whole.” As taught of God, the elect both understand the Bible as the Word of God, and interpret natural revelation through the Bible. The rest of mankind, not taking Scripture as the Word of God, in consequence also misinterpret the natural revelation of God.

RP 11

85c. Apostate man of every age follows Adam’s rejection of God as the source of all possibility. Apostate man assumes that pure possibility or contingency is the source of God. In doing so he is acting as a covenant-breaker always and everywhere, in the “dimension” of science as well as and as much as in the “dimension” of “religion.” This is the “truth,” about man as Scripture presents it. It is only in the mirror of Scripture as the authoritative Word of God that man can see “what is really there,” and what man needs.

AMFS

86. MOLE-LIKE NATURAL MAN – man loves darkness rather than light, scurries underground when the real facts come to his attention and is blind to all things

86a. ... Reformed preaching and Reformed apologetic ... compels [the sinner] to look at himself and the world for what they really are. Like a mole the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] seeks to scurry underground every time the facts as they really are come to his attention. He loves the darkness rather than the light. The light exposes him to himself.

DF3 149

86b. With the entrance of sin, however, man cut his study of himself loose from God, and therewith also cut his study of nature loose from himself. For this reason all the study of nature that man has made since the fall of man has been, in a basic sense, absolutely false. As far as an ultimate point of view is concerned, the sinner has been mistaken in his interpretation of the physical universe no less than in his interpretation of God. The physical world cannot be truly known when it is cut loose from God. ...

Men can read nature aright only when it is studied as the home of man who is made in the image of God. ...

... the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] is as blind as a mole with respect to natural things as well as with respect to spiritual

87. NATURALIZATION PAPERS MUST BE TAKEN OUT BY MIRACLES AND CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE IF THEY WISH TO BE ACCEPTED IN THE REPUBLIC OF SCIENCE

87a. ... if miracles want to have scientific standing, that is be recognized as genuine facts, they must sue for admittance at the port of entry to the mainland of scientific endeavor. And admission will be given as soon as they submit to the little process of generalization which deprives them of their uniqueness. Miracles must take out naturalization papers if they wish to vote in the republic of science and have any influence there.

WIB 15

87b. ... I as a believer in God through Christ, assert that I am born again through the Holy Spirit. The Psychologist says that is a raw datum of experience and as such incontrovertible. We do not, he says, deny it. But it means nothing to us. If you want it to mean something to us you must ascribe a cause to your experience. We shall then examine the cause. Was your experience caused by opium or God? You say by God. Well, that is impossible since as philosophers we have shown that it is logically contradictory to believe in God. You may come back at any time when you have changed your mind about the cause of your regeneration. We shall be glad to have you and welcome you as a citizen of our realm, if only you take out your naturalization papers!

WIB 17

88. NET: WHAT NET CAN'T CATCH ISN'T FISH – scientific description is not merely explanation, but it is definitely anti-Christian explanation, IE a universal judgment about the nature of all existence is presupposed even in the “description” of the modern scientist, compare 40 and 106; Brute facts, compare 66 and 124; Speaking metaphysically and epistemologically

88a. Eddington's view of [of Scientific objects] is when his ichthyologist boldly asserts, “What my net can't catch isn't fish.” For both, a scientific fact to be a fact must first be defined by the mind of man. That is, the raw material of experience must be neatly trimmed and patterned by the scissors of the constructing power of the scientist before it can be used by him at all.

RPJD

88b. It is sometimes suggested that though there is a basic difference between the Christian and the non-Christian explanation, there is no such difference in the mere description, of facts. With this we cannot agree. Modern scientific description is not the innocent thing that we as Christians all too easily think it is. Sir Arthur Eddington's famed “ichthyologist” readily suggests this. This “ichthyologist” explores the life of the ocean. In surveying his catch he makes two statements: (1) “No sea-creature is less than two inches long; (2) All sea-creatures have gills” (Arthur Eddington: *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, p. 16). If an observer questions the first statement the “ichthyologist” replies that in his work as a scientist he is not concerned with an “objective kingdom of fishes.” The only fish that exist for him are those he has caught in his net. He makes bold to say “What my net can't catch isn't fish.” That is to say, description is patternization. It is an act of definition. It is a statement of the *what* as well as of the *that*. It is a statement of connotation as well as of denotation. Description itself is explanation.

Current scientific description is not merely explanation, but it is definitely anti-Christian explanation. Current scientific methodology wants to be anti-metaphysical. It claims to make no pronouncements about the nature of reality as a whole. On the surface it seems to be very modest. In fact, however, current scientific methodology does make a pronouncement about the nature of Reality as a whole. When Eddington's “ichthyologist” says he is not interested in an “objective kingdom of fishes” he is not quite honest with himself. He is very much interested that that “objective kingdom of fishes” shall serve as the source of supply for his scientifically recognized fishes. Some of those “objective” fishes must permit of being graduated into fishes that have scientific standing. Some of them at least must be *catchable*. So the “facts,” that is the “objective” facts, if they are to become facts that have scientific standing, must be *patternable*. But to be patternable for the modern scientist these “facts” must be absolutely formless. ...

So the scientist, if his description of even a small area, or of an aspect or a dimension, of Reality is to stand, must assume that Reality as a whole is non-structural in nature until it is structured by the scientist. The idea of brute, that is utterly uninterpreted, “fact” is the presupposition to the finding of any fact of scientific standing. A “fact” does not become a fact, according to the modern scientist's assumptions, till it has been made a fact by the ultimate definitory power of the mind of man. The modern scientist, pretending to be merely a describer of facts, is in reality a maker of facts. He makes facts as he describes. His description is itself the manufacturing of facts. He requires “material” to make facts, but the material he requires must be *raw* material. Anything else will break his machinery. The datum is not

primarily *given*, but is primarily *taken*.

It appears then that a universal judgment about the nature of all existence is presupposed even in the “description” of the modern scientist. It appears further that this universal judgment negates the heart of the Christian-theistic point of view. According to any consistently Christian position, God, and God only, has ultimate definitory power. God’s description or plan of the fact makes the fact what it is. What the modern scientist ascribes to the mind of man Christianity ascribes to God. True, the Christian claims that God did not even need a formless stuff for the creation of facts. But this point does not nullify the contention that what the Christian ascribes to God the modern scientist, even when engaged in mere description, virtually ascribes to man. Two Creators, one real, the Other would-be, stand in mortal combat against one another; the self-contained triune God of Christianity and ... the autonomous man ... cannot both be ultimate.

We conclude then that when both parties, the believer and the non-believer, are epistemologically self-conscious and as such engaged in the interpretative enterprise, they cannot be said to have any fact in common. On the other hand, it must be asserted that they have every fact in common. Both deal with the same God and with the same universe created by God. Both are made in the image of God. In short, they have the metaphysical situation in common. Metaphysically, both parties have all things in common, while epistemologically they have nothing in common.

Christians and non-Christians have opposing philosophies of fact.

CGG 3-5

88c. You have heard of the man who never wanted to see or be a purple cow. Well, you have virtually determined that you never will see or be a created fact. With Sir Arthur Eddington you say as it were, “What my net can’t catch isn’t fish.”

WIB 17

89. OCEAN AND CAULDRON OF CHANCE AND SHORELESS AND BOTTOMLESS SEA, ON WHICH THERE ROLLS A MUD-BALL OR ISLAND OF ICE – facts whirl around with no ending or grounding and are meaningless and unintelligible for the autonomous man, whereas we show the only story, the little island on which we dwell rests upon the ocean of the reality and rationality of God, also see 70 and compare 149 and 104; Facts do not speak for themselves

89a. Let us note then some of the forms of authority that are quite acceptable to the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] because, to his mind, they do not violate the principle of autonomy.

First there is the need for authority that grows out of the existence of the endless multiplicity of factual material. Time rolls its ceaseless course. It pours out upon us an endless stream of facts. And the stream is really endless on the non-Christian basis. For those who do not believe that all that happens in time happens because of the plan of God, the activity of time is like to that, or rather is identical with that, of Chance. Thus the ocean of facts has no bottom and no shore.

DF3 124

89b. Underneath all forms of apostate philosophy is the notion of man as a law unto himself. Involved in this is the idea that the world is a bottomless and shoreless ocean of chance.

TRA 10

89c. Christians know that every intellectual argument advanced by the would-be autonomous consciousness of man rests upon man himself as swimming in the shoreless and bottomless ocean of chance. Christians will not avoid intellectual debate. But in their debate with the would-be-autonomous man the Christian will always lead every argument the latter offers back to the point where it is seen to rest on the religious commitment to the self-sufficiency of man who is withal wholly unintelligible to himself. On the other hand, Christians will seek to avoid giving the impression that their own position rests upon a faith construct similar to that of the non-Christian. On the contrary, they will point out that it is only upon the presupposition of the Christian position that it is possible to make intelligent and significant discrimination between the goal, the norm and the motivation of human behavior.

CTETH 157-8

89d. Theism says that God created the world; Pragmatism says that the world created God.

Thus a metaphysical difference of the first magnitude separates the two. The Pragmatist thinks it quite possible to ask: “Who made God?” Back of God lies mere possibility. Possibility is a wider concept than actuality. God and man both dwell on the island called Reality. This island is surrounded by a shoreless and bottomless ocean of possibility and the rationality that God and we enjoy is born of chance. The Theist thinks it impossible to ask: “Who made God?” God is for him the source of possibility: actuality is a wider concept than possibility. The little island on which we dwell rests

upon the ocean of the reality of God; our rationality rests upon the rationality of God. Pragmatism maintains a thorough metaphysical relativism, while Theism will not compromise on the conception of God as a self-conscious absolute personality.

CI

89e. The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] is spiritually blind. Accordingly he does not see himself as a creature made in the image of God. He starts with himself, as the ultimate interpreter of reality. He does not think of the world about him as created and controlled by the providence of the creator redeemer God of man. Instead he holds to pure contingency as enveloping himself, the world and all the gods that be. Thus his principle of diversity is that of pure chance and his principle of unity is a law that is because it must be what he thinks it must be. Starting from himself as autonomous in a bottomless, shoreless, ocean of chance, the natural man swings his logician's postulate and says, in effect that a God such as scripture presupposes cannot exist.

Must we then as Christians give up reasoning with unbelievers? If we do then we must also give up preaching or witnessing to unbelievers. Every form of preaching or witnessing to unbelievers involves the setting forth of two mutually exclusive views of God, of man and of the world. The unbeliever can, unless he be imbecile, intellectually follow such a presentation.

The unbeliever may say that the Christian position is unacceptable to him because it is not in accord with logic and fact. Then the Christian will ask him on what he stands when he rejects the Christian view. How do you identify yourself or any fact in your environment in your bottomless ocean of chance? Can you distinguish any "fact" from any other "fact" in a bottomless and shoreless ocean of chance?

Or how, if you could identify yourself or any fact about you, would you discover order or law in the universe? You need a law that will make it impossible for the God of Christianity to exist. You must, in short, make a universal negative judgment about all future as well as all past possibility if you are to make your opposition to Christianity intelligible to yourself.

To say this is not philosophical speculation apart from and prior to Scripture. It is simply to say what Paul asserted in Rom 1. Men are seeking to repress the knowledge of God and ignore his ordinance for them.

US

89f. A consistent Christianity, such as we must humbly hold the Reformed Faith to be, must set an interpretation of its own over against modern science, modern philosophy and modern religion. Its thinking is controlled, at every point, by the presuppositions of the existence of the self-sufficient God of which the Bible speaks. It is upon the basis of this presupposition alone, the Reformed Faith holds, that predication of any sort at any point has relevance and meaning. If we may not presuppose such an "antecedent" Being, man finds his speck of rationality to be swimming as a mud-ball in a bottomless and shoreless ocean.

CI

89g. If you have a bottomless sea of Chance, and if you, as an individual, are but a bit of chance, by chance distinguished from other bits of chance and if the law of contradiction has by chance grown within you, the imposition of this law on your environment is, granted it could take place, a perfectly futile activity. To speak of limiting reason so as to make room for faith is meaningless unless the activity of reason be first shown to be intelligible. And this cannot be done on any basis short of the Christian story.

CFC 141-2

89h. Facts do not speak for themselves.

Arminians think they can show that the teachings of the Bible can be related to one another in the way inductivist philosophers like John Locke and others relate the facts that spring from the womb of chance to one another. When these men construct their inductive systems, believing that all facts "speak for themselves," they build an island of ice floating on a bottomless, shoreless cauldron of chance.

In order to have their non-Christian friends meet their God and the Christ of the Bible my Arminian friends, following Butler, insist that the meeting take place on this island.

JA 399-400

89i. For Mr. Black [an unbeliever], history is something that floats on an infinitely extended and bottomless ocean of Chance. Therefore he can say that *anything* may happen. Who knows but the death and resurrection of Jesus as the Son of God might issue from this womb of Chance?

DF3 242

89j. ... if we recognize the interdependence of method and conclusion in scientific research we can fruitfully reason with men. We can then place ourselves upon our opponents' position for argument's sake. We can be "neutral" for argument's sake. We can see what happens to experience if the "neutral" method be adopted. We can then whirl about with men in their exclusively immanentistic and relativistic cauldron to tire them out.

RNCL

89k. It is ... the responsibility of Christians to point out to their fellow-men that unless they accept Christ they have no answer to the quest for meaning in life. "... hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor 1:20c-21

The history of modern thought is itself objective proof of the truth of Paul's statement on this point. This is obviously the case with respect to modern western philosophy and theology. There is no modern western philosopher or theologian who is able to give an intelligible account either of man himself or of his environment. If man and the facts about him are being brought into a conceptual scheme they lose their identity in it.. The universal laws of logic swallow up all individual facts whether objective or subjective. The only way the non-Christian thinker can "save the individual" is to leave it in the bottomless sea of unrelatedness.

SMMT

89l. It is meaningless to speak of imposing the formalizing activity of the universal mind of man, itself a product of chance, on a bottomless and shoreless ocean of chance. The only possible foundation for science and philosophy as well as for theology is the presupposition that God as all-controlling and Christ as actually redeeming does actually exist and is actually known by man. But to hold this position requires us to give up the idea that man himself is the source of unity in human experience. In seeking such unity as only God can have, apostate man cuts himself loose from the possibility of having any unity in experience at all.

CTETH 250

90. OCEAN OF RELATIVITY IN WHICH NON-CHRISTIAN ETHICS SWIM

If the Christian consciousness has no absolute standard by which to judge itself, it is soon lost in the ocean of relativity, in which all the standards of non-Christian ethics swim. More than that, if the Christian consciousness does not completely submit itself to the Scripture it is already pagan in principle. All that does not spring from obedience to God is sin.

CTETH 25

91. OPERATION: THE UNBELIEVER CAN FEEL LIKE A MAN WHO IS ABOUT TO UNDERGO A MAJOR OPERATION – the effect of realizing that if you are to change your belief about God you will also have to change your belief about yourself

I see you are getting excited. You feel a little like a man who is about to undergo a major operation. You realize that if you are to change your belief about God, you will also have to change your belief about yourself. And you are not quite ready for that. Well, you may leave if you desire. I certainly do not wish to be impolite. I only thought that as an intelligent person you would be willing to hear the "other side" of the question.

WIB 4

92. ORANGE: NON-CHRISTIAN'S SPOILED ORANGE (wrong interpretation) AND BELIEVERS FRESH ORANGE (right interpretation)

How can Reformed thinkers read Rom 8:5-7 ("For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be") and still think of the "carnal mind" as being able to interpret things rightly, even if not comprehensively? How can a Christian say to a non-Christian, "I quite agree with what you have said, but you have not said enough; you have only half an orange, I have the whole orange"? [It is highly likely that Van Til is here referring Francis Schaeffer's illustration from pages 128-31 of *Death in The City* (Inter-Varsity Press, 1969). See further CVTRA pages 130-1.] Obviously he should have said, "You have a spoiled orange, while I have a fresh orange."

FH

93. PARASITE – the unbeliever must feed upon the truth, also see 16

There would be no reality to cite against the unbeliever unless unbelief itself as a parasite must feed upon the truth.

PDS 132

94. PEPPER-POT OF CHANCE – every conceivable kind of configuration of facts and laws may eventually appear if you shake it long enough

If the pepper-pot of Chance shakes long enough every conceivable kind of configuration of facts and laws may eventually appear; theism may be true today and non-theism may be true tomorrow.

RNCL

95. PERMIT IS NEEDED TO DIG ON THE WHITE HOUSE LAWN AND IF GIVE INTRUDER A SMALL CORNER, THE ILLEGITIMATE GROUND-DIGGER SOON DIGS TUNNELS UNDERNEATH THE WHITE HOUSE ITSELF, WHILST BEG FOR PERMISSION TO HAVE A PLACE ALONGSIDE THE GROUND-DIGGER'S PRESENT OPERATIONS FOR HIS RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE – the non-believing scientist is actively engaged in breaking God's covenant requirements when he says that he is simply neutrally following the facts wheresoever they may lead him also see 96 and compare 45 and 60; Whilst a Christian who fails to challenge the unbeliever to show his permit claims room for faith as a necessary supplement to an autonomous science

It is also of the essence of the modern approach to the field of science that the facts are assumed to be non-revelational of God ... It is therefore the responsibility of Christians who are scientists to call other men who are also scientists, to repentance for their assumption of neutrality with respect to the facts with which they deal in the laboratory. The non-believing scientist is actively engaged in breaking God's covenant requirements when he says that he is simply following the facts wheresoever they may lead him. This is as though someone would dig up a piece of ground on the White House lawn and then not only act greatly surprised when the guard taps him on the shoulder and asks him for his permit to do what he is doing, but insist on his right to do what he is doing without any permit at all. If I find a red heifer with the letters LBJ [President Lyndon Baines Johnson] on it, on the LBJ ranch in Texas, I will grant that I need a permit to move it about. If I enter through the gate of the ranch at all, I already know that every fact I will meet within the confines of the ranch belongs to LBJ.

Now [if one who is] committed to the Reformed faith ... fails to thus challenge the unbeliever to show his permit ... [to] ... at least make room for the Christian religion ... then he makes room for religion in the way that the White House guard might make room for LBJ by asking the intruder mentioned above to restrict his activity to a certain small corner of the rose garden. Graciously accepting this arrangement, the illegitimate ground-digger soon digs tunnels underneath the White House itself, its collapse being the inevitable issue. After all, if the ground-digger claims to have the right to dig at one point on the White House lawn, he will at last claim the right to dig wherever he pleases, He will not only claim the right to dig wherever he pleases, but he will claim that he simply *must* dig up the whole ground to accomplish his purpose. After all, he wants to replace the White House with a building of his own.

Having granted this sort of thing, [he] is driven to the position of having to beg for permission to have a place alongside the ground-digger's present operations for his own religious structure of Calvinism. He thinks he is very bold in claiming the right to build his Calvinistic structure alongside that of the anti-Christian ground-digger. He argues vigorously against those who claim that "all truth is to be obtained by one method, the method of science" ... [but] he claims room for faith as a necessary supplement to an autonomous science.

