

MEETING OF THE PRESBYTERY OF THE ORTHODOX PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, at 2328 GERMANTOWN AVENUE, PHILA. PA.

On

July 7, 1944

Commencing at 1:45 p.m., EWT.

IN RE: EXAMINATION IN THEOLOGY OF GORDON H. CLARK

MR. MARSTON: I move that a record of the examination be made by a Court Stenographer.

(This motion, having been seconded from the floor, was put to a vote and was carried).

GORDON H. CLARK, was examined in Theology as follows:

BY REVEREND CLELLAND:

Q You have been examined before, Mr. Clark, by the Presbytery, and I do not think it is necessary for me to conduct a comprehensive examination in Theology at this time. Therefore, I shall confine myself to certain points which seem to me to be important in the case at issue.

You accept a confession of the faith in our Church, as brought out in the Holy Scripture?

Clark

2

A I do.

Q You believe the statement in Chapter 2, Section 1, that the one only living and true God is incomprehensible?

A I believe that there are indications in Scripture that when we shall be glorified, our knowledge will continue to increase forever, and that in all probability there will be no end to such increase.

Q That there will always be then, something which we could not yet comprehend?

A It seems to me entirely likely, though the exegies of it are a little weak, but it seems to me entirely likely that there will always be certain particular truths that we do not know.

Q I will ask you this question, which you may have already answered:

Is all truth in the mind of God, capable of being addressed in propositions intelligent to the mind of man?

A I would no know what the word: "truth" meant unless as a quality of proposition. I cannot conceive of anything that is of truth that is not a proposition.

Q All right, then - how about the proposition being intelligible to the mind of man?

A I have no Scriptural basis for that, God can reveal any particular proposition to man, and if God can make Sons

why prop. a. true

1 of Abraham out of stones of the roadway, he can make even  
 2 a stupid individual person understand a proposition.  
 3 Q Is the omniscience of God an incommunicable attribute?  
 4 A Yes.  
 5 Q Man then, will never be omniscient?  
 6 A I have already stated there will always be propositions  
 7 that man will not know and furthermore, if omniscience is  
 8 supposed to be not only the proposition that God knows, but  
 9 his manner of knowing them, naturally, we shall never have  
 10 any knowledge in that manner.  
 11 Q Chapter 3, Section 1, of the Confession, this speaks of  
 12 God Eternal Decree by which he has ordained whatsoever comes  
 13 to past, yet, so as thereby neither is God the author of sin,  
 14 nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor  
 15 the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away--  
 16 do you subscribe freely to that statement?  
 17 A Yes, it includes the last three words:  
 18 "But rather established".  
 19 Q Does not that seem to be a paradox, -- Let me ask you,  
 20 can you accept doctrines that are paradoxical?  
 21 A By paradox you mean, I suppose, a pair of propositions  
 22 which people cannot harmonize?  
 23 Q Yes.

*Man never  
 knows in the  
 manner s.  
 knows.*

*Paradox = 2  
 prop<sup>s</sup> people  
 can't harmonize*

1 A Yes, that is often the case. I have to accept certain  
 2 propositions which are paradoxical, but of course, you don't  
 3 mean paradoxical in the Barthian sense.  
 4 Q Are there any conditions paradoxical to God?  
 5 A No, sir.  
 6 Q There is no paradox in God?  
 7 A No.  
 8 Q Chapter 5, Section 3, under "Providence", reads as fol-  
 9 lows:  
 10 "God, in his ordinary providence, maketh use of means  
 11 yet is free to work without, above, and against them, at his  
 12 pleasure".  
 13 Do you subscribe to that statement of Confession?  
 14 A God works against men in a sense which a weak-kneed king  
 15 would try to do something, use an Army or some device to over-  
 16 throw the People of God, and God would destroy the Army or  
 17 the means that the King used. I know of only two cases in  
 18 which God works without means, in the creation of the word -  
 19 he used no means; and the only other case I know where God  
 20 has worked without all means - is in his upholding the Uni-  
 21 verse as a whole.  
 22 As for working above means, I must confess I don't know  
 23 what the word: "above" indicates in this connection. If  
 24 you give me a definition, I will tell you what I think.

- 1 Q Chapter 21, Section 7, of the Confession, under:  
 2 "Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day," - the statement is  
 3 made:  
 4 "God, by a positive moral and perpetual commandment,  
 5 binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed  
 6 one day in seven for a Sabbath,"- under the Old Testament,  
 7 it was the Seventh day of the Week, and from the Resurrection,  
 8 Christ changed that to the First day of the Week --  
 9 Do you accept that Statement?  
 10 A Yes.  
 11 Q Do you hold then, that the first day of the week is  
 12 the Christian Sabbath, which takes place of the Seventh Day  
 13 of the Old Testament?  
 14 A Yes. In the Book of Acts, it is indicated Christians  
 15 worship on the first day of the week.  
 16 Q In the 109th question of the Larger Catechism, under:  
 17 "Sins Forbidden", in the Second Commandment, there is for-  
 18 bidden making any representation of God, of all, or of any  
 19 of the Three Persons, either inwardly in our minds, or out-  
 20 wardly, of any kind of image or likeness of any creature what-  
 21 soever" --  
 22 Do you subscribe to that particular statement of the  
 23 Larger Catechism?  
 24 A Very easily, there is no possible imagining of God.

- 1 Q Would you interpret that to forbid pictures of Jesus?  
 2 A No sir, that is his human nature, he had a body like  
 3 anyone else and there is no reason that a likeness cannot  
 4 be made of Christ, not to kneel before them, not to worship,  
 5 but there is no objection to painting a scene of the Crucifix-  
 6 ion or Christ before Pilate.  
 7 Q Chapter 33, back in the Confession, Section 1, on the  
 8 "Last Judgment", we are told that God appointed a day where-  
 9 in he will judge the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ,  
 10 in which day, not only the Apostate Angels shall be judged,  
 11 but likewise, all persons that have lived upon earth, shall  
 12 appear before the Tribunal of Christ --  
 13 Do you feel you can accept that statement?  
 14 A Yes -- all shall appear before the Judgment Seat of  
 15 Christ, God has given all judgment into the hand of Christ.  
 16 Q In one day, or a day?  
 17 A Well, there may be other Judgment Days, I'm not sure, but  
 18 I'm quite willing to say they will all appear on one day,  
 19 whether they have appeared previously, or not.  
 20 Q The thing I am getting at is this:  
 21 It would seem to me here, the Confession teaches there  
 22 is a day, one particular day in which all men shall appear, I'm  
 23 trying to ask you whether you subscribe to that - whether you  
 24 subscribe to it, and in case you don't, do you think it is

1 put here, one Judgment --

2 A Well, the word: "day", is not always a reference to ex-  
3 exactly 24 hours, but it does seem to me that there is one great  
4 final judgment.

5 Now, there may be certain other punishments and judg-  
6 ments preceding that and I think there is this one final judg-  
7 ment, meaning usually in the everlasting, final date.

8 Q Does God make a free Public and Sincere offer of Salva-  
9 tion to all men?

10 A God makes a perfectly free offer of Salvation through  
11 his Ministers, proclaiming the word of God.

12 The word: "sincere" is not in the Confession. I don't  
13 know just what it would mean under such conditions, it is  
14 perfectly free and general.

15 Q There is no question then about the free or public --  
16 Under "Repentance or Faith" - I believe you are looking  
17 for.

18 A I was looking at that passage in the Confession a little  
19 while ago and I can agree with the word, that is, word for  
20 word right down, what the Confession says, Chapter 7, Section  
21 3, I think it is. Yes, Chapter 7, Section 3:

22 "Wherein He freely offered unto sinners, life and salva-  
23 tion by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in Him, that they  
24 may be saved and promising to give unto all of those that are

*What can  
Sincere  
mean?*

1 Ordained unto Life, His Holy Spirit, to make them willing and  
2 able to believe".

3 Q Well, when I used the word: "sincere", I mean - some-  
4 thing that comes from my heart, something that I genuinely  
5 offer.

6 You hold of course you cannot say all of these things  
7 about God, but about ourselves but you say, God makes a  
8 genuine offer of Salvation to all men?

9 A God is certainly sincere, he commands all men everywhere,  
10 to repent, that is a sincere command.

11 REVEREND CLELLAND: I have no other questions.

12 -----  
13 THE MODERATOR: Are there any other questions?  
14 -----

15 BY REVEREND E. H. RIAN:

16 Q I have one or two things which I'd like to have cleared  
17 up.

18 As to the word: "omniscient" - whether Dr. Clark holds  
19 or believes that man can become omniscient, and as to the  
20 definition of omniscient - it is defined for this purpose as  
21 the way in which God holds all things as well as the contents  
22 of his knowledge, that being an incommunicable attribute or  
23 attainment toward which man does not, or ever will, come.

24 "Omniscience" is defined in the way in which God knows all

*God is  
sincere*

*Def. of  
omniscience*

1 things, as well as the contents of his knowledge, which is an  
2 incommunicable attribute - the attainment toward which man  
3 does not, or ever will, make progress.

4 A I subscribe to that.

5 Q I believe you spoke, or Mr. Clelland spoke about all  
6 truth in the mind of God is capable of being expressed in  
7 propositions intelligible to the mind of man.

8 Wouldn't you say that according to the Scripture Revela-  
9 tion, we have no right to say - either all knowledge in the  
10 mind of God is capable of being expressed in proposition or -  
11 all proof is not capable of being expressed in proposition  
12 intelligible to the mind of man.

13 In other words, we cannot dogmatically say either one of  
14 those, is that correct?

15 A I would put to it, the considerable knowledge to justify  
16 those statements and its basically a matter of English, its  
17 a matter of English, - it is simply a matter of common sense,  
18 what the word: "truth" means.

19 Q Wouldn't you say from Scripture, that you wouldn't be  
20 able, dogmatically, to say either?

21 A You couldn't deduce that from the teaching of the Scrip-  
22 ture. A great deal of this, not a great deal, various parts  
23 of this cannot be deduced from Scripture, at least some or part  
24 of it gives a weak support to it, in my opinion.

Clark

10

1 Q Now, as to a paradox, this is an expression of what I  
2 mean by a seeming contradiction, God makes a free, public,  
3 sincere offer of the Gospel to all men at the same time, he  
4 wills some should be saved, isn't that seemingly a contra-  
5 diction?

6 A It sees so to you.

7 Q All right, it seems so to me, and a lot of others.

8 A That is a paradox, yes.

9 Q Would you admit those two?

10 A Oh yes. My only question is the word: "sincere", there  
11 is a peculiar adjective to use, or should I say - a word in  
12 English language?

13 REVEREND RIAN: I have no more questions at this time.

14

15 BY DR. WELMERS:

16 Q I have three questions and it may turn out to be one or  
17 more less, or the parts of the questions may be in one:

18 Apart from the argument as to whether God's knowledge  
19 can be spoken of as a series of propositions, would it be  
20 your opinion that some of those propositions, if they are  
21 propositions, are, of themselves, an infinite content?