PDS 67-9

96. PICNICS, HUNTING PARTIES AND WORKING ON GOD'S ESTATE WITHOUT ASKING HIS PERMISSION (CONTRAST THE FREEDOM OF SERVING THE OWNER) – as God's creatures a present attitude, of not believing in Him, is very unfair to Him, also see 95 and compare 45 and 60, and scientists act as though they are not dealing with materials that belong to God, compare 8 and 136; The world is treated as a grab-bag; The freedom of fulfilling cultural mandate by working on God's estate, for the owner

96a. ... not believing in God you do not think the universe has been created by God. That is to say, you think of yourself and the world as just being there. Now if you actually are God's creature, then your present attitude is very unfair to Him. ... You have as it were entered upon God's estate and have had your picnics and hunting parties there without asking His permission.

WIB 11-2

96b. The cultural mandate is to be fulfilled in our handling of the facts or events of our environment. Men must subdue, to the service of Christ, the earth and all that is therein [Gen 1:28]. As the Christian constantly does so, he is constantly conscious of the fact that he is working on God's estate. He is not himself the owner of anything, least of all of himself. He is the bondservant of God through Christ. Therein lies his freedom. Those who still think of themselves as owners of themselves and think of the world as a grab-bag cannot properly evaluate the situation as it really is. Unbeknown to them, they too are working on God's estate. As they construct their temples to themselves God looks down from heaven and watches them; he yet cares for them. He has infinite patience with them. Will they not finally understand that neither they nor the world belongs to them? Will they not repent? Can they not observe the fact that the wisdom of this world is but foolishness in the sight of God [1 Cor 1:20]?

PDS 1-2

96c. When working in the laboratory as scientists, men act as though they are not dealing with materials that belong to God. ... They are like those who go hunting in a woods clearly marked "No Gunning," without a permit from the owner.

CGG 131

97. POURING WATER THROUGH A SIEVE – the effect of presenting facts to an unbeliever without challenging his assumptions, compare 30

... to present facts and more facts to an unbeliever, whose basically immanentistic assumptions we have tacitly granted is much like pouring water through a sieve. The unbeliever can "do away with" an infinity of facts as long as his assumptions are not challenged. The presentation of facts as such loses all of its challenge if it is not accompanied by the presentation of the total Christian life and world view.

GH 244

98. PRESIDENT'S VOICE: WE DO NOT TAKE A RECORDING PRESIDENT'S VOICE TO THOSE WHO HAVE NEVER HEARD HIS VOICE, IN ORDER TO HAVE THEM JUDGE WHETHER IT IS HIS VOICE! – we do not start speaking of the Scriptures at first as merely the records of men before we prove them inspired, rather we must take the Bible simultaneously with Christ and with God as its author, who is speaking to us, also see 39 and 76; Evidences and defending Scripture's inspiration; Circular thinking

For all this stress upon the plenary inspiration of Scriptures as the work of the Holy Spirit making the Scriptures the very Word of God, Warfield wants the Christian apologist to start speaking of them at first as merely the records of men. Says Warfield, "Inspiration is not the most fundamental of Christian doctrines, nor even the first thing we prove about the Scriptures. It is the last and crowning fact as to the Scriptures. These we first prove authentic, historically credible, generally trustworthy, before we prove them inspired. And the proof of their authenticity ... would give us a firm basis for Christianity prior to any knowledge on our part of their inspiration, and apart indeed from the existence of inspiration" (B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible*, Philadelphia, 1948, p. 210).

Warfield's purpose in thus falling back upon the general trustworthiness of the New Testament as historical records is, as noted, in the interest of convincing the unbeliever of the revelation and inspiration of God in Christ. The New Testament writers themselves bear witness to the fact of inspiration. They are the "prime witnesses of the fact and nature of their inspiration." But in order to escape the charge that in saying this we are reasoning in a "vicious circle," argues Warfield, "We do not assume inspiration in order to prove inspiration. We do not assume inspiration. We assume only honesty and sobriety. If a sober and honest writer claims to be inspired by God, then here, at least, is a phenomenon to be accounted for" (Ibid., p. 423). ...

The flaw in this whole approach of Warfield's to the defense of the Bible as the inspired Word of God is that its philosophy of history is the opposite of that which the Bible, according to Warfield himself, teaches. If history is not what it is because of its creation and redemption by the triune God, there could not be any foundation on which man could stand in order either to affirm or deny the truth about anything.

The whole of Warfield's conviction with respect to the Bible is to the effect that unless it is the Word of God there is no light or life for men. On Warfield's view of the Bible all the phenomena within and about it are what they are because God and Christ and the Holy Spirit are what they are and have done what they have done. To be sure, we need not and must not say, "First the inspired Bible and secondly the divine Christ" (cf. Patton, *The Christian View of Science and the Scripture*, Grand Rapids, 1954, by B. Ramm, p. 146). We must rather take the Bible simultaneously with Christ and with God as its author. It is God who is speaking through Christ and his Spirit in the Bible. When we have spoken to the President, we do not take a record of the voice of the President to those who have never heard the voice of the

99. PRISON INMATES AND THEY LOCK THE DOOR BEHIND THEM – the Christian minister is called upon to offer men release from their self-imposed prison, not to join with them and ecumenists

... all modern ecumenists are unaware of the fact that they are playing their orchestra on a sinking ship. They do not realize that modern man, as a theologian, as a philosopher and as a scientist thinks of himself as “thrown” into the world of an infinitely extended and bottomless sea of pure contingency. Man is thought of as the white-cap on the wave of an infinitely extended ocean. And all the facts of this man’s environment are thought of as sprung from pure contingency. Accordingly the form or structure of the mind of man and of the facts of his environment have also sprung from pure contingency.

Obviously modern man needs something else than pure contingency if he is to have awareness of himself in distinction from awareness of the objects of his environment, and awareness of his fellow-man. But the only thing available to him through which he might have awareness of himself is the idea of pure form as correlative to pure contingency. If he appealed to the God of Scripture as the creator and redeemer of the cosmos for the principle of structure that he needs, he would lose his notion of pure contingency or freedom. But when in his desperation he appeals to the ideal of pure form to lift him out of the bottomless ocean of chance, then he finds that it is not he who has made this appeal at all. ... Pure form has swallowed up pure contingency. ...

... Meanwhile many a modern scientist, many a modern philosopher, and many a modern theologian assumes that he will find true self-awareness, and true freedom by locking himself into this cage of endless dialectical interaction between pure form and pure matter.

The Christian minister is called upon to offer men release from this self-imposed prison through that only name by which men must be saved [Acts 4:12], Jesus Christ. It is sad indeed to find ministers of the gospel join the inmates of this prison and lock the door behind them.

RSF

100. PROPELLER’S GYRATIONS BY AN AIRPLANE ENGINE WITHOUT THE AIRPLANE – the meaninglessness of the naked eye of reason without the authority of the Scripture message, also see 11, 13, 68, and 111; To remove our “rose-colored glasses” of Scripture (see 57 and contrast 58) would be to take the ground from under our feet

Our Reformed pastor saw, therefore, that for Calvin the Christian lives above all by the authority of the Scripture message. If then a non-Christian should urge our pastor to take off his “rose-colored glasses” and look at the cosmos “with the naked eye of reason,” or should appeal to conscience to refute the interpretation of human experience as given in Scripture, our pastor knows that to do so would be to take the ground from under his own feet. Reason would then be truly “naked” or formal; its assertions would be as meaningless as the gyrations of a propeller of an airplane engine without the airplane. If facts could be said to exist at all, they would be utterly interchangeable with one another.

RP 34

101. PUMPING OUT THE WATER OF SIN TAKES UP MUCH OF OUR TIME, BUT WE ARE NEVERTHELESS LAYING THE FOUNDATION OF OUR BRIDGE ON SOLID ROCK – our goal of the absolute destruction of sin and evil is certain

... the Biblical *summum bonum* [highest good] requires the absolute destruction of sin and evil in the individual and in society. ...

Our task with respect to the destruction of evil is not ended when we have sought to fight sin itself everywhere we see it. We have the further obligation to destroy the consequences of sin in this world as far as we can. We must do good to all men, especially to those of the household of faith. To help relieve something of the sufferings of the creatures of God is our privilege and our task.

... A great deal of our time will have to be taken up with the destruction of evil. We may not even seem to see much progress in ourselves or ‘round about us, during our lifetime. We shall have to build with the trowel in one hand and the sword in the other. It may seem to us to be but a hopeless task of sweeping the ocean dry. Yet we know that this is exactly what our ethical ideal would be if we were not Christians. We know that for non-Christians their ethical ideal can never be realized either for themselves or for society. They do not even know the true ethical ideal. And as to our own efforts, we know that though much of our time may have to be taken up with pumping out the water of sin, we are nevertheless laying the foundation of our bridge on solid rock, and we are making progress toward our goal. Our victory is certain. The devil and all his servants will be put out of the habitable universe of God. There will be a new heaven and a new

102. QUICKSAND, SINKING INTO – the problems with traditional Thomistic-Butler type apologetics are answered by Reformed apologetics: we must first introduce the Creator-creature distinction, without which we are sunk, and place ourselves, for the sake of the argument, upon the position of the non-Christian and show him that on his view of man and the cosmos, he and the whole culture he is based upon, will sink into quicksand

102a. I had for many years rejected the Thomistic-Butler type of approach to apologetics. I had done so because of the unbiblical view of man and the cosmos which underlay this apologetic. I had over and over pointed out that non-Christian schemes of thought, whether ancient or modern, presupposed a view of man as autonomous, of human thought or logic as legislative of what can or cannot exist in reality, and of pure contingency as correlative to such legislative thought. I had for years pointed out that for a Christian to adopt these non-Christian presuppositions about man, together with the dialectical interdependence of legislative logic and brute contingency, and then to join the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] in asking *whether* God exists and *whether* Christianity is true would be fatal for his enterprise. If we allow that one intelligent word can be spoken about *being* or *knowing* or *acting* as such, without first introducing the Creator-creature distinction, we are sunk. As Christians we must not allow that even such a thing as enumeration or counting can be accounted for except upon the presupposition of the truth of what we are told in Scripture about the triune God as the Creator and Redeemer of the world. As a Christian believer I must therefore place myself, for the sake of the argument, upon the position of the non-Christian and show him that on his view of man and the cosmos he and the whole culture is based upon, and will sink into, quicksand. If the unbeliever then points to the fact that non-Christian scientists and philosophers have discovered many actual “states of affairs,” I heartily agree with this but I must tell him that they have done so with borrowed capital. They have done so *adventitiously*. The actual state of affairs about the entire cosmos is what the Bible says it is.

JA 90-1

102b. It has become plain to us that the traditional Butler-type of apologetics does not present Christianity as a challenge to modern relativist thought. Modern man must be challenged to forsake his sinful and therefore futile effort to find meaning in life in terms of himself as a law unto himself. ...

So far as modern thought is not based upon the presupposition of the truth of Christianity it is lost in utter darkness. Christianity is the only alternative to chaos. The traditional method of apologetics fails to bring out this fact. It is the business of a Reformed and therefore truly biblical apologetics to do what Romanist-Arminian apologetics has not done and cannot do.

CTK 310

102c. The general conclusion then is that on the traditional method it is impossible to set one position clearly over against the other so that the two may be compared for what they are. Certainly there can be no confrontation of two opposing positions if it cannot be pointed out on what they oppose each other. On the traditional basis of reasoning the unbeliever is not so much as given an opportunity of seeing with any adequacy how the position he is asked to accept differs from his own.

DF3 207

103. RADIO BUTTON – man cannot turn on any button on his self-consciousness without hearing the requirement of God and seeing the God who is there (God reveals himself also in the heart and conscience of every man); General revelation – God is everywhere and inescapable, , also see 45, 49, 79 and 114 – there are no atheistic peoples and no atheistic men

103a. As made in the image of God no man can escape becoming the interpretative medium of God’s general revelation both in his intellectual (Rom 1:20) and in his moral consciousness (Rom 2:14–15). No matter which button of the radio he presses, he always hears the voice of God. Even when he presses the button of his own psychological self-conscious activity, through which as a last resort the sinner might hope to hear another voice, he still hears the voice of God. “If I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there” [Ps 139:8]. It is in this sense that we must, at least to begin with, understand the matter when we are told that there are no atheistic peoples and no atheistic men. Psychologically there are no atheistic men; epistemologically every sinner is atheistic.

CGG 53-54

103b. Speaking of the comprehensiveness of God's general revelation, [Bavinck] says: "He reveals himself also in the heart and conscience of every man, Job 34.8; 33.4; Prv 20.27; Jn 1.3-5, 9, 10; Rom 2.14.15; 8.16. This revelation of God is general, in itself observable and intelligible to every man." (Bavinck, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, 3rd ed., 1918, vol. 1, p. 321.) Discussing the principles of religion, Bavinck speaks as follows: "Thus there is not only an external, objective, but also an internal, subjective revelation." (Ibid., p. 290.)...

The main point is that if man could look anywhere and not be confronted with the revelation of God then he could not sin in the biblical sense of the term. Sin is the breaking of the law of God. God confronts man everywhere. He cannot in the nature of the case confront man anywhere if he does not confront him everywhere. God is one; the law is one. If man could press one button on the radio of his experience and not hear the voice of God then he would always press that button and not the others. But man cannot even press the button of his own self-consciousness without hearing the requirement of God.

CGG 176-7

103c. ... we know that man has been created in the image of this triune God. Every man is therefore confronted with the revelation of the triune God within his own constitution as well as in the facts of his environment. Man cannot turn on any button on the dial of his self-consciousness but he will see the face of this God who is there. The triune God of Scripture who is there is everywhere there and is everywhere inescapably there. Paul says of all men that "knowing God" they have not kept him in remembrance [Rom 1:21].

AMFS

104. RAFT, ADRIFT ON A SHORELESS OCEAN – no intelligible interpretation of experience apart from Christ, Compare 89 and 105

Accordingly, he [who has not followed the true and full meaning of the gospel of Christ] has never seen that no school of modern science or philosophy or theology has offered any intelligible interpretation of human experience. Accordingly, he is as it were adrift on a raft that floats on a shoreless ocean blindly grasping a straw that bobs up and down on the waves that are ready to envelope him.

GH 52

105. RAFT: SINKING RAFT OF AUTONOMOUS EXPERIENCE; Compare 104

When I beseech men to forsake their unbelief and accept the Christ of Scripture as God over all and therefore as their Savior, I ask them to forsake the obviously sinking raft of experience as it is assumed to be by would-be autonomous man.

JA 426

106. RAILROAD TRACK: IF I SLEEP ON IT, HOW COULD I CERTAIN THAT NO TRAIN WILL COME? – the evolutionist makes a universal negative conclusion that God and a coming judgment do not exist but we may be face to face with the judgment at any time, also see 40

... we note that the evolutionist has to make and does make a universal negative conclusion on the basis of a little stream of experience. When he takes for granted that anything happens by chance, he really takes for granted that everything happens by chance. He thus negates God. He says in effect that there cannot be a judgment coming. Yet he himself admits that all his reasoning about anything is based upon a short span of human experience of at most a few thousand years. How is it possible that evolutionists are able to predict, on such a basis, what can and what cannot happen for millions of years to come? Yet this is exactly what every evolutionist does.

If I should go to sleep on a railroad track, how could I be safe? Only if I were certain that no train would come for several hours. How could I be certain of this? Only if I control the railroad or have the full assurance of the man who controls the railroad. And if you say that people do not fall asleep on railroad tracks, I reply that every spot in this universe is like a railroad track if creation be true. In that case, we may be face to face with the judgment at any time.

JCC2

107. REBEL, AGAINST THE CAPTAIN OF AN OCEAN STEAMER, JUMPS OFF OR SETS HIS OWN ROOM ON FIRE TO PREVENT THE STEAMER REACHING ITS DESTINATION, BUT WHO FAILS? YET THE CAPTAIN OFFERS THE MUTINEERS ABOARD HIS SHIP THE CHANCE TO REPENT – the captain is Christ who offers the mutineers the chance to join him in his inevitable victory over evil,

compare 108 and 109

Since the advent of Christ, apostate man has indeed tried untiringly, and always in vain, to find a foundation for preventing Christ's call to repentance and salvation from reaching his ears. A man may rebel against the rules of conduct issued by the captain of an ocean steamer, and he may even jump off and attempt deflecting the steamer's course, to prevent it from reaching its destination. But who will fail, he or the captain? Or, again, he may set fire to the wastebasket in his room, hopefully to incinerate the captain, and if successful, both he and the captain would burn to death or drown. Who is the captain in this case? It is the self-attesting Christ of Scripture; he it is who has set before him, set in motion, the forces that will lead the steamer to his own chosen destination.

He offers the mutineers aboard his ship the chance to repent and to join him in his inevitable victory over evil, and, if they refuse, doing all in their power to keep the captain from reaching his destination, they will reap only eternal death for their folly

WSA

108. REBELLIOUS SAILOR, OR ENGINEER WHO MAKES DISCOVERIES, SEEKS TO BURN UNBURNABLE SHIP – point of contact with apostate thinking because the world (the ship) is what God says it is, also see 7, 36, 61, and 71; Compare 107 and 109

Moreover, it is precisely in the fact that the world is what it is in terms of the Christian framework that there is any actual contact with apostate thinking. Contact between the two positions is not only possible, but unavoidable just because all reality, including the mind of the unbeliever, is what God in his Word has said that it is. A sailor on an ocean liner may hate the captain and seek to burn up the ship. He is caught and put to scrubbing the deck. If he is an engineer, he may be made to repair the boilers. All his gifts will then be made finally subservient to the progress of the ship as directed by the captain. He may discover several states of affairs which he, a better engineer than any other on board, alone could discover. Even so, the fact that he can discover any state of affairs at all is due to the fact that the boat cannot be burned down by him. It is not burnable. If it were the sort of boat that the rebellious engineer in the first place thought it to be when he tried to burn it, then there would have been no possibility of dialogue with him.

CC

109. REBELLIOUS SAILORS MUST EMPLOY THEIR GIFTS TO HELP THE SHIP, AND EVEN THOUGH THEY KNOW THAT THEIR MUTINY IS CERTAIN TO END IN SELF-FRUSTRATION, THEY MAKE THEMSELVES BELIEVE IN DIFFERENT WAYS, THAT THEIR MUTINY WILL BE SUCCESSFUL; ALSO THEY ARE CALLED TO RETURN TO THE CAPTAIN – though men do not recognize the truth about the world they can, in spite of themselves, produce much culture which is given to others and there are degrees of self-deception in which they labor; God calls the human race to repent and believe so that they will be saved and also have their culture saved, or be destroyed; Compare 107 and 108

109a. But what about those who do not accept the Christ of God? What about those who continue their mutiny against the captain of the ship? God continues to call them, as part of the crew, to repentance. He sends forth a general call to the whole human race, promising those who repent and believe that they will be saved and have their culture saved also. He also continues to threaten those who will not believe that they will be destroyed. They will be kept on board until the end of the journey. They will not simply be kept in ward. They will even be allowed the freedom of the ship. But they will of necessity help to do the work of the ship. And so of necessity the total culture to which they had to contribute will be saved.

This saving of their culture will therefore be in spite of their own principle. Their principle, the principle of mutiny, was aimed to destroy the ship. It may be compared to the fire that is started in one of the cabins of the ship. If not put out it would destroy the ship. Its principle is absolutely destructive. But it is under perfect control. Hence those who have made the fire cannot even succeed in destroying the work that they, together with the rest of the crew, perform daily aboard the ship as it sails on to its destined haven. It should be remembered that the mutineers are not perfectly self-conscious. But at bottom they realize that their own mutinous endeavors are bound to fail. Calvin, like Paul, emphasizes the fact that all men have the knowledge of God within them [Rom 1:21]. They know therefore that mutiny is certain to end in self-frustration. They know that to sin against God is at the same time to sin against the law their own being. They know that mutiny does not pay. For mutineers must still work, and as mutineers they must labor for the captain without finally reaping the reward that he has offered them.

So their mutiny is something that requires artificial stimulation all the time. Rules of navigation are carefully drawn up by the chief mutineer which are calculated to show that the captain is not properly directing the ship and that he will therefore be unable to reach his own destination. Yet such rules of Satan are artificial and false imitations of the rules which he himself learns from the way the captain actually handles the ship.

Even so the mutineers believe that they will finally be successful. They make themselves believe that no one, while still on the open sea, ought to make a choice for the captain rather than for the chief mutineer. So there are degrees of self-deception by which the mutineers labor.

ECE 87-8

109b. Though men do not recognize the truth about the world they can, in spite of themselves, produce much culture. They cannot help but do so. They are like the rebellious sailor who tries to burn up the ship because he hated the captain. This sailor, instead of being thrown into the brig, is made to employ his gifts, whatever they may be, so that the ship may go forward to the harbor. When the ship arrives at its destination all the fruits of this sailor's labor will be preserved, but they will be given to others and he himself will be lost. What he has accomplished constructively will enter into the new heavens and the new earth for their adornment.

ECE 16

110. REPORTING OF SCIENTISTS CONTAINS MUCH THAT IS TRUE, BUT NEED ONLY TO TURN THEIR REPORTS RIGHT SIDE UP TO HAVE A MARVELOUS DISPLAY OF THE FACTS AS GOD INTENDED, also see 124

... I find all these [strong men of biology, psychology, logic, and scientific methodology] , though standing on their heads, reporting much that is true. I need only to turn their reports right side up, making God instead of man the center of it all, and I have a marvelous display of the facts as God has intended me to see them.

WIB 19

111. REVOLVING DOOR IN A VOID – logic, including and the law of non-contradiction, move from nothing into nothing on the basis of chance, also see 11, 13, 68 and 100

111a. When the non-Christian, not working on the foundation of creation and providence, talks about *musts* in relation to *facts* he is beating the air. His logic is merely the exercise of a revolving door in a void, moving nothing from nowhere into the void. But instead of pointing out this fact to the unbeliever the traditional apologist appeals to this non-believer as though by his immanentistic method he could very well interpret many things correctly.

DF3 206

111b. ... in the universe of Chance the law of contradiction has no fulcrum. It is then like a revolving door resting upon chance moving nothing into nothing except for the fact that it then cannot move.

CGG 113

112. ROTTING APPLE IN A BUSHEL WILL SPOIL THE WHOLE BUSHEL IN TIME – one spot of ultimate irrationality will spoil rationality

One rotting apple in a bushel will spoil the whole bushel in time. One spot of ultimate irrationality will not only spoil rationality in the future but even now makes all talk about complete rationality meaningless.

CTEV 118

113. ROWING TOGETHER IN A LEAKY BOAT TELLING EACH OTHER THAT IN ALL PROBABILITY THERE IS A FATHER GOD WHO WILL SEND US FOOD AND DRINKING WATER ON OUR WAY – the Reformed creeds have been more faithful in giving a proper response to the mercy of God to men in Christ than have other creeds (the rowers, etc.) which have, to some extent, reduced the offer of the sovereign grace of God in Christ

The actual state of affairs about the entire cosmos is what the Bible says it is.

In its response to what the Bible says is the actual state of affairs, the Christian church has written its creeds. In these creeds we have a response on the part of redeemed people of God to his revelation of sovereign grace to them and of his calling all apostate men to repent and submit themselves to Christ. In the creeds men who are made in the image of God, who have fallen into sin and who have been redeemed in principle by the death and resurrection of Christ in their place and subsequently born again by the Holy Spirit, think God's thoughts of mercy after him. The Reformed creeds have been more faithful in giving a proper response to the mercy of God to men in Christ than have other creeds. Roman Catholics, Lutherans, and Arminians have, to some extent, reduced the offer of the sovereign grace of God in Christ by

means of a schematism of thought borrowed from the natural man [1 Cor 2:14]. “We are, all of us, in the same boat,” they say. “Let us see *whether* we can together stop the leaks and get to shore.” “Let us together row harder and harder, till we reach the shore. Let us not despair. Let us keep telling each other that in all probability some great one, very likely Christ, will meet us and help us. In all probability there is a Father God who will send us food and drinking water on our way.” Meanwhile, except for the grace of God, who in Christ forgives men such God-dishonoring tactics, lost men keep dying only to appear before the judgment of Christ whom they rejected by not taking him at his word.

JA 91

114. SEARCHLIGHT – searchlight of God’s general revelation is constantly shining everywhere, particularly within men where the knowledge of God is infixed in their being, also see 45, 49, 79 and 103; Searchlight of the Scripture, which is all-revealing, is to be directed towards the unbeliever so they see the face of the Great Physician who says that the heart of the natural man is desperately wicked and he can heal all his diseases; Compare 115

114a. ... men do have a knowledge that is created within them and inherited from Adam. It is the knowledge which they have as image bearers of God. Men generally seek to suppress this knowledge of God. They would gladly live where the searchlight of God’s revelation does not constantly expose them to themselves. But there is no such place. This searchlight never ceases to shine. It shines particularly *within them*. There is no hiding from it. The knowledge of God is infixed in their being.

RP 16

114b. The Arminian as well as the Roman Catholic fails to present to the believer a challenge to the effect that he needs a radical conversion. Neither the Arminian nor the Roman Catholic so much as gives the unbeliever the opportunity of seeing what the gospel really is. They do not direct the all-revealing searchlight of the Scripture toward him. They do not even show him the face of the Great Physician lest this Great Physician should say that the heart of the natural man is desperately wicked [1 Cor 2:14; Jer 17:9] and that no man knows the depth of that wickedness except the Great Physician, who would heal all his diseases.

RP 70

115. SEARCHLIGHT (compare 114) IS NEEDED TO SEE THE NIAGARA FALLS AT NIGHT – without the true light of Scripture as the word of the self-attesting Christ we would know no fact for what it is, i.e., as set in the only framework in which it can have meaning, also see 57 and 85; Reason and revelation should not be contrasted as two sources of knowledge for “facts” are known by revelation and by creation the “facts” are themselves a revelation of God; The revelation of God in the facts of the created world was, from the beginning supplemented by the “supernatural” word revelation of God

In the objective sphere there is the supreme fact of the incarnation, the death and resurrection of Christ as the Son of God and Son of man, and there is the Scripture as the authoritative interpretation of these facts. By the incarnation and all that it involves in the way of the life and death of Christ, the object of knowledge is redeemed. That is, the object of knowledge is brought into right relationship with God once more. And an aspect of this restoration is that true light is thrown upon it by the Scriptures. The Niagara Falls cannot be seen at night unless there is a powerful searchlight that throws light upon them.

The point of importance to note about this matter of Scripture is that according to the Christian theistic position the Bible is an inherent part of the system of theism as a whole. If man is a totally dependent creature, if this creature has fallen into sin so that the whole of creation has for his sake been subjected to “vanity”; if the “facts” because created by God must ultimately be interpreted by God as to connotation and denotation alike, there must be a Scripture which brings this interpretation of God. But that Scripture must be, we learn from Scripture itself. Without the Scripture as the word of the self-attesting Christ we would know no fact for what it is, i.e., as set in the only framework in which it can have meaning. It is of the utmost importance that Christians themselves become aware of the exact position of Scripture in their thinking. All too often they carry forth the old Scholastic doctrine that man can know certain facts by the exercise of his reason but that he needs information about other facts by way of revelation. Now if the Christian theistic view is true at all, there is no fact that can be known truly without the revelation of Scripture. Reason and revelation should not be contrasted as two sources of knowledge. It ought to be clearly understood that the “facts” by virtue of their creation by God cannot be known otherwise than by revelation. By virtue of creation the “facts” are themselves a revelation of God. And the revelation of God in the facts of the created world was, from the beginning supplemented by the “supernatural” word revelation of God. Hence if reason is to function fruitfully it must always function upon revelational material. Reason as one “fact” among others is itself a revelation. This much is implied in theism. In addition to this we

must maintain that no “fact” can be truly known, now that sin has come into the world, without the special revelation of Scripture, because it is only through Christ and the Scriptures that “facts” are seen as they are, that is, as theistic “facts.”

SCE 123-124

116. SEE A STAR THROUGH TELESCOPE AND A GERM THROUGH MICROSCOPE NOT VICE-VERSA – all facts must be seen “in God” to be seen truly, not by looking elsewhere

If all things must be seen “in God” to be seen truly, one could look ever so long elsewhere without ever seeing a fact as it really is. If I must look through a telescope to see a distant star, I cannot first look at the star to see whether there is a telescope through which alone I could see it. If I must look through a microscope to see a germ, I cannot first look at the germ with the naked eye to see if there is a microscope through which alone I can see it. If it were a question of seeing something with the naked eye and seeing the same object more clearly through a telescope or a microscope, the matter would be different. We may see a landscape dimly with the naked eye and then turn to look at it through a telescope and see it more clearly. But such is not the case with the Christian position. According to it, nothing at all can be known truly of any fact unless it be known through and by way of man’s knowledge of God.

SCE 5

117. SEED OF RELIGION IS DIVINELY SOWN IN ALL MEN

117a. [Men] have demanded a *Beyond*. The nations have been incorrigibly religious. The *sensus deitatis* has been deeply ingrained in men, says Calvin, and the seed of religion has been so fixed in their being that they have tried in vain to remove the knowledge of God from their hearts.

IST 107

117b. ... the *seed of religion* [Calvin’s *Institutes* I.4.1 and I.5.1] is divinely sown in all. Men should have recognized God; the revelation from without and from within is a daily challenge to them to turn to God (IST 93). God’s power and divinity “are still displayed in man as well as about him, in the fact of the self-conscious activity of his person, in his own negative moral reaction to the revelation about and within him, in his sense of dissatisfaction with all non-theistic interpretations, and in a measure of involuntary recognition of the truth of the theistic interpretation as the true interpretation of the origin of the world” (IST 97).

CGG 160

118. SHELTER TO FACTS IS CHRISTIANITY AS A UNIT; Christian religion cannot be defended piecemeal as it proves its truth to men by offering itself as the foundation of proof and the refuge for facts, compare 5, 17, 20, 21 and 124

118a. ... the second aspect of biblical teaching concerns the question of sin and redemption [the first being Christian Theism]. Here again it is the sovereign God who meets us. When man fell into sin, God, the triune God, graciously provided redemption for his people. He was sovereign in that he needed not to have given redemption to any, and he is sovereign in that he does not give it to all. This work of redemption on the part of God reveals itself in this world in supernatural form. Miracle is at the heart of Christianity. The incarnation of the second person of the Trinity, the death and the resurrection of Jesus, are but the central cycle of the larger circle of redemptive works that have proceeded from it.

As to the purpose of redemption, it was both restorative and supplementive. The miracle of redemption graciously dropped into the center of history by God, the creator of history, spreads its influence till it reaches the very circumference of the universe. There is no fact not affected for good or for evil by the redemptive work of Christ. And this includes the acceptance or non-acceptance of redemption. “He that is not for me is against me” [Mt 12:30].

The consequence of this position is that here too we meet with the same basic alternative between Christian and non-Christian methodology. As Christians we hold it to be impossible to interpret any fact without a basic falsification unless it be regarded in its relation to God the Creator and to Christ the Redeemer. On the other hand, the current methodology takes for granted that at best redemption is one among several independent facts that must be taken into consideration when we interpret facts. *For us there can be no true interpretation of facts without miracle*; for our opponents, miracle is at best a somewhat unruly fact.

Thus Christian theism stands before us as a unit. It offers to men the conception of God the Creator and Redeemer as the ultimate category of interpretation of every fact of the world. It claims that no fact is intelligible unless seen in relation to central creating-redeeming activity of God as Creator and Redeemer.

That this implies a reversal of the method employed by Butler and the others whom we have discussed in the

previous chapters is apparent. We do not offer Christianity to men apologetically, admitting that their interpretation of life is right as far as it goes. In particular, we do not accept the “appeal to facts” as a common meeting place between believers and unbelievers. Christianity does not thus need to take shelter under the roof of “known facts.” It rather offers itself as a roof to facts if they would be known. Christianity does not need to take shelter under the roof of a scientific method independent of itself. It rather offers itself as a roof to methods that would be scientific.

CTEV 51-2

118b. The Christian religion cannot be defended piecemeal. It proves its truth to men, whether they accept it or not, by offering itself as the foundation of proof. It is fatal to say that there is at least as good a case for Christianity is probably true. Christianity is true or nothing is true. Christianity is in accord with logic because logic, to be logic, must be in accord with Christianity. Christianity is in accord with the facts of experience because these facts, if they would be experienced, better take refuge under the roof of Christianity.

GH 230

119. SHIP’S BALLAST IS THROWN OVERBOARD AND THE SHIP IS DOOMED TO ARRIVE AT THE ENCHANTED ISLANDS – forsaking God as the presupposition of true interpretation lead to throwing every criterion of distinction between fact and fiction, between right and wrong overboard and the ship of science and philosophy is doomed to arrive at the Enchanted Islands

Forsaking God as the presupposition of true interpretation in any field leads to pure inactivity. Every criterion of distinction between fact and fiction between truth and falsehood, between right and wrong, has been thrown overboard as ballast and the ship of science and philosophy is doomed to arrive at the Enchanted Islands.

CMT

120. SHOE LACES: MAN MUST LIFT HIMSELF BY THEM – the modern view of Niebuhr, Barth, Brunner is autosoterism/self-salvation

For the modern view, the idea of orthodox theology that some men are saved and others are not saved is immoral and intellectually inconceivable. It is at this point especially that the realm of pure freedom or contingency is itself invaded by the adherents of the modern view with the tools of pure determinism and rationalism. It is surely impressive to watch the great theologian of the freedom of God, Karl Barth, argue with vehemence for the absolute *impossibility* of the existence of any man that is not saved. The great stress in his anthropology is that self-consciousness involves Christ-consciousness. Man cannot be man unless he is a sinner; he is a sinner in virtue of his finitude; but neither can man be man unless he is saved in ‘Christ.’ Nothing can be said about the pure individual. He must be related to the pure universal. To be sure, nothing can be said about a pure universal; it must be united to the pure particular. But when the pure particular is somehow—no one knows how—joined to the pure universal then we have *The Individual*. He alone exists; all individual men that ‘exist’ must exist by way of participation in *The Individual*. It is this great ‘discovery’ of Kierkegaard that is offered as the panacea of all the individual and the social ills of men by Niebuhr, by Barth, by Brunner, and by a host of others. Yet when analyzed into its component parts of pure determinism and pure indeterminism, this notion of *The Individual* appears to offer to man nothing but autosoterism [self-salvation]. Man must lift himself by his own shoe laces.

ICG 37-8

121. SHOWER OF THE WRATH OF GOD UPON THE WHOLE CREATION IS FOCUSED UPON THE SOUL OF MAN THAT HAD SINNED

We are told particularly by Paul that the wrath of God was revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of man [Rom 1:18]. If the wrath of God came down like a shower upon the whole of creation, we may say that it poured down with a particular violence upon the soul of man that had sinned. The point at which there is the most glorious display of the evidence of God as creator and bountiful benefactor is, at the same time, the point at which there is the most intensified concentration of the wrath of God. All of the wrath of God upon the whole creation is focused at this point. There where the water was deepest, it has also been troubled most deeply by the lash of the wrath of God.

IST 91

122. SNUFFBOX IS NOT NEEDED IF THE WHOLE HEAD IS SICK, BUT A LIVELY STIMULANT – we

must hold before the natural man the necessity of a total reversal of his attitude of mind to be an avenue through which the Holy Spirit can give life

... we must set over against this natural man [1 Cor 2:14] not something that is a little modification of that which he already holds. We must hold before him the necessity of a total reversal of his attitude of mind. It is this that Paul did when he preached the gospel to the wise men of Athens [Acts 17:16-34], steeped as they were in Plato and Aristotle. The Christian epistemologists have been all too remiss in fearing to follow Paul's example boldly. They have feared that they would have no results if they were thus fearless in their approach. Yet if anything would seem to follow from the Christian position as a whole, it is that we could expect no results at all unless bold measures be taken. If the whole head is sick and the whole heart faint, it is not a snuffbox that is needed, but a lively stimulant. If men are dead in their sins and trespasses they are dead epistemologically too, and no demonstration of health will do any good, but only the gift of new life. Accordingly, we must reason in such a way that the Holy Spirit can give life through our reasoning as an avenue.

SCE 203

123. SOLDIER IS THE RAW RECRUIT CLASSIFIED AND DRILLED ON THE AUTHORITY OF MAN HIMSELF – irrationalist modern man will readily accept all the facts of Paul's gospel as raw recruits but as a rationalist he will classify and 'destroy' these facts

As an irrationalist the modern man will readily accept all the facts of Paul's gospel but as a rationalist he will classify and naturalize and thus 'destroy' every one of these facts. The facts of Christianity will be accepted as raw recruits, but the finished soldier is the raw recruit classified and drilled on the authority of man himself.

ICG 22

124. SOLOMON'S TEMPLE WAS BUILT ACCORDING TO GOD'S BLUEPRINT BY THE PHOENICIANS/SIDONIANS BUILDERS, AS THEY WERE HIS SERVANTS, NOT HIS ARCHITECTS – we gladly recognize and use the detail work of many scientists and thinkers, like Aristotle, as being highly valuable and raised up by God's Providence, but we cannot use them and their method as the architects of our structure of Christian interpretation, for God and the Christ of the Bible are the basis on which all facts have meaning (there can be no facts but Christian-theistic facts), also see 110; Brute, unintelligible, facts on the basis of a non-Christian hypothesis, compare 66 and 88; Covenant keepers will make use of the works of the covenant breakers to perform the cultural task of mankind; The Reformed apologist should gratefully employ the results of evangelical apologists and scholarship in such fields as Biblical history and archaeology in accordance with his own master plan of procedure, compare 5, 17, 20, 21 and 118

124a. To illustrate our attitude to modern science and its methodology we call to mind the story of Solomon and the Phoenicians [Sidonians] [2 Kgs Ch. 5 & 6]. Solomon wished to build a temple unto the Covenant God. Did he ask those who were not of the covenant and did not know the God of the covenant to make a blueprint for him? No, he got his blueprint from God. The timbers were to be laid in accordance with this blueprint. The timbers had to be fitted into the place made for them by this blueprint. Perhaps it took some of the builders a good while before they found the proper place for each timber. Perhaps they had various hypotheses as to just where this or that particular timber would fit. But they never doubted the ultimacy of the blueprint itself. They offered no hypotheses that they did not think to be in accord with the blueprint. They did not appeal to brute timbers in order to test the relevancy of the blueprint. They knew the facts would somehow have to fit in with the blueprint.