22 For example:

23 The proposition - God is Love, that is a proposition as  
24 much as A plus B. Does that, in your opinion, have, in it-

*Certain logical  
truths are not  
deduced from  
Scripture by  
exegesis*

*Can a prop. have  
infinite content?*

1 self, an infinite content?  
 2 A No, in itself, it is just that one proposition, no more.  
 3 Q To further expound on that question:  
 4 Do you believe that God's Love, as well as other of his  
 5 Attributes are Infinite?  
 6 A They are limited by nothing outside of himself.  
 7 Q You subscribe to the Doctrine that God is Infinite in  
 8 his Being?  
 9 A Yes.  
 10 Q If God is Infinite in his ability and being, then, is  
 11 not knowledge of those attributes also infinite?  
 12 A Why, no.  
 13 Q Why, not?  
 14 A Because it is just one piece of knowledge.  
 15 Q Does not God know all of the infinity of his attributes,  
 16 all of their application?  
 17 A He knows that none of his attributes are limited by any-  
 18 thing outside himself, that is knowing the Infinity of them.  
 19 Q To comprehend then, the proposition:  
 20 "God is Love",  
 21 would seem to me like to ask if you agree that that denotes  
 22 infinite knowledge?  
 23 A No more than it requires infinite knowledge to know the  
 24 Rule of Infinite Theories in Geometry or Algebra, it is just

Clark

12

1 one piece of knowledge, one proposition.  
 2 Q Well, we'll go on to the second one:  
 3 You have in the past, attributed a great deal to what  
 4 you call the premise of the intellect and all of us hold, I  
 5 am sure, that an intelligent grasp of fundamental Scriptural  
 6 truth is basic to saving faith.  
 7 In that sense, we all hold to what might be called a  
 8 priority of the intellect. However, would you agree that the  
 9 intellect, the emotions and volitional aspect of man's nature  
 10 are equally fundamental to his soul and equally important,  
 11 while still granting that the intellect might be first in order  
 12 in much the same way that the Father is first in order, in the  
 13 Holy Trinity.  
 14 A Well, if your statement isn't self contradictory, it is  
 15 a paradox to me. How can A and B, be on a par, and yet one is  
 16 first, that is beyond me.  
 17 Q Do you not believe the members of the Holy Trinity are  
 18 absolutely on a par and yet, the Father is first in order?  
 19 A There is a distinction there:  
 20 The Order refers to an economic suggestion and their  
 21 being on a par refers to their substantial personalities.  
 22 There are two points there, and what you say of one is  
 23 not true of the other.  
 24 Q I believe it is a good illustration, and I don't want to  
 get into

No.

A knows infinity  
 is not itself  
 infinite

*In intellect & emotion  
equally essential  
but not on a par*

1 odious comparisons here.  
 2 It is my feeling that the intellect and emotion and  
 3 will are equally fundamental as aspects of the Human Soul,  
 4 yet, there is in the calling and serving faith, there is an  
 5 economic precedent of the intellect, that is that.  
 6 And, the intellectual grasp of the way of salvation,  
 7 first requires the saving of faith to both.  
 8 A I am willing to admit the intellect and volition and  
 9 emotion are equally essential to a human being.  
 10 Now, if that is all you mean, that is that.  
 11 But - they have different functions and I hold that the  
 12 intellect is a supreme function.  
 13 Q To get farther into that, is my next question:  
 14 I believe you said at the last examination, and I hope  
 15 I am not mis-quoting you, that man's highest good is an  
 16 intelligent apprehension of God.  
 17 A I said - that was his method of enjoying God forever and  
 18 it was the greatest religious activity.  
 19 Q In the Scriptures, the greatest command is to love the  
 20 Lord, our God, and man's highest end is the love of God and  
 21 to enjoy him forever. And, I would think it most obvious,  
 22 the most obvious thing is the glorifying of God, if we are  
 23 to indulge in volitional activities.  
 24 A So do I hold that.

*Contemplation  
glorifies God -  
it is not just a  
means of glorify  
him.*

1 Q Would you then say the intellectual apprehension of  
 2 God is the most basic?  
 3 A No, I'd say it is the highest, - not the most basic.  
 4 Q You would not say - it is a means to an end of loving  
 5 and glorifying God, but is the end?  
 6 A I should say the contemplation of God is - glorifying  
 7 and enjoying God.  
 8 Q Rather than a means to the end of Glorifying him?  
 9 A Of course, you mean - I don't make your distinction be-  
 10 tween the end and a means to the end.  
 11 DR. WELMER: I think that is all.

-----

*God is infinite  
but not indefinite*

13 BY REVEREND KUCHKE:  
 14 Q Dr. Clark, is it true that God is Infinite?  
 15 A Infinite in the sense that there is nothing outside of  
 16 him that bounds him or limits him in any way. He is not  
 17 in the old Greek sense, Infinite, but He is Infinite in the  
 18 sense that nothing outside of him limits him in any way.  
 19 Q Does God have infinite knowledge of His own being?  
 20 A Yes, his knowledge is not limited by anything outside  
 21 of him.  
 22 Q Is this true, that the finite mind can know God as He  
 23 reveals Himself in finite things and finite ideas?  
 24 A Yes.

- 1 Q Can the infinite mind know God apart from revelations  
2 also?
- 3 A You include under "Infinite" - individual propositions,  
4 that God reveals?
- 5 Q To me, yes.
- 6 A I say yes to that, if that is what you mean.
- 7 Q To me, a proposition is something in itself, finite.
- 8 A Then, I agree with that.
- 9 Q Will the infinite mind be able to know God directly in  
10 His wisdom, apart from God's revelation of Himself, in the  
11 finite?
- 12 A By "Infinite" you mean - proposition? No, I think only  
13 through propositions.
- 14 Q And, is the finite mind limited by the finite?
- 15 A Yes, we know by propositions, -- by means of propositions  
16 and that is the only way we do know.
- 17 Q And, can the finite mind penetrate ever beyond the range  
18 of the finite into the infinite?
- 19 A Well, the proposition referred to infinite action, such  
20 as algebraic and arithmetic theories - it is a finite pro-  
21 position, but infinity is one of the terms of it.
- 22 You can sum up an infinite series, you have an infinite  
23 number of terms in the proposition.
- 24 Q When the Confession of Faith says:

- 1 "God is without body parts - passion",  
2 Does it mean God is lacking in feeling or emotion?
- 3 A It does.
- 4 Q I'll define feelings and emotions:  
5 I mean - affection in the sense of principal activity  
6 with reference to objections. Now, I'll repeat the question,  
7 if you wish.
- 8 A Go ahead.
- 9 Q The Confession says:  
10 "God is without body parts or passion".  
11 Does it mean God is lacking in feeling or emotion?
- 12 A Go ahead--
- 13 Q And by feeling or emotion, I mean - in the sense of  
14 principal activity with reference to objects.
- 15 A I forget which way to answer that - yes or no.
- 16 Q The Confession of Faith says:  
17 "God is without body or parts".
- 18 A The answer is yes, but I protest against the awful  
19 English of your statement, the word: "emotion" -- never mind  
20 that English.
- 21 Q You mean that God has never acted upon anything aside  
22 from himself?
- 23 A I don't understand you.
- 24 Q What I would like to know is this:



1 We can call these feelings or emotions in God, and I  
2 would define them as analogous to our feelings and emotions  
3 and affections in the sense that they are active principles,  
4 active with reference to objects.

5 For example:

6 God is angry with the wicked, God loves His people  
7 eternally, - would you deny that?

8 A That is right right, what you say is right.

9 Q That is what the Confession means?

10 A No, what -- not what it means, right there - not what  
11 the Confession means --

12 Q The Fourth Commandment is binding upon us today?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And another is:

15 "Does God sincerely offer the Gospel to the reprobates?"

16 A God makes a perfectly free and public offer of the Gos-  
17 pel to all men. I stand on the wording of the Confession.

18 REVEREND KUCHKE: That is all I have.

19

20 THE MODERATOR: Are there any other questions?

21

22 BY DR. WOOLLEY:

23 Q Is there any difference in kind between the knowledge of  
24 God, subjective, and the knowledge that human beings have or

1 possess?

2 A That is entirely different.

3 Q Can you give any further explanation or definition of  
4 that difference?

5 A Briefly, I should say God's knowledge is intuitive and  
6 ours indispersive?

7 Q You consider that a difference in kind, rather than a  
8 difference in the method of knowledge or method of knowing?

9 A I thought kind and method meant the same thing.

10 Q I didn't mean them to mean the same thing, that is -  
11 I would say that to my mind when I use the word: "kind", I  
12 meant a description of knowledge which was much broader in  
13 extent than purely the method of acquiring which covered type  
14 of being or content that you might describe to knowledge,  
15 apart from acquisition.

16 A I know of two points, often this subject:

17 That is - the method of knowledge - knowing, is, in the  
18 case of God not acquisitional, but in our case, it is. That  
19 is one point of it, and the only other point that has any  
20 reference to the subject is:

21 The object known, such as  $2 \times 2$ , equals 4.

22 I hold that that is the same as it is for God, but the  
23 method of knowing it, is entirely different.

24 Q Does that mean that the method which we use is less

1 perfect than the method used by God, or simply that is the  
2 part of the method used by God. Is there a difference in  
3 perfection or simply a difference in quantity?

4 A No, the method is the same, but the objects are a matter  
5 of quantities.

6 Q That is quite a different point in connection with the  
7 question:

8 What was previously asked was as to the pictorial re-  
9 presentation of Christ, and you made some reference to those  
10 representations as to the human nature of Christ, does that  
11 mean the pictorial and only of the human nature of Christ?

12 A I wouldn't know how to paint on canvas, anything that  
13 was not physical.

14 Q Thank you.

15 A You can't paint a picture of a man's soul, so obviously,  
16 you couldn't paint a picture of God's.

17 BY MR. CUMMINGS:

18 Q I understand that your position, Dr. Clark is - that  
19 according to God's revelations in the Bible, we are not able  
20 to say all truth in the mind of God is capable in being ex-  
21 pressed of propositions intelligently to the mind of man,  
22 nor, that all truth in fact, is not capable of being expressed  
23 in the mind of man.

24 Now, if -- and nor can we say all truth in the mind of

1 God is not capable of being expressed in propositions intelli-  
2 gent to the minds of man.

3 Is that not to say that it is capable of being expressed  
4 in propositions intelligent to the mind of man?

5 A That simply means - the Bible does not give free express-  
6 ion on the lesson in logic.

7 Q How then are there any judgments and ways passed find-  
8 ing out?

9 A I would explain that by saying no endeavor on our part  
10 can discover certain truths about God but those truths can be  
11 obtained only by revelations and we cannot solve them out on  
12 our own incentive, on our own steam - if I may use that  
13 phrase.

14 Q Would you say that all propositions that have been re-  
15 vealed in the Scripture are capable of being intelligent now,  
16 to the mind of man?

17 A All scriptures - the doctrines are not all intelligent  
18 to man's mind, sometimes.

19 Q Is it comprehensive to man's mind?

20 A That means the same thing.

21 Q You would say then, that all that is revealed in the  
22 Scripture is capable of being comprehended by the mind of man?

23 A Oh yes, that is what it was given to us for, to under-  
24 stand it.

1 MR. CUMMINGS: Thank you.

2 -----

3 BY MR. KEIPER:

4 Q You would say of course, that God is infinite - or, is  
5 it infinity?

6 A Yes.

7 Q You would say the human intellect is finite?

8 A Yes.

9 Q You would also say subsequently, that the human mind can  
10 never comprehend God?

11 A Not for that reason, a finite man can know him in finite  
12 things.

13 Q Can it comprehend anything that is infinite?

14 A Certainly. One-half plus one-half, plus one-quarter,  
15 plus one-sixteenth, that is an infinite series which is very  
16 easily comprehended.