But did this attitude of the builders of Solomon's temple imply that there was nothing useful to do for those who were not of the covenant? Not at all. The Phoenicians [Sidonians] were employed as laborers to cut the timber. These Phoenicians [Sidonians] were even recognized as being far more skillful than the covenant people in fashioning and trimming the timbers. They might even build temples of their own with the timber they cut. Such temples might resemble the appearance of Solomon's temple. Yet they would be nothing but temples reared to idols. Therefore these temples would sooner or later fall to the ground. Solomon knew this very well. He used the Phoenicians [Sidonians] as his servants, not as his architects.

Something similar to this should be our attitude to science. We gladly recognize the detail work of many scientists as being highly valuable. We gladly recognize the fact that "science" has brought to light many details. But we cannot use modern scientists and their method as the architects of our structure of Christian interpretation. We deny the legitimacy of the ideal of science; we deny its principle with respect to the relevancy of hypotheses; and we deny the legitimacy of its appeal to brute facts. We challenge its whole procedure. Instead we offer the God and the Christ of the Bible as the concrete universal in relation to which all facts have meaning. We maintain that there can be no facts but Christian-theistic facts. We then go to the "facts," the phenomena of experience, and find again and again that if we seek

to interpret any “fact” on a non-Christian hypothesis it turns out to be a brute fact, and brute facts are unintelligible.

CTEV 64-5

124b. The earth and the fulness thereof belong to the Lord [Ps 24:1] and to those to whom in His sovereign grace He gives it. To them therefore belong all the common gifts of God to mankind. Yet that it may be the earth and the *fulness* thereof that is developed, the covenant keepers will make use of the works of the covenant breakers which these have been able and compelled to perform in spite of themselves. As Solomon used the cedars of Lebanon [2 Kgs Ch. 5 & 6], the products of the rain and the sunshine that had come to the covenant breakers, and as he used the skill of these very covenant breakers for the building of the temple of God, so also those who through the Spirit of God have believed in Christ may and must use all the gifts of all men everywhere in order by means of them to perform the cultural task of mankind.

CGG 118-9

124c. It is not to be marveled at then, that when all the writings of Aristotle became known to the teachers of the church in the 13th century, they were tempted to make much use of them.

It should be carefully noted that our criticism of this procedure does not imply that we hold it to be wrong for the Christian church to make formal use of the categories of thought discovered by Aristotle or any other thinker. On the contrary, we believe that in the Providence of God, Aristotle was raised up of God so that he might serve the church of God by laying at its feet the measures of his brilliant intellect. When Solomon built the temple of God he was instructed to make use of the peculiar skill and the peculiar gifts of the pagan nation that was his neighbor [2 Kgs Ch. 5 & 6]. But this was something quite different than to build together with pagan nations. The Samaritans wanted to help the Jews construct the city and the temple. Hence they were rejected by the true Jews [Ezra Ch. 4]. The Phoenicians [Sidonians] merely wanted to bring their treasures to Solomon and let him construct the way he saw fit. Hence they were gladly received by Solomon.

SCE 57

124d. Are all the efforts of evangelical apologists then to no avail? Are we to make no use whatsoever of the research done by them in such fields as Biblical history and archaeology, to mention nothing more?

... And as for the results of evangelical scholarship, the Reformed apologist should gratefully employ all that is true and good in it. What is true and good in it derives from the measure of Calvinism any form of Christianity contains. But when it comes to the master plan of procedure, the Reformed apologist must go his own way; and it is only of the master plan that we speak when we deal with the question of apologetics in general. Solomon made use even of the Sidonians when building the temple of the Lord, but he did not give them membership on his building committee [2 Kgs Ch. 5 & 6].

DF3 223

125. SON WHO HAS GONE AWAY FROM HOME FOR A LONG TIME RECOGNIZES HIS FATHER FOR WHAT HE ACTUALLY IS – the sinner knows that he ought to accept Christianity is true and the sense of deity within him constantly gives the lie to all his theories, compare 27

When the Scriptures are presented to the natural man [1 Cor 2:14] and with it the system of truth that it contains, he knows at once that he ought to accept it. He knows that if he rejects it he does so in spite of the fact that he knows its claim is true and just. Scripture speaks in the name of God to the sinner asking that he repent from his sin. The natural man, having usurped authority to himself is asked to recognize his legitimate sovereign. A son that has gone away from home and has been away for a long time might suddenly be put face to face with his father. Would it be possible for him not to own and recognize his father for what he actually is? So impossible is it for the sinner to deny that Christianity is true. The sense of deity within him constantly gives the lie to all his theories short of the recognition of God as Creator and Judge.

CTK 244

126. SPARK IN MY CAR: IF THE SPARK IS MISSING THEN IT'S NO GOOD PLANNING MY JOURNEY – the natural man does not have the motivating power of faith in the redemption through Christ

... we must now deal with faith as the motivating power in Christian ethics. I may have California in mind as the goal of my journey. I may have route 66 marked out as the standard route by which I shall travel on my way to California. I may have a fine new Pontiac full of gasoline loaded with my baggage. All this will do me no good if there is no spark in my car.

The would-be self-sufficient moral consciousness is spiritually dead. The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] may do many things which “for the matter of them” are good, but he does not do them to the glory of God [1 Cor 10:31] as his goal, and in accordance with the revealed will of God as his standard, and from faith in the redemption through Christ as his motive.

CTETH 152

127. SPHERE: PHILOSOPHERS FOLLOW ONE ANOTHER ABOUT IN CIRCLES WITHIN THE HOLLOW OF A SPHERE OF THEIR AUTONOMY

... necessity is laid upon us [1 Cor 9:16]. The gospel must be heard without compromise. The whole world lies in darkness. Modern philosophers follow one another about in circles within the hollow of a sphere that they have built about themselves. They will never question their common assumption of human autonomy. Therefore those who know that they were themselves in that state but have been taken out of it by grace must proclaim that grace to those who are in darkness still.

DF3 6

128. STAMP OF GOD’S OWNERSHIP ENGRAVED ON THE UNIVERSE AND FIELD OF REALITY INCLUDING EVERY FACT IN THIS WORLD – all men know God, so how can you be neutral to him? Compare 77

128a. All men know God. Every fact of the universe has God’s stamp of ownership indelibly and with large letters engraved upon it.

CGG 130

128b. Every fact in this world, the God of the Bible claims, has His stamp indelibly engraved upon it. How then could you be neutral with respect to such a God?

WIB 8

128c. The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] at bottom knows that he is the creature of God. He knows also that he is responsible to God. He knows that he should live to the glory of God. He knows that in all that he does he should stress that the field of reality which he investigates has the stamp of God’s ownership upon it. But he suppresses his knowledge of himself as he truly is [Rom 1:18].

DF3 101

129. STEALING ITEMS “INNOCENTLY” FROM WESTMINSTER SEMINARY – pull the mask of the unbeliever’s own false (“innocent”) frame of reference from his face, also see 78; How to proclaim the gospel of the God who is there to twentieth century sophisticated man by setting forth before him the meaning of the gospel as we find it in the Scriptures

They [unbelievers] do not understand themselves and their world for what they are because they do not see themselves and the world in the light of the triune God who everywhere confronts them with his claims. They are like men who might wander about on the campus of Westminster Seminary, appropriating to themselves what they pleased. When approached by Mr. Gregg, and asked why they were taking things that did not belong to them they would look at him “innocently,” as though surprised that this campus did belong to somebody. “Didn’t you see that large, conspicuous sign facing Church Road, Westminster Theological Seminary?” They answer: “We thought that was just somebody’s hypothesis. We are still sure that you can’t prove that this place belongs to anyone.”

How then shall we proclaim the gospel of the God who is there to twentieth century sophisticated man? Surely, you say, we must do so by setting forth before him the meaning of the gospel as we find it in the Scriptures. We must make it unmistakably clear in what we say that the God who is there wants his love and service with the whole of his heart, as he engages himself in his calling, whether as an artist, as a scientist, as a philosopher or as a theologian. Only thus we challenge him. Only thus is he actually challenged. Only thus do we speak to him at the place where he is. Only thus do we pull the mask of his own false frame of reference from his face and let him see himself for what he is. He is there where on the basis of Scripture you say he is. He is not there where he thinks or assumes he is. He must therefore repudiate the goal of life, the standard of life and the motivation of life that have marked him up to this point. He must become a “new man” in Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit in order to respond properly, even if it be only in principle, to the God who is there.

130. STEALING TOMATOES IN GOD’S GARDEN – no one can steal, knowing that it is God’s garden, and expect to escape the wrath of God by claiming that he does not know what he is doing, compare 136; Man knows in his deepest heart this is God’s world

[A] dictionary records the usage of words conventionally agreed upon by a group of scientists and philosophers, even though none of these scientists or philosophers has been able to give himself or others an intelligible account as to the reason for his usage of words. There is a common assumption on the part of the contributors to this dictionary that though the “basic propositions” on which every possible use of the dictionary depends are utterly meaningless to those who make them, yet, together, they prove that the presence of the activity of God and of Christ in their own consciousness and in the facts must be denied as meaningless. ...

No one can steal tomatoes in God’s garden while in his deepest heart knowing that it is God’s garden (*gnontes ton Theon*) [knowing God – Rom 1:21,32] and expect to escape the wrath of God by claiming that he does not know what he is doing.

The name of the self-identifying Christ must therefore be pressed anew upon the men of science and of philosophy in our day in order that they might be saved.

CTEV 145

131. STONE ROLLED UP A HILL ONLY TO SEE IT ROLL DOWN AGAIN – meaninglessness of man, educators and liberal church activism, without Christ

131a. Man fears himself as surrounded by meaninglessness. In fact, underneath all he fears the wrath of God to come for his disobedience to his Creator. ...

GH 125

131b. The task of educators who do not educate in and unto Christ is like the task of Sisyphus as he rolled his stone to the top of the hill only to see it roll down again.

ECE 16

131c. ... the substitution of the modern Christ-ideal for the Christ of the Scriptures leads into an activism by which man rolls his rock to the top of the hill only to be crushed by it as it rolls down again by its own weight.

GDT

132. SUN THAT IS ALWAYS BEHIND THE CLOUDS – logic, a criterion of meaning, is silenced without God

Modern science has imposed silence upon God but in doing so, it was compelled to impose silence on itself. Modern science boldly asks for a criterion of meaning when one speaks to him of Christ. He assumes that he himself has a criterion, a principle of verification and of falsification, by which he can establish for himself a self-supporting island floating on a shoreless sea. But when he is asked to show his criterion as it functions in experience, every fact is indeterminate, lost in darkness; no one can identify a single fact, and all logic is like a sun that is always behind the clouds.

CTEV 147-8

133. SUN THAWS THE ICE OF A MARSH AND BRINGS TO ACTION THE DORMANT HORDES OF MANY SCORPIONS, ADDERS AND POISONOUS INSECTS – the law brings to light the sins of the heart, compare 134

Sin exists therefore in the soul prior to consciousness [of a specific sin] and is awakened by the law. Rom. 7:8: “apart from the law sin is dead.” The law acts upon the heart bringing to light the sins which are there as the sun thaws the ice of a marsh and brings to action the dormant hordes of insect life. “The fire in a cave discovers reptiles and stirs them but they were there before; the light and the heat do not create them. A beam of light piercing into a room reveals thousands of moats floating in the air, never before suspected.”

ET

133a. ... conscience alone loses its sensitiveness. But the law enters into the recesses of the heart. Deeper by far does it descend into man's being than Freud's psychology. The torch of human psychology leaves the depths of the human heart as a frozen marsh while the Sun of God's law thaws the marsh bringing into movement the many scorpions, adders and poisonous insects. Thus the law when seen to be "spiritual" [Rom 7:14] makes us yearn for purity, for relief from the pollution of sin as it once made us cry out for relief from its guilt. The Christian who seeks to guide his life carefully by the law of God is always conscious of breaking the law. The Christian in name, on the contrary, will readily say: "all these things have I kept from my youth up."

TC

134. SUNLIGHT PIERCING INTO A ROOM REVEALS THOUSANDS OF MOATS FLOATING IN THE AIR – the law brings to light the sins of the heart, compare 133

Sin exists therefore in the soul prior to consciousness [of a specific sin] and is awakened by the law. Rom. 7:8: "apart from the law sin is dead." The law acts upon the heart bringing to light the sins which are there ... "... A beam of light piercing into a room reveals thousands of moats floating in the air, never before suspected."

ET

135. SWAMP THAT HAS NO BOTTOM, IN WHICH YOU ARE IN – seeking for facts on the basis of time and chance

Then when [man's] assertions start from facts and purport at all costs to be about facts, he can say nothing about these facts. He has no principle by which to distinguish one fact from another; in Chaos and Old Night all cows are black and all cats are grey. How do you even distinguish cows from cats if time and chance as such are the ultimate principles of individuation? With time as the ultimate principle of individuation one cannot account for counting. In seeking for facts you are then in the swamp that has no bottom ...

CTK 320

136. THIEF CLAIMS THAT THE QUESTION OF THE OWNERSHIP OF THE HOUSE, INDELIBLY WRITTEN AT UNAVOIDABLE PLACES, IS OF NO CONCERN TO HIM – scientists act as though they are not dealing with materials that belong to God, compare 8, 96, 128 and 130

136a. When working in the laboratory as scientists, men act as though they are not dealing with materials that belong to God. They are like a thief who, entering into your home and exploring all kinds of things within it, claims that the question of the ownership of the house is of no concern to him.

CGG 131

136b. Scientists deal with that which has the imprint of God's face upon it. Created reality may be compared to a great estate. The owner has his name plainly and indelibly written at unavoidable places. How then would it be possible for some stranger to enter this estate, make researches in it, and then fairly say that in these researches he need not and cannot be confronted with the question of ownership?

DF3 97

137. TOPSY-TURVY LAND: THE NATURAL MAN MUST BE TAKEN OUT OF HIS HALL OF MIRRORS, OUT OF TOPSY-TURVY LAND INTO THE OPEN SUNLIGHT – the would-be self-authenticating man must be challenged to repent and return to God, then he will see for the first time that it is not Chance, and himself as the ultimate interpreter of facts, but God's plan which constitutes his proper unity; The gospel of the self-authenticating God speaking through Christ in Scriptures offers man salvation, not only for his life, but for his science and philosophy and theology as well

137a. The gospel of the self-authenticating God speaking through Christ in Scriptures offers man salvation, not only for his life, but for his science and philosophy and theology as well. The would-be self-authenticating man must be challenged to repent and return to God. The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] whose wisdom has, in the course of history, shown itself to be foolishness [! Cor 1:20], must be taken out of his hall of mirrors, out of Topsy-Turvy Land into the open

sunlight. He will then see for the first time that it is not Chance but God's providence that constitutes man's principle of individuation and that it is not some abstract principle of rationality or logic but God's plan which constitutes his proper principle or unity.

JA 367

137b. The citizen of the kingdom of this world is the man with yellow glasses cemented to his eyes. He sees every fact that the citizen of the kingdom of God sees, but he sees them all as centering around man as the ultimate interpreter of them. He sees them as a man who stands on his head sees the facts but sees them topsy turvey.

CPL 215

138. TOTALITARIAN POWERS VIOLENTLY BATTLE EVEN FOR A SPOT OF DESERT SAND – covenant-keepers and covenant-breakers antitheses of principle is at every point

There is in consequence no neutral territory between covenant-keepers and covenant-breakers. The antitheses of principle is equally real and equally basic at every point of contact between them. How could it be otherwise? The antithesis is not basic at any point unless it is basic at every point. The point of battle between two totalitarian powers may be a spot of desert sand. The battle is not any the less violent for all that. The fate of the empire is always involved. If one fact were intelligible without the presupposition of the truth of the special principle, i.e., of Christ as the Savior of the natural principle, then all facts would be. If the unbeliever could, on his principle, discover any meaning in one fact in relation to any other fact, in terms of *his principle*, then the indispensability of supernatural revelation, and in particular of supernatural revelation in its redemptive garb, would disappear.

PDS 130

139. TRAIN IS MISSED, BY A MINUTE OR AN HOUR – some non-Christian thinkers theories are closer to Christianity than others but nothing is more important in the sphere of apologetics today than to point out clearly the fundamental differences that underlie the similarities between Christian and non-Christian thought because all non-Christians will be lost forever unless brought to Christ; The sinner's knowledge frustrates itself; The ambiguity of language in many of the higher forms of non-Christian thought means it is easy to change the heavy perpendicular line that separates non-Christian thought from Christian thought into an ascending diagonal; Common grace teaches us to look for many similarities between Christian and non-Christian thinking, and there is corroborative value for the truth of Christianity in non-Christian thinkers

139a. Just as it is not at all a matter of indifference whether a man be a murderer or a respectable citizen, even though from the point of view of Christianity both will be lost forever unless brought to Christ, so it is not a matter of indifference whether a man have a high or a low form of non-Christian interpretation. It is true that a man who misses a train by a minute has missed it as well as the one who has missed it by an hour, yet we give a great deal more credit to the man who missed it only by a minute than to the man who missed it by an hour. We rejoice when men are "not far from the kingdom of heaven" [Mk 12:34] even though they are not in the kingdom. But all this only brings out the more strikingly the fact that the sinner's knowledge frustrates itself. Knowing God as well as he does, that is, coming-in the form of his interpretation so near to the truth, he yet refuses to accept the truth in its full significance. It is of this self-frustration that Paul speaks particularly in Rom 1:18–21: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness: because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God manifested it to them. For the invisible things of him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity; that they may be without excuse: because that, knowing God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened."

IST 93

139b. Nor can it really be said that any one position [psychological theory] is fundamentally nearer to theism than another. To be sure, we would not minimize the fact that [some theories] ... are more crass forms of opposition to Christianity than [others], but this should never blind us to the fact that any who misses a train by a step misses it just as well as he who misses it by a mile. And it is sometimes very difficult to make those who have a position that approaches Christianity in form see that, after all, they do not have Christianity.

SCE 215

139c. Many non-Christian philosophers have been in close contact with Christianity. Many philosophers and theolo-

gians have tried to effect combinations of Christian and non-Christian elements of thought. One of the results of these efforts has been an ambiguous use of words. And by this ambiguity of language many of the higher forms of non-Christian thought are made to appear very similar to Christian thought itself. Accordingly it is still easy to change the heavy perpendicular line that separates non-Christian thought from Christian thought into an ascending diagonal. There are after all many similarities between Christian and non-Christian thinking.

Yet because of the greater self-consciousness of modern thought spoken of before, Christian theologians should never regard these similarities as identities. These similarities constantly appear against a background of difference. And nothing is more important in the sphere of Apologetics today than to point out clearly the fundamental differences that underlie the similarities between Christian and non-Christian thought. Satan appears as an angel of light [2 Cor 11:14]. It is in his interest to point out similarities without noting differences.

This does not mean that we would deprecate all seeking of similarities between Christian and non-Christian thought. The doctrine of common grace teaches us to look for similarities. It has taught us to look for relatively good elements in the hearts and lives of those who are in principle absolutely evil. Some forms of non-Christian thought are far more valuable to us than others. We would even see corroborative value for the truth of Christianity in the fact that many non-Christian thinkers have seen something of the bankruptcy of the lower forms of non-Christian thought and have therefore turned to some higher form of non-Christian thought. Yet we should not forget that to miss a train by a minute is to miss it just as effectually and disastrously as to miss it by an hour. And it is this last fact that seems to be forgotten by those who are constantly seeking for similarities between Christian and non-Christian thought but who do not point out the underlying difference in connection with which these similarities appear.

SFS

140. TURNPIKE IN THE SKY HAS NO WAY ONTO IT FROM EARTH – logic, rationality and fact and the law of contradiction cannot be approached and fitted together unless one stands on the Reformation Christ-line; Non-Christian scientific methodology is bankrupt, , also see 11, 13, 68 and 119

140a. ... the law of contradiction, which has its classic statement in Aristotle ... to my way of thinking has turned out to be an eternally static turnpike in the sky ... [in that is] there is no way to get on it.

ATBG 20 & 22

140b. This problem of the relation of the “free self” to its environment is found alike in science, in philosophy and in theology. In all three of these fields of endeavor man seeks to show that his assertions are both according to logic and according to fact. But when he thinks that his assertions are fully in accord with the law of contradiction and therefore fully clear, they are purely tautological. In that case science has no contingency, philosophy no synthesis, theology no revelation. His logic hovers above the field of fact, like a turnpike in the sky with no approaches to it. He can go as fast as he wills on this turnpike in either direction; it makes no difference in which direction he goes for going is the same as standing still.

140c. Then when his assertions start from facts and purport at all costs to be about facts, he can say nothing about these facts. He has no principle by which to distinguish one fact from another; in Chaos and Old Night all cows are black and all cats are grey. How do you even distinguish cows from cats if time and chance as such are the ultimate principles of individuation? With time as the ultimate principle of individuation one cannot account for counting. In seeking for facts you are then in the swamp that has no bottom, and from which there is no approach to the turnpike of logic. Science has no system, philosophy has no coherence and revelation has no intellectual content.

CTK 320

140d. ... the method of more recent non-Christian scientific methodology is bankrupt because it insists that man can know nothing of God and yet speaks in all its utterance about God. As a consequence recent scientists make an absolute separation between an abstract law of logic which is like a turnpike in the sky, and an infinite number of purely contingent facts, not one of which is distinguishable from another.

CTEV v

140e. The verification principle of modern positivism can verify nothing. It has separated absolutely between a formal rationality that is like a turnpike in the sky and a bottomless swamp of factual ooze on which the turnpike must somehow rest.

CTEV 143

140f. Only by standing [on the Reformation Christ-line] is it possible to see that logic and fact do fit together without devouring one another.

Not as though one can logically penetrate how this can be so. If one could penetrate the relation between logic and

changing factuality logically, then factuality would, once more, have been swallowed up by logic. Then the law of contradiction would be like a turnpike in the sky without approaches to it from the earth.

GDT

141. UNITED STATES ADMITTING THAT IT HAD BEEN A PROVINCE OF THE SOVIET UNION BUT OUGHT AT THE SAME TIME TO BE RECOGNIZED AS AN INDEPENDENT POWER – admitting that the principles of the unbeliever, are right and then to seek to win him to the acceptance of the existence of God

... the arguments for the existence of God as conducted by Mr. Grey [an Arminian evidentialist Evangelical] based on the assumption that the unbeliever is right with respect to the principles in terms of which he explains all things. These principles are: (a) that man is not a creature of God but rather is ultimate and as such must properly consider himself instead of God the final reference point in explaining all things; (b) that all other things beside himself are non-created but controlled by Chance; and (c) that the power of logic that he possesses is the means by which he must determine what is possible or impossible in the universe of Chance.

At last it dawned upon Mr. White [a Reformed Christian] that first to admit that the principles of Mr. Black, the unbeliever, are right and then to seek to win him to the acceptance of the existence of God the Creator and judge of all men is like first admitting that the United States had historically been a province of the Soviet Union but ought at the same time to be recognized as an independent and all-controlling political power.

DF3 255-6

142. UNITY OF VAN TIL IS THAT OF A CHILD WHO WALKS WITH ITS FATHER THROUGH THE WOODS AND IS NOT AFRAID BECAUSE ITS FATHER KNOWS IT ALL – there are some “difficulties” with respect to belief in God but all facts have their final explanation in God whose thoughts are higher than our thoughts

... if my unity is comprehensive enough to include the efforts of those who reject it, it is large enough even to include that which those who have been set upright by regeneration cannot see. My unity is that of a child who walks with its father through the woods. The child is not afraid because its father knows it all and is capable of handling every situation. So I readily grant that there are some “difficulties” with respect to belief in God and His revelation in nature and Scripture that I cannot solve. In fact there is mystery in every relationship with respect to every fact that faces me, for the reason that all facts have their final explanation in God Whose thoughts are higher than my thoughts, and Whose ways are higher than my ways [Is 55:9]. And it is exactly that sort of God that I need. Without such a God, without the God of the Bible, the God of authority, the God who is self-contained and therefore incomprehensible to men, there would be no reason in anything. No human being can explain in the sense of seeing through all things, but only he who believes in God has the right to hold that there is an explanation at all.

WIB 20

143. UPROOT THE WEEDS RATHER THAN CUTTING THEM OFF AT THE SURFACE – uproot not legitimize the natural man’s view of himself; Special grace removes the cancer of sin, compare 23

143a. Romanism and evangelicalism, by failing to appeal exclusively to that which is within man but is also suppressed by every man, virtually allow the legitimacy of the natural man’s [1 Cor 2:14] view of himself. They do not seek to explode the last stronghold to which the natural man always flees and where he always makes his final stand. They cut off the weeds at the surface but do not dig up the roots of these weeds, for fear that crops will not grow.

The truly Biblical view, on the other hand, applies atomic power and flame-throwers to the very presupposition of the natural man’s ideas with respect to himself. It does not fear to lose a point of contact by uprooting the weeds rather than by cutting them off at the very surface.

DF3 94

143b. Both types of grace, special and common, presuppose total depravity. The difference between the two must be indicated by the different effect they accomplish upon the totally depraved. Regeneration, a gift of special grace, Kuyper argues, removes the cancer of sin by taking out its roots. In the place of sin it gives the power of eternal life. “But common grace does nothing of the sort. It keeps down but does not quench. It tames, but does not change the nature. It keeps back and holds in leash, but thus, as soon as the restraint is removed, the evil races forth anew of itself. It trims the wild shoots, but does not heal the root. It leaves the inner impulse of the *ego* of man to its wickedness, but prevents the full fruition of wickedness. It is a limiting, a restraining, a hindering power which brakes and brings to a standstill”

144. WARFARE WITH MUTUALLY DEPENDENT BAYONET FIGHTING, RIFLE SHOOTING AND MACHINE GUNS, COMBINED WITH HEAVY GUNS AND ATOM BOMBS – in the vindication of Christian theism, as a unit and whole, factual and philosophical argument go together, also see 81

Christianity can never be separated from some theory about the existence and the nature of God. The result is that Christian theism must be thought of as a unit.

We may, therefore, perhaps conceive of the vindication of Christian theism as a whole to modern warfare. There is bayonet fighting, there is rifle shooting, there are machine guns, but there are also heavy cannon and atom bombs. All the men engaged in these different kinds of fighting are mutually dependent upon one another. The rifle men could do very little if they did not fight under the protection of the heavy guns behind them. The heavy guns depend for the progress they make upon the smaller guns. So too with Christian theism. It is impossible and useless to seek to vindicate Christianity as a historical religion by a discussion of facts only. Suppose we assert that Christ arose from the grave. We assert further that his resurrection proves his divinity. This is the nerve of the “historical argument” for Christianity. Yet a pragmatic philosopher will refuse to follow this line of reasoning. Granted he allows that Christ actually arose from the grave, he will say that this proves nothing more than that something very unusual took place in the case of “that man Jesus.” The philosophy of the pragmatist is to the effect that everything in this universe is unrelated and that such a fact as the resurrection of Jesus, granted it were a fact, would have no significance for us who live two thousand years after him. It is apparent from this that if we would really defend Christianity as an historical religion we must at the same time defend the theism upon which Christianity is based. This involves us in philosophical discussion. To interpret a fact of history involves a philosophy of history. But a philosophy of history is at the same time a philosophy of reality as a whole. Thus we are driven to philosophical discussion all the time and everywhere. Yet in defending the theistic foundation of Christianity we, in the nature of the case, deal almost exclusively with philosophical argument. In apologetics we shoot the big guns under the protection of which the definite advances in the historical field must be made. In short, there is an historical field must be made. In short, there is an historical and there is a philosophical aspect to the defense of Christian theism. *Evidences deals largely with the historical while apologetics deals largely with the philosophical aspect. Each has its own work to do but they should constantly be in touch with one another.*

CA 1-2

145. WASHING: RATIONALISM AND IRRATIONALISM TAKE ONE ANOTHER’S WASHING IN – the rationalism-irrationalism dilemma, also see 70 and 72

Naturally, Plato was “helpful” when he pointed out to the Sophists that, if reality were subject to universal flux, then human predication would cease to have meaning, and that relativistic theories were generally proposed with a claim of absolute truthfulness. But then, having said this, it would have been well to investigate the other half, namely, that the Sophists were, of course, equally capable of refuting Plato. His highest law, the absolute universal, was a purely empty form. Whatever else was to be said of it, it had still to be made correlative to the idea of pure contingency. But by merely speaking, Plato became a relativist; thus, he took pure contingency into his pure absolute. As with the Sophists, he had to, if he spoke at all, contradict himself with every word. For appearances of justification in predicating on any subject, it thus behooved the Platonist [with his impersonal principle of rationality or unity] and the Sophist [with his impersonal principle of irrationality and diversity] to take in each other’s washing. Pure form and pure “matter,” or pure contingency, are correlatives of each other. Possibly, Christians throughout history would have an emotional preference for the idealist thinking of Platonism, as over against all forms of sophism, as well as mechanism, materialism and pragmatism before or since. But, as to logical priority, neither was able to “make peace with the law of contradiction,” i.e., neither one could offer a positive foundation upon which the law of contradiction might have been employed at all. Only the Christian position, with its teachings of the triune God as the creator and redeemer of men, is the true starting-point for all argument without contradiction. Scepticism is defeated only by Christianity.

WSA

146. WATER SUPPLY IN A CITY IS QUITE SUFFICIENT FOR THE NORMAL NEEDS OF ITS CITIZENS BUT IT MAY NOT BE SUFFICIENT IF ALL THOSE CITIZENS TAKE TO BURNING THEIR HOUSES DOWN – insufficiency of present general revelation is due to the sin of man

146a. It is indeed true that nature does not reveal God’s grace to man. This objective insufficiency of present general revelation is plainly taught by Paul. The whole argument of the first few chapters of Rom establishes the fact that all “righteousness” which is of men, whether among Jews or Gentiles, places all under the condemnation of God and that

in general revelation there is no remedy for this condition. Men are lost without Christ—and he is not revealed in nature. The whole point may be summed up in the words of Peter when he says: “And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). But we should remember that the objective insufficiency of present general revelation is due to the sin of man. It is true that nature does not reveal grace to us, but it is also true that man, as he was originally created, did not need grace. Even if the water supply in a city is quite sufficient for the normal needs of its citizens it may not be sufficient if all those citizens take to burning their houses down simultaneously. The original revelation of God to man was quite sufficient for his creatures who loved him, but it was not enough for creatures who became sinners, and who, therefore, burned beneath his wrath.

In consequence of his sin, then, man needs both new or additional revelation—a revelation of grace—and renewed power by which to perceive that new revelation and to understand and accept the revelation of God in nature for what it really is. He needs, as Warfield has put it, both new light and new power of sight.

IST 111

146b. To be sure, the sinner needs new light as well as a new power of sight. He needs the light of the grace of God in Christ. If the water supply of a city is sufficient for the ordinary needs of its citizens, it none-the-less takes the fire hose to put out a conflagration started by mischievous hands. So the light of the grace of God in Christ as redemptive is given to those who have wilfully taken out their own eyes and are trying to blame their darkness on the God who had created them in a relation of light and love to himself.

CFC

147. WATER THROWN ON A FIRE BY THE NATURAL MAN CANNOT QUENCH THE FIRE – all men, due to the sin within them, seek to “suppress” the knowledge of God they possess, also see 8 and 58

Of course, when we thus stress Paul’s teaching that all men do not have a mere capacity for but are in actual possession of the knowledge of God, we have at once to add Paul’s further instruction to the effect that all men, due to the sin within them, always and in all relationships seek to “suppress” this knowledge of God (Rom 1:18, *American Standard Version*). The natural man [1 Cor 2:14] is such a one as constantly throws water on a fire he cannot quench.

DF3 92

147a. ... if we recognize the interdependence of method and conclusion in scientific research we can fruitfully reason with men. We can then place ourselves upon our opponents’ position for argument’s sake. We can be “neutral” for argument’s sake. We can see what happens to experience if the “neutral” method be adopted. We can then whirl about with men in their exclusively immanentistic and relativistic cauldron to tire them out. We may go with our opponents for argument’s sake when as men of water they build ladders of water and place them upon foundations of water against a support of water in order to get out of the water a pure temporality. If to save men we should really and not merely for argument’s sake enter the cauldron of “neutrality” or bare possibility we should need saving ourselves.

RNCL

148. WATER: MAN MADE OF WATER TRYING TO GET OUT OF WATER MAKES A LADDER OF WATER – use the non-Christian “friend’s” method, which is based on chance, for argument’s sake, to show his hopeless and senseless picture, also see 149, and compare 74 and 89

148a. It is not as though the Reformed apologist should not interest himself in the nature of the non-Christian’s method. On the contrary he should make a critical analysis of it. He should, as it were, join his “friend” in the use of it. But he should do so self-consciously with the purpose of showing that its most consistent application not merely leads away from Christian theism but in leading away from Christian theism leads to destruction of reason and science as well.

An illustration may indicate more clearly what is meant. Suppose we think of a man made of water in an infinitely extended and bottomless ocean of water. Desiring to get out of water, he makes a ladder of water. He sets this ladder upon the water and against the water and then attempts to climb out of the water. So hopeless and senseless a picture must be drawn of the natural man’s [1 Cor 2:14] methodology based as it is upon the assumption that time or chance is ultimate. On his assumption his own rationality is a product of chance. On his assumption even the laws of logic which he employs are products of chance. The rationality and purpose that he may be searching for are still bound to be products of chance. So then the Christian apologist, whose position requires him to hold that Christian theism is really true and as such must be taken as the presupposition which alone makes the acquisition of knowledge in any field intelligible, must join his “friend” in his hopeless gyrations so as to point out to him that his efforts are always in vain.

149. WATER: MAN MADE OF WATER, CONCENTRATED AS A WHITE-CAP ON A WAVE OF A BOTTOMLESS AND SHORELESS OCEAN, DISAPPEARS IN HIS ENVIRONMENT OF THE ENDLESS BLUE – unintelligibility is what comes out of chance for the man who rejects the traditional Protestant view, also see 148 and compare 67 and 89

149a. If the modern Protestant thinker first rejects and then refuses to return to the traditional Protestant view of things, it is not that he has found any facts to disprove this position or any logical reasons for saying that it is out of accord with the laws of human thought. Neither is it because he has found facts or logical reasons that even point to the intelligibility of his own position. ... The man of new Protestantism is himself made of water, or rather, he is not made of water because he is water, water concentrated as a white-cap on a wave of a bottomless and shoreless ocean. Come out of chance, he disappears in his environment of the endless blue.

RP 200

149b. The human mind [in a world of chance] is like a white-cap on the wave of a shoreless and bottomless sea. Reason, which has in effect presumed to legislate for the whole of reality, needs chance for its existence, and has its existence swallowed up by chance.

RPJD

150. WATER: ONLY ARGUMENT FOR AN ABSOLUTE GOD THAT HOLDS WATER IS A TRANSCENDENTAL ARGUMENT

Now the only argument for an absolute God that holds water is a transcendental argument.

SCE10-1

151. WEALTH OF GENEROUS MILLIONAIRE'S IS OFFERED THOUGH YOU HAVE NOT A PENNY – God can actually help the non-Christian though he does not understand the meaning of grace (the free and general offer of the gospel)

The non-Christian does not understand the meaning of grace. The Christian does not claim that, of himself, he knows anything the non-Christian does not know. The Christian appeals to the truth of Christ's Word as set forth in Scripture. By the regeneration of his heart he has not received information that is not already found in Scripture. By regeneration his power of true discernment has been brought to life. If I have not a penny of my own but meet a generous millionaire and receive of his generosity and am instructed to extend also to you an offer of his wealth, then I can go and make that offer, having confidence that he can actually help you as he helped me.

It is therefore the responsibility of Christians to point out to their fellow-men that unless they accept Christ they have no answer to the quest for meaning in life. "... hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor 1:20c-21

SMMT

152. WEB OF THE WILY SPIDER NOT CATCHING ANYTHING – logic from chance will not catch a single fact, compare 4

If we say anything about Chance, we have reduced Chance to something other than itself; we have reduced it to reason or sense. And if change is really Chance, then logic is really abstract. If ... we take up the ragged edges of this logic and make it circular, so that it resembles in its appearance the web of the wily spider, we shall yet catch not even a single fact. Logic is found in the arctic zone of everlasting ice and facts are found in the tropic zone of everlasting heat, and never the twain shall meet.

NM

153. WIFE: NEW WIFE IS NOT WANTED BY SOMEONE WHO IS PERFECTLY SATISFIED WITH THE ONE HE HAS NOW – the "natural man" has to some extent seen the emptiness and vanity of his own position before even considering the truth in any serious fashion at all

... it is clear that if you offer a new wife to one who is perfectly satisfied with the one he has now, you are not likely to be relieved of your burden [Editor: Would not a new car rather than a new wife be a more fitting illustration?]. In other words, it is the self-sufficiency of the “natural man” [1 Cor 2:14] that must first be brought under some pressure, before there is any likelihood of his even considering the truth in any serious fashion at all. the non-theist has to some extent seen the emptiness and vanity of his own position.

SCE 207-8

154. WORM OF CONSCIENCE; Sense of deity

A sense of deity is “indelibly engraven on the human heart.” Try as men will they cannot suppress this knowledge of God; “for the worm of conscience, keener than burning steel, is gnawing within them” [Calvin’s *Institutes* I.3.3, Beveridge translation] (IST 88).

CGG 160

155. X-RAY MACHINE OF THE BIBLE – use the Bible to diagnose everyone and everything and do not first go independent experience reason, history, etc, also see 80

Let us now ask by what means we may diagnose Mr. Black [an unbeliever]. For that purpose we use the X-ray machine. Whence do you know your misery? Out of the law, the revealed will of God, answers the Reformed Christian. Let us call him Mr. White. It is by means of the Bible, not by personal experience, that he turns the light on himself, as well as on Mr. Black. He does not appeal to “experience” or to “reason” or to “History” or to anything else as his source of information in the way that he appeals to the Bible. He may appeal to experience, but his appeal will be to experience as seen in the light of the Bible. So he may appeal to reason or to history, but, again, only as they are to be seen in the light of the Bible. He does not even look for *corroboration* for the teachings of Scripture from experience, reason or history except insofar as these are themselves first seen in the light of the Bible. For him the Bible, and therefore the God of the Bible, is like the sun from which the light that is given by oil lamps, gas lamps and electric lights is derived.

Quite different is the attitude of the “evangelical” or “conservative.” Let us call him Mr. Grey. Mr. Grey uses the Bible, experience, reason or logic as equally independent sources of information about his own and therefore about Mr. Black’s predicament. I did not say that for Mr. Grey the Bible, experience and reason are *equally* important. Indeed they are not. He knows that the Bible is by far the most important. But he none the less constantly appeals to “the facts of experience” and to “logic” without first dealing with the very idea of fact and with the idea of logic in terms of the Scripture.