17 Q Would you say that God possesses each of his Attributes  
18 infinitely?

19 A I wouldn't say it because I wouldn't know what it means.

20 Q God is infinite in his Being.

21 A None of His attributes are limited by anything outside  
22 of himself, I think I said that before.

23 Q If infinite in His being - is He not also infinite in  
24 His Attributes?

1 A That is just what I said.

2 Q I beg your pardon, I thought you didn't say that.

3 Would you say that man can comprehend God in his incommuni-  
4 cable attributes?

5 A We can know that God has certain incommunicable attri-  
6 butes, yes.

7 Q Can we comprehend the exhaustive knowledge of his in-  
8 communicable attributes?

9 A Can we know the proposition like - God is Love? Yes.

10 Q Can we know the love of God fully and comprehend it  
11 fully?

12 A I don't know what you mean - can we experience it, do  
13 you mean?

14 Q No, can we have a comprehensive and exhaustive knowledge,  
15 intellectual understanding of it - not just a knowledge that  
16 God is love. Can we know the love of God comprehensively and  
17 substantially?

18 A The only kind of knowledge which I am familiar - is the  
19 knowledge of the proposition, knowledge is the possession of  
20 truth, and the only truth that I know anything about is -  
21 a proposition.

22 If you are talking about something else, I don't know  
23 just what you are talking about.

24 Q I think I am likely talking about something else but I

1 thought it was clear what I was trying to say. I was going  
2 to ask the question next, whether a man can comprehend God  
3 in his communicable attributes, but perhaps you don't feel  
4 like answering that question.

5 You spoke of the Gospel as a command. Isn't it also  
6 an offer?

7 A That word is frequently used, would you quote some  
8 verses you have in mind?

9 Q "Come unto me all thee that labor" -- that is a command  
10 and also an offer.

11 A If you want to use the word in that sense.

12 Q Would you say that God, in the Gospel offers Eternal  
13 Life to sinners?

14 A Yes.

15 Q Would you say God is perfectly since in making that  
16 offer to each one?

17 A If you insist on using that word instead of others --

18 Q Suppose, well, might we not have to deal here with a  
19 so-called paradox?

20 A Possibly it may seem a paradox, but it is simply a matter  
21 of definition.

22 Q Would you also say the Gospel is an invitation?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Would you say God sincerely invites every one who loves

1 God, to Eternal Life?

2 A He makes a perfectly public, free invitation.

3 Q You wouldn't want to use the word: "sincere"?

4 A No.

5 Q I'd like to ask you this:

6 "All who are called should comply with the invitation.

7 I'm going to ask you whether you would subscribe to such a  
8 statement, namely; all who are acceptable to Him, all who are  
9 called, should comply with the invitation.

10 A That is all right, that is a good statement.

11 Q You would agree that God has declared in His word, that  
12 it would be acceptable to him that all men who hear the  
13 Gospel should comply with the invitation?

14 A Yes, that is right.

15 Q That is acceptable to him?

16 A Right, it says so.

17 Q All right. All men who are called in what will be  
18 acceptable to him, namely; all who are called should comply  
19 with the invitation?

20 A That is correct, yes.

21 Q Would you say it would please God that all who are called  
22 accept the invitation?

23 A When we speak of the Gospel there, - after all, a good  
24 many are called, but few are chosen, and we must insist on

1 that.

2 Q Would you say that miracles are supernatural acts of  
3 God?

4 A Well, all acts of God are supernatural.

5 Q In other words, you wouldn't care to draw a line of  
6 demarkation between the supernatural and the natural?

7 A Oh yes, I would, definitely.

8 Q Where would you draw that line?

9 A Between God on the one hand and all his creation on the  
10 other.

11 Q But, you wouldn't want to draw a line between the super-  
12 natural and natural, in the words of God?

13 A Well, the events which come to pass in accordance with  
14 the ordinary laws of physics are, of course, properly called  
15 natural work and miracles do not occur, some of them at any  
16 rate, some of the miracles do not occur in accordance with  
17 the laws of physics.

18 Now, they are not supernatural in the sense that they  
19 take place outside the world. They differ from what we  
20 call ordinary natural phenomena in that they are inconsistent  
21 with the laws of physics and chemistry and whatever par-  
22 ticular background you have.

23 REVEREND KIEPER: That is all.

24 BY MR. ANDREWS:

1 Q Dr. Clark, you have said that man's knowledge is of a  
2 series of propositions, that is, discursively.

3 A Yes.

4 Q That God's knowledge is intuitive.

5 A Yes.

6 Q Do you mean by that, that God sees everything in all its  
7 infinite relation, all at one glance?

8 A Yes, that is awkward language but I don't know any better,  
9 if you don't press me too hard on it.

10 BY MR. MARSTON:

11 Q Dr. Clark, can we know all the propositions about the  
12 love of God?

13 A I think not, but I think that God can reveal any  
14 particular one of the propositions.

15 Q In some correspondence which I was privileged to have  
16 with you, we referred to 319, we have in this verse, the  
17 following thoughts:

18 "To know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge--"

19 I'd like to read a quotation of mine on the phrase:

20 "Love of Christ" - "which passeth knowledge", and I'd like  
21 to hear your reaction to it, please:

22 "The love of Christ transcends human capacity, but the  
23 relative knowledge of the same, opens up even higher, in  
24 higher degrees, the more the heart is filled with the Spirit

1 of Christ, and thereby is its strength and in loving, which  
 2 knowledge is not of the discursive kind but that which has  
 3 its basis in the consciousness of experience --  
 4 In other words, to know the love of Christ which passeth  
 5 understanding --  
 6 A Well, I don't follow Myers in everything he says, the  
 7 passage, it is quite possible that when Paul says:  
 8 "To know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge",  
 9 it is quite possible that he means to experience it rather  
 10 than to know, that is in the philosophical sense we have  
 11 been using it, that is one possibility, or, if he uses it  
 12 in the strict philosophical sense, the continuation of that  
 13 passage which goes along to say that, well, to be filled to  
 14 all the fullness of God, would indicate that Paul is speaking  
 15 of a progression in knowledge.  
 16 Q Dr. Clark, will you give us a statement on your view  
 17 of the incomprehensibility of God?  
 18 A By the incomprehensibility of God, I mean - that God  
 19 knows the -- he knows every propositions and that those pro-  
 20 positions are infinite in number and that we shall not  
 21 exhaust them when he reveals them to us, one at a time.  
 22 BY MR. WEIMERS:  
 23 Q You have said Dr. Clark, that our knowledge must neces-  
 24 sarily be confined to propositions. Would you say that God

1 apart from His Creation, let us say, in His knowledge of Him-  
 2 self, is also confined in his knowledge, the propositions  
 3 which of themselves are necessarily finite, according to your  
 4 own words?  
 5 A You are trying to get me to define intuition, or intuitive  
 6 knowledge. Now, Mr. Andrews made a certain description of  
 7 it which is satisfactory to me in ordinary conversations, but,  
 8 to make a definition, there is no possibility of mistaking  
 9 such a tremendous job, I am not prepared for that question  
 10 at all.  
 11 Q Do you believe that God's intuitive knowledge is the  
 12 same as our discursive knowledge?  
 13 A Well, I guess not, two times two is four, both for God  
 14 and for us, that is the expression of God's knowledge and  
 15 if we don't know the object that God knows, then we are in  
 16 absolute ignorance.  
 17 Q Would you mind repeating your statement or Mr. Andrews  
 18 statement, what it was?  
 19 MR. ANDREWS: As I recall it it was:  
 20 "God's knowledge is intuitive and He sees and knows every-  
 21 thing in all of its infinite relations at one glance."  
 22 BY MR. WEIMERS:  
 23 Q You have said I believe, that man is - his religious ac-  
 24 tion is an intellectual apprehension of God. Do you include

1 in that intellectual apprehension, what the Scripture refers  
2 to as loving God and obeying God?

3 A The intellectual apprehension is the result of a volun-  
4 tary act of paying attention. You can't know anything unless  
5 by an act of will, and yet, the knowing itself is an act of  
6 intellectual apprehension because of its volitional aspects.

7 Q I'm going to try to stay away from arguing and as much  
8 as possible stick to principle. Would you include in that  
9 intellectual apprehension of God, also what the scripture  
10 calls Love?

11 A I have always regarded love in the theological sense as  
12 a volitional act and not an emotional act.

13 Q In the Epistle of James, Faith is described in such terms  
14 that it is obviously confined to mere intellectual apprehen-  
15 sion apart from volitional activities.

16 A I am not sure of that

17 Q Does not James say, he believed God is one --

18 A How can you get away from the volitional belief - that  
19 is a volitional act on their part, that is the object of  
20 their faith, that is different, they simply believe one God  
21 and --

22 Q Was the faith of Christ then, different from the Devil's?

23 A We believe Christ died for us, they only believe there is  
24 one God.

1 Q James make the distinction further that we must have  
2 faith plus work, and he cites work as willingness of Abra-  
3 ham to offer up his son Isaac and I take it, Paul, in his  
4 Epistle, when he says we are justified by faith - he says  
5 that our faith I think he says is apart from the work, Paul  
6 means by faith exactly what James means by faith, plus work.

7 What I'm driving at is this question:

8 Is it your idea of man's highest religious action com-  
9 parable to Paul's definition of faith which includes so much  
10 more than what the Devil believes concerns God rather than  
11 being along the lines of James' definition of faith which  
12 considers apart from work?

13 A I don't think the distinction between Paul's and Jame's  
14 is anything like what you say it is. So, that part of the  
15 question is beside the point. I guess we can drop that out,  
16 will you ask your question over again?

17 Q Would you say that your idea of the highest religious  
18 act of man is comparable to the standard definition of stat-  
19 ing faith as including the confidence in, and leaning upon  
20 Christ, rather than being comparable to the definition of  
21 faith which might suffice for the faith which the devils have?

22 A Well, of course I would agree with that - no, I'm not  
23 sure that is what you are driving at, what you say is per-  
24 fectly true.

- 1 Q I think that satisfies me.  
 2 A The Confession says by this saving faith, faith is dif-  
 3 ferent in degrees - weak or strong, but gets the victory grow-  
 4 ing up, etc., if that is satisfactory.  
 5 BY MR. MARSDEN:  
 6 Q Dr. Clark, you said that two plus two is four. That  
 7 is a proposition and man knows that proposition exactly  
 8 the same as God knows it.  
 9 A No, I said the proposition is known, that is, a known  
 10 proposition is the same proposition, that is very different.  
 11 Q You do not mean then that man knows that proposition  
 12 in all of its relationship, the same as God?  
 13 A I'm not talking about the implication as a proposition.  
 14 I am talking about that one object, namely; two plus two  
 15 equals four. A child in first grade can even know that, but  
 16 the child in first grade doesn't see the implication of it  
 17 which the children in the fourth grade and in high school  
 18 see.  
 19 Q Do you believe that the answer to the first question  
 20 of the Catechism is that that was the chief end of man?  
 21 A That is a perfectly good answer.  
 22 Q The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him  
 23 forever?  
 24 A Yes.

- 1 Q What do you mean then by glorifying God?  
 2 A That takes in quite a lot of things. It takes in the  
 3 ordinary act of obedience on a purely common plain such as  
 4 "Thou Shalt Not Steal", it includes the worship of God,  
 5 private and public, it includes the study of the scripture,  
 6 prayer and in heaven it will also involve the contemplation  
 7 of God. I suppose you can see and say that we contemplate  
 8 God here in a way, although we are making little progress  
 9 in it, I guess.  
 10 THE MODERATOR: Any other questions?  
 11 BY MR. THOMPSON:  
 12 Q Dr. Clark, I presume you hold God has complete knowledge  
 13 of himself?  
 14 A Yes.  
 15 Q I am speaking apart entirely from any question as to  
 16 how such knowledge might be communicated, the manner:  
 17 Would you say that it would ever be possible, whether  
 18 in this life or the next life, for any of God's creatures to  
 19 know God in the same way that God knows himself?  
 20 A I thought you wouldn't be talking about the manner of  
 21 knowledge.  
 22 Q I want to get out of the picture for the moment, the  
 23 question of the proposition, the question of infinite or  
 24 finite and whether you think, in this life or the next, God's



1 creatures will ever have the same knowledge of God that he  
2 has of himself?