The difference is basic. When Mr. White diagnoses Mr. Black’s case he takes as his X-ray machine the Bible only. When Mr. Grey diagnoses Mr. Black’s case he first takes the X-ray machine of experience, then the X-ray machine of logic, and finally his biggest X-ray machine, the Bible. In fact, he may take these in any order. Each of them is an independent source of information.

DF3 226-7

Appendix 1

Additional Van Til illustrations that are not in his books, from some of his former students

Collated by Steve Scrivener from:

- Greg Bahnsen from CVTRA
- John Campbell, 'The Readers Digest' Van Til, Reformation Today No. 84, March–April 1985
- John Frame from AGG and CVTAT
- Sal Macaluso
- Eric Sigward
- Jim West, Van Til's Illustrations, Chalcedon February 2004

If you have any you would like to add, then please Email them to scriv@snmail.co.uk

156. BLACK CAT IN A COAL BIN – Paganism is blind

You are a black cat in a coal bin at midnight and there's no moon and you're blind - that is paganism.
Eric Sigward

157. BLACK CAT, TRYING TO FIND IN A PITCH DARK BARN – Man's ability to use himself as the measure of all things

Man's ability to use himself as the measure of all things is like a man in a pitch dark barn, trying to find a black cat that isn't there.
Sal Macaluso

158. BUILDER, PRETENTIOUS – Autonomous man's failure

Would-be autonomous man is like a pretentious builder who ignores and abandons the exact plans drawn by the Master Architect. He vainly tries to reassign the specific functions of objects for the house, with the result that the building will never materialize unless the Architect steps in.
John Campbell, 'The Readers Digest' Van Til, Reformation Today No. 84, March–April 1985

159. BUTTON, FIRST, IS IN THE WRONG HOLE – Starting point with man

Those who start with man are like someone who buttons up a jacket but soon finds that the first button is in the wrong hole, so that all the others are consequently misplaced.
John Campbell, 'The Readers Digest' Van Til, Reformation Today No. 84, March–April 1985

160. BUYING THE NEXT CUP OF COFFEE – Kindness in witnessing

[The disciples] knew the difference between intellectual argument – the presentation of premises or reasons in support of an inference or conclusion, and the offering of evidence to substantiate claims – and interpersonal hostility or contentiousness. Thus, Peter, aware of the different ways an argument can be conducted, specifically reminded his readers to offer their reasoned defense "with gentleness and respect" (1 Peter 3:15). Paul wrote: "the Lord's bondservant must not quarrel, but gentle toward all, apt to teach, forbearing, in meekness correcting those who oppose themselves" (2 Timothy 2:24). ...This does not mean giving an inch on the issues of truth over which we disagree with the unbeliever. But it does mean, as Dr. Van Til would always say, that we keep buying the next cup of coffee for our opponent.

CVTRA 477 n.24

161. CATTLE RUSTLERS – Living off Christian Theism

Non-Christians are cattle rustlers, living off the proceeds of Christian Theism, which alone is capable of providing a true (though not exhaustively detailed) explanation of the cosmos.

John Campbell, 'The Readers Digest' Van Til, Reformation Today No. 84, March–April 1985

162. RABBITS AND GIRAFFES – Teaching different students

Van Til's students will remember with warmth how he would in classroom lectures "speak to the giraffes" (eating lofty foliage) as well as to the "bunny rabbits" (nibbling on the lower grass).

CVTRA 477 n.24

163. DEAD NOT DROWNING – Dead without Christ, Total depravity

Man is not sick, not drowning, but dead. Dead is dead. You can't throw him a rope. A dead man can't grab anything. Your mother is dead without Christ. Your culture is dead without Christ.

Eric Sigward

164. DUCKS NOT STOLEN BY MY FATHER – Sinners denial of sin confesses their crime

In Holland there was a young boy with a father who was a thief. The young boy would often come to school and, unsolicited, blurt out, "My father didn't steal no ducks! My father didn't steal no ducks!" Reminiscent of Shakespeare's "The lady doth protest too much, Methinks," the boy's denial was an admission of guilt. The boy's denial is like the child who in family devotions reports on his sister, "Mary didn't have her eyes closed for prayer!" Or, like the Apostle Peter who began to curse and swear, saying, "I do not know this man of whom you speak!" (Mk. 14:71) Sinners are vulnerable; they shake at leaves and when their consciences are riddled with guilt, the very thought of stolen ducks incites a preemptive confession of their own criminality.

Jim West, Van Til's Illustrations, Chalcedon February 2004

165. EINSTEIN – Not accounting for counting

There are lots of people who can count. Einstein was a good mathematician, surely he could count. It's been said that there are only five people that can understand Einstein, unfortunately I'm not one of them! But Einstein, as smart as he was, could not account for why he could count.

Sal Macaluso

166. FIREWORKS LAUNCHED FROM THE GROUND – Pagan gods launched from human reason, rationalism; Compare 170

When I was a boy my mother took me to see fireworks on the Fourth of July. She said that the lights came from the sky. When I grew up, I learned they had been launched from the ground. This is the way it is with pagan Gods that they tell us are from the sky but really have been launched from human reason.

Eric Sigward

167. NUMERICAL SEQUENCE – Facts make sense within, also see 31

"Facts" are what they are by virtue of God's providence, just as the number "seventeen" only makes sense within a numerical sequence.

John Campbell, 'The Readers Digest' Van Til, Reformation Today No. 84, March–April 1985

168. POISONED, THE WHOLE GLASS – Total depravity

Total depravity that means the whole glass is poisoned. It's not as poisoned as it could be, but it's all poisoned. The faculties of soul are all turned against God by nature. All are poisoned by sin.

Eric Sigward

169. POTATOES SOLD MORE HONESTLY BY NON-CHRISTIAN NEIGHBOR – Common Grace

My father was a good Christian man, not like our heathen neighbor next door who was also a potato farmer. When we picked our potatoes my father would have us put them in the basket so that the small ugly potatoes were on the bottom and the big healthy looking potatoes were on top. I noticed that when we went to the market to sell our potatoes, our neighbor's baskets had the potatoes just thrown in any which way. Our neighbor hated God, but he was more righteous than we in the way he sold his potatoes.

Sal Macaluso

170. SKYROCKET FROM EARTH NOT SKY – Neo-orthodox theologians god, compare 166

A skyrocket god is a projection of men's carnal minds. On the Fourth of July when we are mesmerized by the fireworks so that our eyes are in a heavenly trance, we are quickly brought back to reality when we consider that the skyrocket has been launched from this terra firma. Van Til used this illustration to show how the god of Neo-orthodox theologians, who appears to be the same God of the Bible, has really been launched from Cape Cerebrum. Thus the Christ of Karl Barth, who is cloaked in an orthodox wardrobe, is an entirely different god from the true God of the Bible. Van Til employed the skyrocket imagery to warn gullible evangelicals about the glittering wiles of Barthianism. The true God of the Bible descends (from heaven); the god of Neo-Orthodox theologians, no matter how spectacular, colorful, and explosive, ascends. He is a “belly god,” even if he presents himself with the name of Jesus (2 Cor. 11:4).

Jim West, Van Til's Illustrations, Chalcedon February 2004

171. STEAL THAT BOOK! – On the importance of acquiring good literature

This is an excellent book if you don't have it buy it, if you can't buy, borrow it, if you can't borrow it steal it, but get it! I once said this in one of my classes and sometime later, a year or two later a woman said to me, “Dr, Van Til, you mustn't tell those boys to steal.”

Sal Macaluso

172. SULFURIC ACID AND WATER LOOK THE SAME – Neo-orthodoxy gives death

Neo-orthodoxy and orthodoxy can appear the same however, sulfuric acid and water look the same, but if you drink one it will kill you and the other will give you life.

Eric Sigward

173. TWO CIRCLE WORLDVIEW – Creator-creature relationship and distinction

173a. Van Til wrote, “Now the basic structure of my thought is very simple” [DF1 23], and in essence it is. Van Til's starting point is the historic doctrine of creation: God is the Creator; the world is his creation. Over and over again in class he would draw two circles on the blackboard: a large circle representing God and a smaller circle below it representing the creation. The two were connected by lines representing providence and revelation, but Van Til emphasized the distinctness of the two circles from one another. He insisted the Christianity has a “two-circle” world view, as opposed to secular thought which has only “one-circle” thinking. Non-biblical thought makes all reality equal: if there is a God, he is equal to the world. But for Christianity, God is the sovereign Creator and Lord; the world is no sense equal to him. That is, in essence, the “simple structure” of Van Til's thought

CVTAT 53

173b. As Van Til put [the creator-creature relationship], the Christian worldview involves a “two-level” concept of reality. Van Til used to walk into class and draw two circles on the board, one under the other, connected by vertical levels of “communication.” The larger, upper circle represented God; the smaller, lower circle represented the creation. All non-Christian thought, he argued, is “one-circle” thought. It either raises man to God's level or lowers God to man's. In any case, it regards God, if it acknowledges him at all, as man's equal, as another part of the “stuff” of the universe. With such notions, Christian apologetics must make no compromise.

AGG 43-4

173c. There is a renowned Van Tillian illustration. Imagine two circles, and these distinguish between the creature and the Creator (Rom. 1:25). Man is not God; God is not man. Pantheism (“all is God”) is a lie; Pan en theism (“All is in God”) is a lie; and mysticism (man being absorbed into God) is a lie. Man is man and God is God, two circles! The

Greek idea that all reality is one endless Chain of Being so that the only difference between man and God is gradational is also a lie. Elton John's popular song, The Circle of Life , is spurious because it envisions only one circle. There are two circles and these two circles illustrate the Creator-creature distinction. That is fundamental Van Tillian apologetics.
Jim West, Van Til's Illustrations, Chalcedon February 2004

Appendix 2

The words searched on the Van Til CD-ROM

WORDS OR PHRASES SEARCHED

(Christian* OR Theism) WITHINWORD 10 (unit OR PHRASE(a whole))

absolute antithesis
absolute ethical antithesis
acid
accounting for counting
agnostic(s), agnosticism
air, arguing
albatross
all-conditioner, all-conditioning
altar
analogue
appeal to, appeal to sense of deity
apple(s)
architect*
at bottom
at the outset
atoll
atom, atomic, bomb*, nuclear, flame throwers
autonomy, autonomous(ly)
aware of God
awareness of God
axe to grind
ballast
bare permission
barn
battle
beads, string
beams under floor
beat, beating
begging
better knowledge
block-house, atomism, atomistic, atomistically, piecemeal
bloodstream
bold, boldly, boldness
borrowed capital, stolen capital
bottomless pit
bridge of inspiration
builder
button, radio
buzz-saw, cut
cannot quench
captain
car(s), automobile(s)
career
cat
cattle
cemented glasses, yellow, jaundiced eye
chain(s)
child WITHINWORD 15 home
circular, circularity, circle
commander*
common consciousness

common notions
compassion*
Copernican, Copernicus
covenant-breaker / covenant breaker OR covenant-keeper / covenant keeper
covenant personality
criminal
declaration of independence
declare their independence
deep down
deepest heart
dentist(s), dentistry, tooth, toothache
discover much truth
doctor
doubting existence
drawing circles
drown*
duck(s)
egg
Einstein
elephant(s)
emplacement
enchanted
exhibition house
factory
fight*
fish
fish out of water
flashlight(s)
for argument's sake
fort, fortress*, citadel, castle
full bucket
garment*
gauntlet
girl on lap
glasses
gobble-de-gook
God-conscious*
grace
groceries
gun(s)
gyrations of a propeller
hawk
heart (in IST, CGG, CTK DF3 and GH)
heart of hearts
hem in
high treason
highway(s)
historically trustworthy
hole(s), jacket(s)
hominen
humble*, humility
ice, ice-cubes / ice cubes
implicate, method of implication
impossibility of the
indelible linoleum
independent power
indicia
indirect
intellectually follow

irrational* AND rational* ANDNOT (irrationalist-rationalist OR rationalism-irrationalism OR rationalist-irrationalist OR rationalist-irrationalists OR rationalistic-irrationalistic)
irrationalist-rationalist, rationalism-irrationalism, rationalist-irrationalist, rationalist-irrationalists, rationalistic-irrationalistic
island of rationality
island(s)
jacket
jailer OR jailor
Janus ANDOR faced
jaundiced
July
jump*
jury, juror
lace(s)
ladder
ladder of water
lifesaver
light of the Word
love
mask(s), masked
master concept
measles
mediate
medicine book
messenger
milk
mirror(s)
miss, misses, train
mix, mixture, mixed
mole
moral holiday
motor idling
neutral or neutrality
new light
nose(s)
numerical
ocean of chance
owner OR ownership OR owners OR owned
parasite(s)
parent(s), parent's, family
pepper-pot / pepperpot
Phoenician
photo(s)
physician(s)
point of contact
poison*
potato*
prattle
prick*
problem of evil
raft
ramp
ranch
reasoning by presupposition
recruit(s)
reversal
revolving or revolve
right side up
rob(s), robb*
roof(s)

roots
ropes(s)
seam*
searchlight
second story, blueprint
seed of religion
sense of deity
sense of God
sense of the true
sensus
service stations
shelter
ship(s)
shoe(s)
shore
side up, upside down
sieve*
Sign(s), signpost
Sisyphus OR hill
soldier(s)
son who has gone away OR recognizes his father
spectacles
spiral
stamp
static AND messenger
steal*, stole*
suaviter in modo, fortiter in re
suicide
sun that is always behind the clouds
sun, light, give light
swallow*
syllogistic*
sympathy, sympathetically
taking in washing
terra
the that WITHINWORD 15 PHRASE the what
theodicy
thief, thieves
totalitarian
topsy
transcendent, transcendental
truth suppressors
trunk
turnpike
twilight zone
two circles, two levels
ultimate and proximate
umpire(s)
unit
unknown god
vindicate*, vindicating, vindication*
war, war-like, warfare
water on a fire
weeds, weeding
welling
wiser than Scripture
witness*
wooden gun(s)
worm
wrath of the Lamb

X-ray machine

Appendix 3

A list of Van Til's illustrations

(with the numbering in this document and the additional illustrations added at the end at 156 following)

1. AIR'S EXISTENCE BEING ARGUED ABOUT – antitheism presupposes theism, also see 28 and 42
2. APPLES SHAKEN OFF THE APPLE TREE AND THEN ASK WHETHER THERE MUST NOT HAVE BEEN SOME SORT OF SOMETHING THAT IS HIGHER THAN THE APPLES IN ORDER TO ACCOUNT FOR THEM – not looking for the meaning of man in the light of the revelation that comes from Christ directly revealed in Scripture, also see 76
3. ARC OF A CIRCLE RELATES THREE POINTS TO ONE ANOTHER – facts are related to the plan of God, contrast 37
4. ARCTIC ZONE OF ICE AND THE TROPIC ZONE OF HEAT SHALL NEVER MEET – logic, from chance, and facts shall never meet
5. ARMY FAILS IN SENDING A FEW INDIVIDUAL SOLDIERS TO WREST SOME ATOLL FROM A POWERFUL CONCENTRATION OF AN ENEMY'S FORCES – atomistic and piece-meal presentation of Christian theism has lost all power to challenge the non-Christian methodology; Neither Roman Catholic nor Arminian apologists atomistic theologies are in a position to challenge the natural man's atomistic procedure, compare 17, 20, 21, 118 and 124
6. ATOMIC BOMBS MUST BE PUT OVER AGAINST THE ENEMY CANNON ATTACKS – the system of truth in Scripture, that is systematic theology, is the best defense and attack; also see 7
7. ATOMIC POWER AND FLAME-THROWERS OF A TRULY REFORMED METHODOLOGY WILL EXPLODE THE LAST STRONGHOLD OF THE NATURAL MAN; NUCLEAR STRENGTH APOLOGETICS, also see 6; The use of martial terminology; Point of contact, also see 36, 61, 71 and 108
8. AXE TO GRIND – men are sinners who want to suppress the truth in unrighteousness and will employ their reason for that purpose, also see 58 and 147; All men, including "open-minded" non-Christian scientists, are sinners whose deepest controlling motive is to fight for their purely man-centered interpretation and not to want to find God, their Creator and Judge, even though they cannot help being confronted with Him all the time and everywhere, compare 96 and 136
9. BALLOON, MEN WHO THINK THAT THEY CAN LEAVE THIS EARTH IN A BALLOON ARE BOUND TO RETURN TO EARTH SOONER OR LATER – optimistic theories of non-Christian ethics are bound to return to pessimism sooner or later
10. BASEMENT OF YOUR OWN EXPERIENCE NEEDS TO BE SEEN FOR WHAT HAS BEEN GATHERING THERE – be critical of this your own most basic assumption, autonomy and self-sufficiency
11. BEADS, INFINITE IN NUMBER, TO BE STRUNG WITH NO HOLES AND INFINITE STRING – facts and laws of the world cannot be related if they are not created and redeemed by God in Christ; A scientific method not based on the presupposition of the truth of the Christian story has no foundation, and such science has an infinite number of unrelated particulars, having to relate with pure abstract logic, also see 13, 68, 100, 111, 119 and 140
12. BEAMS UNDERNEATH THE FLOOR – presuppose God is underneath all things; Absolutely certain Theistic proof for God's existence, also see 53
13. BEATING THE AIR – to appeal to the law of contradiction, or to facts, or to a combination of these, apart from the relation that these sustain to the totality-vision of either the believer or the unbeliever, is to beat the air and fails to present the challenge of the Christian position at all, also see 111; We who are saved by grace need not beat the air, for there is for us a true synthesis of all things in Christ which we offer to all men; The non-Christian, not working on the foundation of creation and providence, when talking about musts in relation to facts is beating the air, also see 11, 68, 100 and 111

14. BLACK CAT IN THE CLOSET IS ASSERTED AND COUNTERED WITH MAYBE THAT'S RIGHT SINCE NOBODY KNOWS – an unbeliever says perhaps God exists since nobody knows what is in the "Beyond," but the God of Scripture cannot live in the realm of Chance
15. BLIND: VALLEY OF THE BLIND – man is blind to the plain evidence for God and man does not believe in Him; Everybody wears colored glasses (see 58)
16. BORROWED OR STOLEN CAPITAL, OR A JACKDAW PLUMING ITSELF WITH STOLEN FEATHERS – non-Christian scientists and philosophers, and even modernism, have discovered much truth and unbelievers produce marvelous works of art, in spite of their fundamental assumption of a chance universe, because of the truths they have stolen and borrowed from Christianity, including that the world is made and controlled by God, and deep down they know this, also see 93; The prodigal flourished for a while with his father's substance; If the non-Christian had to live by his own capital he would choke forthwith and Whirl would be king
17. BOTTOMLESS PIT OF CHANCE, INTO WHICH THE UNBELIEVER WILL THROW ALL THE FACTS OF CHRISTIANITY (AND LOSE THEM); Need to present the philosophy of fact with facts, compare 5, 20, 21, 118 and 124
18. BRAKES TO THE CART THAT WAS RUNNING HEADLONG FROM THE MOUNTAINTOP TO THE ABYSS – common grace means that God has graciously restrained the evil heart of man and accounts for all the natural good that we see about us
19. BRIDGE THAT IS FLOODED IS DRIVEN ACROSS – the trustworthiness of Scripture is based on their original infallible inspiration, though we cannot now see the original autographs
20. BUILDING A THREE STORY HOUSE (compare 21) – the procedure in the apologetics of "Old Princeton" (traditional apologetics) is, the first story is built through reason by Roman catholic natural theology, the second by Evangelical protestants who hold to the Bible but who retain the idea of the autonomy, and the third story is built by Calvinists, who add their "five points" , compare 5, 17, 21, 118 and 124
21. BUILDING A TWO STORY HOUSE (compare 20) – the first story of traditional apologetics is built by the natural man's plans or blueprint (reason) and the second on faith (instead build apologetic argument based on Scripture, not autonomous and biased reason, and give facts, etc. in the light of Scripture), compare , compare 5, 17, 20, 21, 118 and 124
22. BUZZ-SAW: WHETHER A BUZZ-SAW WILL CUT IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION DEPENDS UPON ITS SET AND THE MAN OPERATING IT – reason is a keen tool but it functions wrongly in fallen man's set of sinful human personality, so an unbelieving person will certainly assume the position of judge with respect to the credibility and evidence of revelation, whilst a believer's reason has already been changed in its set by regeneration and cannot then be the judge
23. CANCER DIAGNOSIS NOT WANTED BY MAN WITH CANCER, BUT GOOD DOCTOR SAYS AN OPERATION IS NEEDED; GIVE CORRECT DIAGNOSIS – man does not want to hear what he knows, that he is responsible to God, and the doctor will tell him he needs spiritual heart surgery; Compare 36, 80 and 143
24. CARBOLIC ACID POURED INTO WATER BOTTLES WITHOUT A CHANGE OF LABEL – retention of orthodox Christian forms but not theology
25. CARS GOING IN THE WRONG DIRECTION WITH WRONG SIGNS, SO AT THE SERVICE STATION WIPE OUT THE SIGNS AND TELL THEM THEY ARE GOING THE WRONG WAY THAT LEADS TO THE PRECIPICE – the Reformed apologist challenges his opponent to a duel of life and death from the start
26. CHAINS ABOUT THE NATURAL MAN'S NECK WHO SEES SHADOWS ONLY – from the ultimate point of view the natural man knows nothing truly
27. CHILD ASKING WHETHER HE HAS PARENTS – doubting evidence and proof for God; Compare 125
28. CHILD ON FATHER'S LAP SLAPPING HIS FACE – Antitheism presupposes Theism (also see 1 and 42) because, the unbeliever, as a creature, needs God the creator and providential controller of the universe, in order to oppose this God; Even to negate Christ, those who hate Him must be borne up by Him; Unbelievers rejection of Christianity is based on Christianity
29. COLORLESS SUIT OF NEUTRALITY WHICH SIMPLY COVERS A NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD GOD

30. COMMANDER OF A BATTLESHIP DOES NOT TALK MUCH ABOUT AREAS THAT HE HAS IN COMMON WITH AN ENEMY SUBMARINE, NOR DOES HE LEAVE ONE AREA OF THE ENEMY SUBMARINE UNMOLESTED – challenge the basic assumption of human autonomy at every point, compare 97
31. COUNTING NEEDS A NUMERICAL SYSTEM AS A WHOLE TO TELL ONE NUMBER FROM ANOTHER – without the existence of God as a system there would be no probable relation between any set of facts
32. CRIMINAL WHO HAS COMMITTED HIGH TREASON – man's response to revelation after the entrance of sin; Necessity for a special revelation and the work of the Holy Spirit to change man from this state of rebellion to a state of obedience
33. DENTIST DRILLS TO THE NERVE OF THE MATTER – expose human autonomy and bias and say only the great Physician can make you see facts as they are, compare 34
34. DENTISTRY OF THE REFORMED APOLOGIST IS TO DRILL OUT AND REPLACE THE ENTIRE TOOTH DECAY OF CREATURE WORSHIPPERS – man is spiritually dead in sin and needs the light of Scripture and Christ, compare 33
35. DIVER DIVING OFF DIVING BOARD – immediate and temporary starting point are facts, whilst the ultimate starting point and foundation is God
36. DOCTOR MEETS TRUE NEED OF AN UNWELL MAN THOUGH THIS PATIENT DID NOT KNOW HOW GREAT HIS NEED WAS UNTIL HE MET THIS DOCTOR – through general revelation and the reaction to it the sinner shows some sense of need but by the gospel of Christ he sees the need of escape from eternal death, compare 23, 71 and 80; Point of contact, also see 7, 61, 71 and 108
37. DRAWING CIRCLES IN A VOID – knowledge without bringing in a God, contrast 3
38. DROPS OF WATER IN THE OCEAN WOULD BE INDISTINGUISHABLE FROM ONE ANOTHER BY THE NAKED EYE – without the presupposition of the truth of Christian theism no fact can be distinguished from any other fact
39. DROWNING MEN IN THE SEA CANNOT RIGHTLY DETERMINE WHETHER THE SHIP IS SEAWORTHY – critics of the inspiration of Scripture do not have the epistemological foundation on which to stand on, to raise their objection, also see 76 and 98
40. DWELLERS ON A LITTLE ISLAND DECLARE THEIR INDEPENDENCE AND CLAIM THAT THEY WERE THE ONLY PEOPLE ON THE FACE OF THE GLOBE, BUT THEY HAVE NOT VISITED THE WHOLE EXPANSE OF THE UNIVERSE – the evolutionist makes the universal negative statement, that there is no God, also see 106 and compare 88
41. EGG FRYING: THE EGG DOES NOT HAVE TO JUMP INTO THE FRYING PAN OF ITS OWN ACCORD TO BE TELEOLOGICAL BUT MAN FRIES THE EGG SO THAT HE MAY BE WELL NOURISHED AND THUS ENABLED TO LIVE HIS LIFE TELEOLOGICALLY, THAT IS, TO THE GLORY OF GOD – the end of all created things exists in the mind of God before the things exist, including the frying of an egg
42. ELEPHANT WANTS TO WARM MORE THAN HIS NOSE, OR WANTS MORE THAN HIS NOSE/TRUNK IN THE DOOR/WINDOW – allowing the natural man that certain facts may be truly known apart from Christ leads to much more; Naturalism wants to know all facts without reference to God
43. EMPLACEMENT FOR GUNS – Antitheism presupposes Theism, also see 1 and 28; God is the all-conditioner; True reasoning stands upon God
44. ENGINEERS CANNOT WORK ON AN UNDER RIVER TUNNEL, FROM EACH SIDE, WITHOUT AGREEMENT ON A GENERAL PLAN OF CONSTRUCTION – our general plan of construction is to challenge the wisdom of the world
45. ESTATE OF GOD HAS LARGE OWNERSHIP SIGNS PLACED EVERYWHERE SO THAT HE WHO GOES BY, EVEN AT SEVENTY MILES AN HOUR, CANNOT BUT READ THEM; Inescapable general revelation, also see 49, 79, 103 and 114; Compare 60
46. EXHIBITING WARES IN A MUSEUM TO ONE ANOTHER (BY THE UNBELIEVER AND THE BELIEVER) WITHOUT AT THE SAME TIME DASHING FOR ONE ANOTHER'S THROATS – common grace does not deny the doctrine of total depravity

47. EXHIBITION HOUSE IN THE MIDST OF THIS WORLD SHOWING THE GLORIES AND SPLENDORS OF GOD – cannot ask *whether* God exists, as this world is full of the works of his hands
48. EYES OR NOSES ARE NOT NEW FOR CHRISTIANS – Christians do not operate according to new laws of thought
49. FACTORY IN SINFUL MAN'S PERSON WHERE INNUMERABLE OPERATIONS OF GOD ARE – men have the knowledge of God within themselves, also see 79, 103 and 114
50. FIRE IN A CAVE DISCOVERS REPTILES – the law brings to light the sins of the heart, compare 133 and 134
51. FISH ARE FREE IN THE WATER – man has freedom in the law of God as his native element (which he does not want), and man is free in the providence and plan of God, contrast 52
52. FISH OUT OF WATER – “freedom” of thought outside of its proper place, which is the framework of creation, sin and redemption through Christ, is bound for self-frustration; Tyranny and chaos in being free from obedience to God and the requirements of the love of God, contrast 51
53. FOUNDATIONS: TRANSCENDENTAL ARGUMENT SEEKS TO DISCOVER WHAT SORT OF FOUNDATIONS THE HOUSE OR STATUE OF HUMAN KNOWLEDGE MUST HAVE, IN ORDER TO BE WHAT IT IS, BUT IT DOES NOT SEEK TO FIND *WHETHER* THERE IS A FOUNDATION, IT PRESUPPOSES THAT IT HAS ONE – definition of the transcendental method and argument, also see 12
54. FRESH AIR AND LUNGS GO TOGETHER BUT FIRE AND WATER DO NOT – agreement and disagreement of the Scriptures and regenerated reason
55. FRICTION TO MAKE ADVANCES IN THE SLIPPERY HIGHWAYS OF INTERPRETATION IS MADE BY THE THEIST AND HE ALONE DOES NOT JUMP FROM ONE ICE LUMP TO ANOTHER IN THE MIDST OF A TORRENTIAL STREAM, HE ALONE DOES NOT TRY TO BREATHE IN A VACUUM – man as a finite rational personality must live by revelation alone
56. FULL-BUCKET, TO WHICH IS WATER IS ADDED – believing in an absolute, self-sufficient and self-contained God, plus that the created universe adds to the glory of God; To God nothing can be added, yet everything in history adds to the glory of God; Everything happens in accordance with God's immutable plan yet prayer changes things; We deal with the incomprehensible and infinitely inexhaustible God so we run into mystery (things beyond our understanding); Apparent not real contradiction
57. GLASSES (ROSE-COLORED) / SPECTACLES OF SCRIPTURE – only see nature and general revelation aright through these, also see 57 and 115; To remove our “rose-colored glasses” of Scripture (contrast 58) would be to take the ground from under our feet
58. GLASSES: COLORED GLASSES/SPECTACLES CEMENTED TO THE SINNER'S EYES, AND ALL IS YELLOW TO THE JAUNDICED EYE BUT THE REFORMED APOLOGIST SEEKS TO CHALLENGE THE NATURAL MAN TO TAKE OFF HIS COLORED GLASSES – all the facts and arguments presented to the unbeliever will be observed on the assumption that man is the final reference point of his own interpretation of human experience, and he cannot remove these glasses because he will not remove them; The natural man suppresses the truth, is blinded by sin and loves to be blind (also see 8 and 147) and therefore needs new light—regeneration by the Spirit; Contrast 57 and 100
59. GOBBLE-DE-GOOK – on the basis of the unbeliever's methodology, of fate and chance, all facts would be gobble-de-gook (unintelligible)
60. GRAPES OF GOD'S VINEYARD TAKEN WITHOUT PAYING HIM ANY RENT – as God's creatures a present attitude of not believing in him, is very unfair to Him; Compare 45, 46 and 96
61. GROCERIES: MAN SAYS HE NEEDS MORE GROCERIES BUT THIS IS POISON WHEN IT IS THE BLOODSTREAM THAT ITSELF MUST BE CURED – sinner does not need natural answer but sin must be seen in the light of damnation and the cross; Point of contact, also see 7 ,36, 71 and 108
62. GUNS: TRUE GUNS OF THE BELIEVER AGAINST THE WOODEN GUNS OF THE ENEMY – correctly formed theistic proofs are the truth against the enemies lies
63. HAMSTER CLIMBING ITS CIRCULAR STAIRCASE IN A CAGE – movement of man surrounded by meaninglessness; Stone rolled up a hill only to see it roll down again, also see 131

64. HIGHWAY OF THE CHRISTIAN AND REFORMED FAITH IS NOT TO BE VEERED OFF FROM, AND WARN ONE ANOTHER NOT TO GO OFF THE HIGHWAY; Going astray about common grace; Do not veer off from election and reprobation are under the sovereign will of God
65. HOUSE OF MAN'S INTERPRETATION OF LIFE HAD TO BE BROKEN DOWN, AND THE BUILDING BLOCKS GATHERED COULD BE USED, ONLY TO PAUL'S TOTALLY NEW ARCHITECTURAL PLAN
66. ICE CUBES ARE THE SAME SIZE BECAUSE OF THE ICE TRAY – in the world of science, the unbeliever will always see “raw stuff” ordered and arranged by himself by means of his logical activity, compare 88; Brute fact, compare 88 and 124
67. ICEBERG IS UNMOVED BY A MAN SWIMMING IN THE OCEAN AND PUSHING AGAINST IT, BUT EVEN IF HE DOES NOT NOTICE IT, THE MAN, NOT THE ICEBERG, IS MOVING – the man who rejects the traditional Protestant view gets nowhere in identifying himself, let alone saying anything intelligible about the world, God, or Christ, compare 149
68. IDLING OF A MOTOR THAT IS NOT IN GEAR – science, knowledge and facts are meaningless on the covenant breakers assumptions, also see 11, 13, 100 and 111, 119 and 140
69. ISLAND OF INDEPENDENCE – men seek to outwit God by their independence from God and seem to have emptied out the bottomless pit even though they have not yet succeeded in filling it up
70. ISLAND OF RATIONALITY (MADE FROM ITSELF) FLOATING ON AN ABYSS OF UNRELATEDNESS AN OCEAN OF IRRATIONALITY – science making room for faith simply makes room for faith in the irrational; Rational-irrational dilemma, also see 72 and 145
71. JAILER CRIES OUT IN FASHIONABLE SUBURBS THAT HE IS OFFERING RELEASE FROM JAIL FOR ALL ITS RESIDENTS, BUT THIS FALLS ON DEAF EARS AS HE DOES NOT ANSWER WHAT THEY THINK THEY NEED – preachers of Christianity offering escape from the wrath to come, would be ignored unless the gospel offer also includes the work of the Holy Spirit with his regenerating power, men; Point of contact, also see 7 ,36, 61and 108
72. JANUS-FACED [two-faced, double-minded] COVENANT BREAKER WHO WALKS THE STREETS OF NEW YORK AND LONDON – man with his rationalism-irrationalism dilemma (, also see 70 and 145), the would-be autonomous man must be won for the gospel
73. JUMPING FOR SAFETY FROM THE BURNING SHIP OF DETERMINISM INTO THE SEA OF INDETERMINISM ENDS IN DEATH IN EITHER CASE – consequence of appealing to the statistical character of natural laws in order to point out that science itself can allow for miracle
74. LADDER RESTING ON PURE CONTINGENCY AND ITS TOP RESTS AGAINST THE FOG – the faith and fruit of liberal theologians, compare 148
75. LIFESAVER IS BOUND TO THE SHORE TO RESCUE OTHER PARTY – be shored to God (analogically) when we place ourselves on our opponents position; The for “argument’s sake” strategy
76. LIGHT: GOD (AND HIS SCRIPTURE) IS THE (SUN)LIGHT FROM WHICH ALL OTHER LIGHTS (ELECTRIC BULBS, FLASHLIGHTS LANTERNS, CANDLES AND FIREFLIES) ARE DERIVED – the Christ of Scripture is the *Sun* from which all light derives; Facts are not independent witnesses, they do not speak for themselves
77. LINOLEUM THAT HAS ITS FIGURE INDELIBLY IMPRINTED IN IT – cannot erase man’s sense of his creatureliness and sinfulness, and the pattern of Christian theism in each fact, compare 128
78. MASK OF THE NATURAL MAN’S AUTONOMOUS FALSE INTERPRETATION, THROUGH WHICH HE SEES HIS OWN REFLECTION IN THE MIRRORS OF THE SYSTEMS OF HIS PHILOSOPHY, MUST BE TORN OFF BY THE REFORMED APOLOGIST, also see 129; Appeal to what the natural man knows in his heart; Method of Reformed apologist; Both in preaching and in reasoning the Reformed Christian relies on the work of the Spirit as he tells men to do what they cannot do
79. MEASLES IN A BOY ARE FIRST INTERNAL BUT, THOUGH HE FEEL’S ABNORMAL, HE SAYS HE’S NORMAL TILL HE FINALLY ADMITS HE HAS THE MEASLES, WHEN HE CAN SEE THEM FOR HIMSELF – God’s general revelation within the man persists in cropping up in spite of all that the sinner can do to keep it under, also see 49, 103 and 114
80. MEDICINE BOOK – the Bible is our “medicine book by which we diagnose the unbeliever’s disease and medication, , also see 155 and compare 23

81. MESSENGER BOY, SCOUT, WEAPONS AND FORTRESS IN WARFARE – an apologist is: a *messenger boy* to organize the different theological disciplines in this warfare for Christian theism as a whole, a *scout* to detect in advance the movements of the enemy, and one who wages offensive and defensive warfare, with the complementary *weapons* of philosophical or factual argument, from the *fortress* of Christianity that covers the whole earth, also see 144; Martial figures of speech because the place of apologetics cannot be very closely defined
82. MILK BOTTLE: FILL IT WITH A POISONOUS WHITE LIQUID AND CALL IT MILK – new theology attaching new meanings to old, familiar words is highly dangerous to man
83. MILLIONAIRE REDUCED TO POVERTY, BEGGING BREAD; THE ATTITUDE OF THE DROWNING MAN AT SEA STRETCHING FORTH HIS HANDS FOR MERCY AND SURE TO PERISH WITHOUT IT – a natural man must do what he resists to do, declare his bankruptcy
84. MIRROR OF GOD'S GENERAL REVELATION – creation clearly reveals God which man knowingly obscures by sin
85. MIRROR OF SCRIPTURE – only through the mirror of Scripture, as the authoritative Word of God which reports God's work of redemption in Christ, can general revelation be seen for what it is and man see what he needs, also see 57 and 115
86. MOLE-LIKE NATURAL MAN – man loves darkness rather than light, scurries underground when the real facts come to his attention and is blind to all things
87. NATURALIZATION PAPERS MUST BE TAKEN OUT BY MIRACLES AND CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE IF THEY WISH TO BE ACCEPTED IN THE REPUBLIC OF SCIENCE
88. NET: WHAT NET CAN'T CATCH ISN'T FISH – scientific description is not merely explanation, but it is definitely anti-Christian explanation, IE a universal judgment about the nature of all existence is presupposed even in the "description" of the modern scientist, compare 40 and 106; Brute facts, compare 66 and 124; Speaking metaphysically and epistemologically
89. OCEAN AND CAULDRON OF CHANCE AND SHORELESS AND BOTTOMLESS SEA, ON WHICH THERE ROLLS A MUD-BALL OR ISLAND OF ICE – facts whirl around with no ending or grounding and are meaningless and unintelligible for the autonomous man, whereas we show the only story, the little island on which we dwell rests upon the ocean of the reality and rationality of God, also see 70 and compare 149 and 104; Facts do not speak for themselves
90. OCEAN OF RELATIVITY IN WHICH NON-CHRISTIAN ETHICS SWIM
91. OPERATION: THE UNBELIEVER CAN FEEL LIKE A MAN WHO IS ABOUT TO UNDERGO A MAJOR OPERATION – the effect of realizing that if you are to change your belief about God you will also have to change your belief about yourself
92. ORANGE: NON-CHRISTIAN'S SPOILED ORANGE (wrong interpretation) AND BELIEVERS FRESH ORANGE (right interpretation)
93. PARASITE – the unbeliever must feed upon the truth, also see 16
94. PEPPER-POT OF CHANCE – every conceivable kind of configuration of facts and laws may eventually appear if you shake it long enough
95. PERMIT IS NEEDED TO DIG ON THE WHITE HOUSE LAWN AND IF GIVE INTRUDER A SMALL CORNER, THE ILLEGITIMATE GROUND-DIGGER SOON DIGS TUNNELS UNDERNEATH THE WHITE HOUSE ITSELF, WHILST BEG FOR PERMISSION TO HAVE A PLACE ALONGSIDE THE GROUND-DIGGER'S PRESENT OPERATIONS FOR HIS RELIGIOUS STRUCTURE – the non-believing scientist is actively engaged in breaking God's covenant requirements when he says that he is simply neutrally following the facts wheresoever they may lead him also see 96 and compare 45 and 60; Whilst a Christian who fails to challenge the unbeliever to show his permit claims room for faith as a necessary supplement to an autonomous science
96. PICNICS, HUNTING PARTIES AND WORKING ON GOD'S ESTATE WITHOUT ASKING HIS PERMISSION (CONTRAST THE FREEDOM OF SERVING THE OWNER) – as God's creatures a present attitude, of not believing in Him, is very unfair to Him, also see 95 and compare 45 and 60, and scientists act as though they are not dealing with materials that belong to God, compare 8 and 136; The world is treated as a grab-bag; The freedom of fulfilling cultural mandate by working on God's estate, for the owner