3 A I think right now we have items of knowledge exactly  
4 identical, two plus two, equals four.

5 Q I began my statement by saying God has complete know-  
6 ledge regarding himself --

7 A He knows all the propositions, every one of them.

8 Q Do you think it is possible for man, either in this  
9 life or the next life, to have complete knowledge regarding  
10 God?

11 A There is only one verse in the Scripture which seems  
12 to indicate and that is in First Corinthian's 13:12:

13 "Now we know in part, then we shall know even as we  
14 were known". That sounds as if we would have every proposi-  
15 tion, the contrast seems to be between special knowledge and  
16 complete knowledge, although the word: "Complete" is not  
17 there. But, it says: "We shall know, even as we were known".  
18 That is a puzzle to me. However, there is no other verse  
19 in scripture that would bear out the position that we shall  
20 know every proposition and hence, since it is impossible to  
21 base a doctrine on one verse when the exegesis of the verse  
22 itself is now clear even at that, it is impossible to make  
23 such an assertion and it is necessary to say that the Bible  
24 indicates that we shall continue forever to learn.

1 Q I believe you said earlier that God can reveal any pro-  
2 position concerning himself?

3 A That is right.

4 Q Is there any reason why God could not reveal every pro-  
5 position concerning himself?

6 A In a certain sense, we are temporal creatures, and that  
7 will never be exhausted.

8 Q Is it possible that God could make such revelations  
9 in the hereafter?

10 A That is like the proposition: "Can God make a stone,  
11 too heavy for him to lift". And, that involves a self con-  
12 tradiction and is meaningless.

13 Q You said awhile ago it seems to me that 2 times 2  
14 equals four, and that is true for God as was man, is that  
15 correct?

16 A That is right.

17 Q Now, I'd like to ask you this simple question:

18 How do you know it is true for God?

19 A By the definition of one and the definitions of two,  
20 three and four, and certain operation of arithmetic it is  
21 so and also by the strict laws of logic.

22 Q Where do we get those laws of logic?

23 A "Every man that cometh into the world".

24 Q Is it possible that by the effective sin, man will not

1 be able to deduce by the propositions concerning God?

2 A That is often the case.

3 MR. THOMPSON: That is all.

4 BY MR. CUMMING:

5 Q Pardon me for rising again, but one point is not clear  
6 to me:

7 Since you state it is possible that all truth in the  
8 mind of God is capable of being express in propositions, in-  
9 telligible to the minds of man, how do you reconcile this  
10 with your statement there is an apparent paradox in the Scrip-  
11 ures?

12 A Well, the two statements may seem paradoxical to one  
13 and not to another. Just as the early student in physics  
14 cannot understand why one bucket of water and if there is  
15 twice the amount of water in another bucket, there is no more  
16 pressure, at least that seems strange to the young student  
17 and not at all strange to a person who understands it.

18 Q Would you not say that there are propositions that have  
19 been revealed, for instance:

20 Referring to God making a free, public, sincere offer  
21 of salvation, would you not consider that to us is a seeming  
22 contradiction?

23 A If you say so, I must admit it.

24 Q How about in your own mind?

1 A It doesn't bother me at all, I don't see no contradict-  
2 ion, it just doesn't bother me.

3 Q In your mind, is there any paradox in the Scriptures?

4 A Yes, I have a bad one, the paradox of the Evolution of  
5 God and the Acts of Creation.

6 BY REVEREND RYAN:

7 Q Might I bring back a question - I think you answered  
8 me to the effect that according to revelation of the Scrip-  
9 ture, we were not in position to say all proof is capable  
10 of being expressed in propositions or that all truth is not  
11 capable of being expressed in propositions.

12 A I could not prove either of those statements from the  
13 expression of the statements in the scriptures.

14 Q In other words, you do admit that we cannot dogmatically  
15 say either one is true?

16 A That is right.

17 BY MR. STONEHOUSE:

18 Q You would say there are laws of logic which compel you  
19 to decide in favor of one proposition?

20 A I cannot imagine anyone would say that in truth, that  
21 is not a proposition.

22 Q I want to carry now a little forward, the discussion  
23 about the incomprehensability of God.

24 Just a little while ago, a question was raised as to

1 what might prevent on God's part, the revelation of all  
2 propositions in his knowledge and you say there are an infinite  
3 number of those propositions - of course, the propositions  
4 are infinite and therefore --

5 A Because we are temporal creatures, that is what makes  
6 the impossibility of revealing all propositions - not that  
7 by itself.

8 Q Would you also say the incomprehensibility of God pre-  
9 vents revelation of all propositions?

10 A Because of his incomprehensibility and the reason for  
11 knowing, - you can't say one thing is because of itself.

12 Q The incomprehensibility of God is an attribute of his  
13 being.

14 A What does it mean?

15 Q What does it mean?

16 A The meaning which I give to the word or phraseology -  
17 incomprehensibility of God is that in a sense, he sees all  
18 propositions and there are an infinite number of propositions  
19 and the infinite number cannot be indicated and known by us  
20 who are temporal creatures.

21 Q It is then his incomprehensibility which prevents him  
22 from disclosing all knowledge that he has to them.

23 A Yes.

24 Q What is your - shall I say in the introduction, in con-

Clark

38

1 nection with the term "Omnisciened", the subject of the manner  
2 of God's knowledge? I of course agree that subject is one  
3 of greatest importance when we consider the difference between  
4 God and man. God knows truth in a different way than man does  
5 know truth. But, why do you introduce that in connection  
6 with the subject of omniscience, and you won't -- why they are  
7 not restricted to the items of his knowledge.