97. POURING WATER THROUGH A SIEVE – the effect of presenting facts to an unbeliever without challenging his assumptions, compare 30
98. PRESIDENT'S VOICE: WE DO NOT TAKE A RECORDING PRESIDENT'S VOICE TO THOSE WHO HAVE NEVER HEARD HIS VOICE, IN ORDER TO HAVE THEM JUDGE WHETHER IT IS HIS VOICE! – we do not start speaking of the Scriptures at first as merely the records of men before we prove them inspired, rather we must take the Bible simultaneously with Christ and with God as its author, who is speaking to us, also see 39 and 76; Evidences and defending Scripture's inspiration; Circular thinking
99. PRISON INMATES AND THEY LOCK THE DOOR BEHIND THEM – the Christian minister is called upon to offer men release from their self-imposed prison, not to join with them and ecumenists
100. PROPELLER'S GYRATIONS BY AN AIRPLANE ENGINE WITHOUT THE AIRPLANE – the meaningless of the naked eye of reason without the authority of the Scripture message, also see 11, 13, 68, and 111; To remove our "rose-colored glasses" of Scripture (see 57 and contrast 58) would be to take the ground from under our feet
101. PUMPING OUT THE WATER OF SIN TAKES UP MUCH OF OUR TIME, BUT WE ARE NEVERTHELESS LAYING THE FOUNDATION OF OUR BRIDGE ON SOLID ROCK – our goal of the absolute destruction of sin and evil is certain
102. QUICKSAND, SINKING INTO – the problems with traditional Thomistic-Butler type apologetics are answered by Reformed apologetics: we must first introduce the Creator-creature distinction, without which we are sunk, and place ourselves, for the sake of the argument, upon the position of the non-Christian and show him that on his view of man and the cosmos, he and the whole culture he is based upon, will sink into quicksand
103. RADIO BUTTON – man cannot turn on any button on his self-consciousness without hearing the requirement of God and seeing the God who is there (God reveals himself also in the heart and conscience of every man); General revelation – God is everywhere and inescapable, , also see 45, 49, 79 and 114 – there are no atheistic peoples and no atheistic men
104. RAFT, ADRIFT ON A SHORELESS OCEAN – no intelligible interpretation of experience apart from Christ, Compare 89 and 105
105. RAFT: SINKING RAFT OF AUTONOMOUS EXPERIENCE; Compare 104
106. RAILROAD TRACK: IF I SLEEP ON IT, HOW COULD I CERTAIN THAT NO TRAIN WILL COME? – the evolutionist makes a universal negative conclusion that God and a coming judgment do not exist but we may be face to face with the judgment at any time, also see 40
107. REBEL, AGAINST THE CAPTAIN OF AN OCEAN STEAMER, JUMPS OFF OR SETS HIS OWN ROOM ON FIRE TO PREVENT THE STEAMER REACHING ITS DESTINATION, BUT WHO FAILS? YET THE CAPTAIN OFFERS THE MUTINEERS ABOARD HIS SHIP THE CHANCE TO REPENT – the captain is Christ who offers the mutineers the chance to join him in his inevitable victory over evil, compare 108 and 109
108. REBELLIOUS SAILOR, OR ENGINEER WHO MAKES DISCOVERIES, SEEKS TO BURN UNBURNABLE SHIP – point of contact with apostate thinking because the world (the ship) is what God says it is, also see 7, 36, 61, and 71; Compare 107 and 109
109. REBELLIOUS SAILORS MUST EMPLOY THEIR GIFTS TO HELP THE SHIP, AND EVEN THOUGH THEY KNOW THAT THEIR MUTINY IS CERTAIN TO END IN SELF-FRUSTRATION, THEY MAKE THEMSELVES BELIEVE IN DIFFERENT WAYS, THAT THEIR MUTINY WILL BE SUCCESSFUL; ALSO THEY ARE CALLED TO RETURN TO THE CAPTAIN – though men do not recognize the truth about the world they can, in spite of themselves, produce much culture which is given to others and there are degrees of self-deception in which they labor; God calls the human race to repent and believe so that they will be saved and also have their culture saved, or be destroyed; Compare 107 and 108
110. REPORTING OF SCIENTISTS CONTAINS MUCH THAT IS TRUE, BUT NEED ONLY TO TURN THEIR REPORTS RIGHT SIDE UP TO HAVE A MARVELOUS DISPLAY OF THE FACTS AS GOD INTENDED, also see 124
111. REVOLVING DOOR IN A VOID – logic, including and the law of non-contradiction, move from nothing into nothing on the basis of chance, also see 11, 13, 68 and 100
112. ROTTING APPLE IN A BUSHEL WILL SPOIL THE WHOLE BUSHEL IN TIME – one spot of ultimate irrationality will spoil rationality

113. ROWING TOGETHER IN A LEAKY BOAT TELLING EACH OTHER THAT IN ALL PROBABILITY THERE IS A FATHER GOD WHO WILL SEND US FOOD AND DRINKING WATER ON OUR WAY – the Reformed creeds have been more faithful in giving a proper response to the mercy of God to men in Christ than have other creeds (the rowers, etc.) which have, to some extent, reduced the offer of the sovereign grace of God in Christ
114. SEARCHLIGHT – searchlight of *God's general revelation* is constantly shining everywhere, particularly within men where the knowledge of God is infixed in their being, also see 45, 49, 79 and 103; Searchlight of *the Scripture*, which is all-revealing, is to be directed towards the unbeliever so they see the face of the Great Physician who says that the heart of the natural man is desperately wicked and he can heal all his diseases; Compare 115
115. SEARCHLIGHT (compare 114) IS NEEDED TO SEE THE NIAGARA FALLS AT NIGHT – without the true light of Scripture as the word of the self-attesting Christ we would know no fact for what it is, i.e., as set in the only framework in which it can have meaning, also see 57 and 85; Reason and revelation should not be contrasted as two sources of knowledge for “facts” are known by revelation and by creation the “facts” are themselves a revelation of God; The revelation of God in the facts of the created world was, from the beginning supplemented by the “supernatural” word revelation of God
116. SEE A STAR THROUGH TELESCOPE AND A GERM THROUGH MICROSCOPE NOT VICE-VERSA – all facts must be seen “in God” to be seen truly, not by looking elsewhere
117. SEED OF RELIGION IS DIVINELY SOWN IN ALL MEN
118. SHELTER TO FACTS IS CHRISTIANITY AS A UNIT; Christian religion cannot be defended piecemeal as it proves its truth to men by offering itself as the foundation of proof and the refuge for facts, compare 5, 17, 20, 21 and 124
119. SHIP'S BALLAST IS THROWN OVERBOARD AND THE SHIP IS DOOMED TO ARRIVE AT THE ENCHANTED ISLANDS – forsaking God as the presupposition of true interpretation lead to throwing every criterion of distinction between fact and fiction, between right and wrong overboard and the ship of science and philosophy is doomed to arrive at the Enchanted Islands
120. SHOE LACES: MAN MUST LIFT HIMSELF BY THEM – the modern view of Niebuhr, Barth, Brunner is autosoterism/self-salvation
121. SHOWER OF THE WRATH OF GOD UPON THE WHOLE CREATION IS FOCUSED UPON THE SOUL OF MAN THAT HAD SINNED
122. SNUFFBOX IS NOT NEEDED IF THE WHOLE HEAD IS SICK, BUT A LIVELY STIMULANT – we must hold before the natural man the necessity of a total reversal of his attitude of mind to be an avenue through which the Holy Spirit can give life
123. SOLDIER IS THE RAW RECRUIT CLASSIFIED AND DRILLED ON THE AUTHORITY OF MAN HIMSELF – irrationalist modern man will readily accept all the facts of Paul's gospel as raw recruits but as a rationalist he will classify and ‘destroy’ these facts
124. SOLOMON'S TEMPLE WAS BUILT ACCORDING TO GOD'S BLUEPRINT BY THE PHOENICIANS/SIDONIANS BUILDERS, AS THEY WERE HIS SERVANTS, NOT HIS ARCHITECTS – we gladly recognize and use the detail work of many scientists and thinkers, like Aristotle, as being highly valuable and raised up by God's Providence, but we cannot use them and their method as the architects of our structure of Christian interpretation, for God and the Christ of the Bible are the basis on which all facts have meaning (there can be no facts but Christian-theistic facts), also see 110; Brute, unintelligible, facts on the basis of a non-Christian hypothesis, compare 66 and 88; Covenant keepers will make use of the works of the covenant breakers to perform the cultural task of mankind; The Reformed apologist should gratefully employ the results of evangelical apologists and scholarship in such fields as Biblical history and archaeology in accordance with his own master plan of procedure, compare 5, 17, 20, 21 and 118
125. SON WHO HAS GONE AWAY FROM HOME FOR A LONG TIME RECOGNIZES HIS FATHER FOR WHAT HE ACTUALLY IS – the sinner knows that he ought to accept Christianity is true and the sense of deity within him constantly gives the lie to all his theories, compare 27
126. SPARK IN MY CAR: IF THE SPARK IS MISSING THEN IT'S NO GOOD PLANNING MY JOURNEY – the natural man does not have the motivating power of faith in the redemption through Christ
127. SPHERE: PHILOSOPHERS FOLLOW ONE ANOTHER ABOUT IN CIRCLES WITHIN THE HOLLOW OF A SPHERE OF THEIR AUTONOMY

128. STAMP OF GOD'S OWNERSHIP ENGRAVED ON THE UNIVERSE AND FIELD OF REALITY INCLUDING EVERY FACT IN THIS WORLD – all men know God, so how can you be neutral to him? Compare 77
129. STEALING ITEMS "INNOCENTLY" FROM WESTMINSTER SEMINARY – pull the mask of the unbeliever's own false ("innocent") frame of reference from his face, also see 78; How to proclaim the gospel of the God who is there to twentieth century sophisticated man by setting forth before him the meaning of the gospel as we find it in the Scriptures
130. STEALING TOMATOES IN GOD'S GARDEN – no one can steal, knowing that it is God's garden, and expect to escape the wrath of God by claiming that he does not know what he is doing, compare 136; Man knows in his deepest heart this is God's world
131. STONE ROLLED UP A HILL ONLY TO SEE IT ROLL DOWN AGAIN – meaninglessness of man, educators and liberal church activism, without Christ
132. SUN THAT IS ALWAYS BEHIND THE CLOUDS – logic, a criterion of meaning, is silenced without God
133. SUN THAWS THE ICE OF A MARSH AND BRINGS TO ACTION THE DORMANT HORDES OF MANY SCORPIONS, ADDERS AND POISONOUS INSECTS – the law brings to light the sins of the heart, compare 134
134. SUNLIGHT PIERCING INTO A ROOM REVEALS THOUSANDS OF MOATS FLOATING IN THE AIR – the law brings to light the sins of the heart, compare 133
135. SWAMP THAT HAS NO BOTTOM, IN WHICH YOU ARE IN – seeking for facts on the basis of time and chance
136. THIEF CLAIMS THAT THE QUESTION OF THE OWNERSHIP OF THE HOUSE, INDELIBLY WRITTEN AT UNAVOIDABLE PLACES, IS OF NO CONCERN TO HIM – scientists act as though they are not dealing with materials that belong to God, compare 8, 96, 128 and 130
137. TOPSY-TURVY LAND: THE NATURAL MAN MUST BE TAKEN OUT OF HIS HALL OF MIRRORS, OUT OF TOPSY-TURVY LAND INTO THE OPEN SUNLIGHT – the would-be self-authenticating man must be challenged to repent and return to God, then he will see for the first time that it is not Chance, and himself as the ultimate interpreter of facts, but God's plan which constitutes his proper unity; The gospel of the self-authenticating God speaking through Christ in Scriptures offers man salvation, not only for his life, but for his science and philosophy and theology as well
138. TOTALITARIAN POWERS VIOLENTLY BATTLE EVEN FOR A SPOT OF DESERT SAND – covenant-keepers and covenant-breakers antitheses of principle is at every point
139. TRAIN IS MISSED, BY A MINUTE OR AN HOUR – some non-Christian thinkers theories are closer to Christianity than others but nothing is more important in the sphere of apologetics today than to point out clearly the fundamental differences that underlie the similarities between Christian and non-Christian thought because all non-Christians will be lost forever unless brought to Christ; The sinner's knowledge frustrates itself; The ambiguity of language in many of the higher forms of non-Christian thought means it is easy to change the heavy perpendicular line that separates non-Christian thought from Christian thought into an ascending diagonal; Common grace teaches us to look for many similarities between Christian and non-Christian thinking, and there is corroborative value for the truth of Christianity in non-Christian thinkers
140. TURNPIKE IN THE SKY HAS NO WAY ONTO IT FROM EARTH – logic, rationality and fact and the law of contradiction cannot be approached and fitted together unless one stands on the Reformation Christ-line; Non-Christian scientific methodology is bankrupt, , also see 11, 13, 68 and 119
141. UNITED STATES ADMITTING THAT IT HAD BEEN A PROVINCE OF THE SOVIET UNION BUT OUGHT AT THE SAME TIME TO BE RECOGNIZED AS AN INDEPENDENT POWER – admitting that the principles of the unbeliever, are right and then to seek to win him to the acceptance of the existence of God
142. UNITY OF VAN TIL IS THAT OF A CHILD WHO WALKS WITH ITS FATHER THROUGH THE WOODS AND IS NOT AFRAID BECAUSE ITS FATHER KNOWS IT ALL – there are some "difficulties" with respect to belief in God but all facts have their final explanation in God whose thoughts are higher than our thoughts
143. UPROOT THE WEEDS RATHER THAN CUTTING THEM OFF AT THE SURFACE – uproot not legitimize the natural man's view of himself; Special grace removes the cancer of sin, compare 23

144. WARFARE WITH MUTUALLY DEPENDENT BAYONET FIGHTING, RIFLE SHOOTING AND MACHINE GUNS, COMBINED WITH HEAVY GUNS AND ATOM BOMBS – in the vindication of Christian theism, as a unit and whole, factual and philosophical argument go together, also see 81
145. WASHING: RATIONALISM AND IRRATIONALISM TAKE ONE ANOTHER'S WASHING IN – the rationalism-irrationalism dilemma, also see 70 and 72
146. WATER SUPPLY IN A CITY IS QUITE SUFFICIENT FOR THE NORMAL NEEDS OF ITS CITIZENS BUT IT MAY NOT BE SUFFICIENT IF ALL THOSE CITIZENS TAKE TO BURNING THEIR HOUSES DOWN – insufficiency of present general revelation is due to the sin of man
147. WATER THROWN ON A FIRE BY THE NATURAL MAN CANNOT QUENCH THE FIRE – all men, due to the sin within them, seek to “suppress” the knowledge of God they possess, also see 8 and 58
148. WATER: MAN MADE OF WATER TRYING TO GET OUT OF WATER MAKES A LADDER OF WATER – use the non-Christian “friend’s” method, which is based on chance, for argument’s sake, to show his hopeless and senseless picture, also see 149, and compare 74 and 89
149. WATER: MAN MADE OF WATER, CONCENTRATED AS A WHITE-CAP ON A WAVE OF A BOTTOMLESS AND SHORELESS OCEAN, DISAPPEARS IN HIS ENVIRONMENT OF THE ENDLESS BLUE – unintelligibility is what comes out of chance for the man who rejects the traditional Protestant view, also see 148 and compare 67 and 89
150. WATER: ONLY ARGUMENT FOR AN ABSOLUTE GOD THAT HOLDS WATER IS A TRANSCENDENTAL ARGUMENT
151. WEALTH OF GENEROUS MILLIONAIRE’S IS OFFERED THOUGH YOU HAVE NOT A PENNY – God can actually help the non-Christian though he does not understand the meaning of grace (the free and general offer of the gospel)
152. WEB OF THE WILY SPIDER NOT CATCHING ANYTHING – logic from chance will not catch a single fact, compare 4
153. WIFE: NEW WIFE IS NOT WANTED BY SOMEONE WHO IS PERFECTLY SATISFIED WITH THE ONE HE HAS NOW – the “natural man” has to some extent seen the emptiness and vanity of his own position before even considering the truth in any serious fashion at all
154. WORM OF CONSCIENCE; Sense of deity
155. X-RAY MACHINE OF THE BIBLE – use the Bible to diagnose everyone and everything and do not first go independent experience reason, history, etc, also see 80

Additional Van Til illustrations that are not in his books, from some of his former students

- 156. BLACK CAT IN A COAL BIN – Paganism is blind
- 157. BLACK CAT, TRYING TO FIND IN A PITCH DARK BARN – Man's ability to use himself as the measure of all things
- 158. BUILDER, PRETENTIOUS – Autonomous man's failure
- 159. BUTTON, FIRST, IS IN THE WRONG HOLE – Starting point with man
- 160. BUYING THE NEXT CUP OF COFFEE – Kindness in witnessing
- 161. CATTLE RUSTLERS – Living off Christian Theism
- 162. RABBITS AND GIRAFFES – Teaching different students
- 163. DEAD NOT DROWNING – Dead without Christ, Total depravity
- 164. DUCKS NOT STOLEN BY MY FATHER – Sinners denial of sin confesses their crime
- 165. EINSTEIN – Not accounting for counting
- 166. FIREWORKS LAUNCHED FROM THE GROUND – Pagan gods launched from human reason, rationalism; Compare 170
- 167. NUMERICAL SEQUENCE – Facts make sense within, also see 31168. POISONED, THE WHOLE GLASS – Total depravity
- 169. POTATOES SOLD MORE HONESTLY BY NON-CHRISTIAN NEIGHBOR – Common Grace
- 170. SKYROCKET FROM EARTH NOT SKY – Neo-orthodox theologians god, compare 166
- 171. STEAL THAT BOOK! – On the importance of acquiring good literature
- 172. SULFURIC ACID AND WATER LOOK THE SAME – Neo-orthodoxy gives death
- 173. TWO CIRCLE WORLDVIEW – Creator-creature relationship and distinction