8 A In the previous examination last March, I did restrict  
9 myself to the concept -- to the content or items of his know-  
10 ledge and that produced misunderstanding among a few people  
11 and I found out since there are some gentlemen in the room  
12 who don't think that it mentioned God knows everything and  
13 hence, in order to make it quite clear, I make the distinct-  
14 ion so that anyone can understand what I mean.

15 Q Would you say all the contents of God's knowledge is  
16 communicable to man?

17 A I would say any particular proposition is communicable.

18 Q But not all propositions?

19 A There is no all, I just said they were infinite and  
20 how can there be an all, if it is infinite.

21 Q I don't see there is a contradiction in that -- and  
22 a little humility and politeness would help too. In your  
23 argument on the premise of the intellect, you say the in-  
24 tellect is referring to that mode by which man comes in

1 possession of religion and volition is the condition or  
 2 act of striving to gain possession. In other words, the de-  
 3 sire and love is a means to an end and cannot be the end  
 4 itself.

5 Now, do you not very clearly reduce love whether emo-  
 6 tional or volitional, do you not clearly define love that  
 7 it can be thought of as the end in itself, love of God can  
 8 be a means to the end.

9 A I wasn't talking about things God does, I was talking  
 10 about man's active love of God.

11 Q But God is the object, is he not?

12 A That is right.

13 Q We are in agreement on that point.

14 A Yes.

15 Q You state in the first section that intellect is a  
 16 fact or mode of action by which man comes into possession or  
 17 of contact with religion and you say as to love, that means  
 18 to say it cannot be the end in itself. Love cannot.

19 A That is right.

20 Q Do you not therefore imply the love of God on man's  
 21 part, toward God is definitely subordinated to the intellect-  
 22 ual contemplation of God and that is a means to that end?

23 A That is exactly what that says, it also says that is  
 24 being argued on the assumption that intellect and volition

1 are different.

2 Q How much of that is contrary?

3 A All of it.

4 Q The whole article?

5 A It is directed against a very fixed position and I have  
 6 discussed what I believe to be the unacceptable conclusion  
 7 from the position from which I am talking from.

8 Q When you say obedience is far from nonsense, and the  
 9 respective rules of God and man are changed, how can this  
 10 be described as the Union of God and man, is that part of  
 11 your argument?

12 A Part of it.

13 Q Intellectual contemplation of God --

14 A I think the contemplation of God itself is in obedience  
 15 to his command. I think that is not the point. Of course,  
 16 in obedience and to his command might involve volitional  
 17 acts.

18 A That is right.

19 Q The point is whether intellectual contemplation of God  
 20 is regarded as the goal of let us say, the love of God or  
 21 obedience of God.

22 A That is right.

23 Q Does not that imply the love of God and obedience to  
 24 God may not be regarded probably to the end?

- 1 A Its a means to the end.  
 2 Q Would you defend such a position from Scripture?  
 3 A Well, this is Life Eternal, they should know, they, the  
 4 only True God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent".  
 5 Q You think the verb, "to know" in that particular passage  
 6 is the same as intellectual comprehension of God and the  
 7 contemplation of diety.  
 8 A Yes.  
 9 Q Don't you think the Scriptural verb, "to love" - de-  
 10 finitely includes the act to Love, to love God, the verb,  
 11 "to know" - involves the act of love toward God?  
 12 A Yes, sometimes, at any rate, not always, of course.  
 13 Q In other words, if you admit it is applied to a passage  
 14 like this, you could hardly appeal to that passage which  
 15 you take as to the position of the contemplation of God is  
 16 the goal which Love of God must have in view. What I am set-  
 17 ting over against, what seems to be your position, the  
 18 comprehension of God, the total responsibility of man's  
 19 personality must involve in the intellectual contemplation-  
 20 it must involve the same level not subordinate to it, the  
 21 Love in the Holy Scripture, contemplates the relation of God  
 22 and man, and that is put in jeopardy if you allow obedience  
 23 to God that that may be put in some secondary phrase subor-  
 24 dinate to the comprehension of God.

- 1 A There may be anti-scriptural forms of intellect, but  
 2 intellect is in itself not necessarily anti-scriptural.  
 3 Q Intellectual comprehension defined in this article is  
 4 subordinating love and obedience to the intellect or in-  
 5 tellectual contemplation of the Diety.  
 6 A I can't see how obedience is an end in itself, it is  
 7 always for a purpose. I think obedience is purposeful.  
 8 Q Then, you say intellectual contemplation of God is not  
 9 purposeful?  
 10 A That is the end.  
 11 Q At that point I do think there is a deep-seated differ-  
 12 ence between our conception, what the Scriptures set forth  
 13 as to God and man --  
 14 BY MR. ELLIOTT:  
 15 Q I'd like to ask concerning called work joined into the  
 16 Lord, is one Spirit, is that intellectual Union?  
 17 A I have no idea, I don't know what it is.  
 18 Q The context refers to the union, in a lustful union of  
 19 the flesh, compared to the Union which the believer has, with  
 20 the Holy Spirit.  
 21 A Without some study of the matter, I don't think I should  
 22 say anything on that particular passage.  
 23 BY MR. WELMERS:  
 24 Q Dr. Clark, what do you take to be the meaning when Christ

1 asked a young man, asked him, which was the greatest command,  
2 that is, "you shall love the Lord, God, etc".

3 A That means that command meant - summarizes all the Ten  
4 Commandments or at least the First Table.

5 Q Would that Commandment summarized, include your state-  
6 ment that an intellectual contemplation of God is man's  
7 highest end?

8 A I think that is included in the First Commandment of  
9 the Ten, "Thou shall have no other God or Gods before me".

10 Q Would you feel free to use the word: "Love", with re-  
11 gard to your own statement of man, of man's highest religious  
12 end, which you call "intellectual contemplation of God"?

13 A Somehow or other, intellect and volition sometimes merge,  
14 but I cannot give you a theory in one, two, three order, I  
15 cannot do that.

16 Q I'm trying to confine myself to Scripture, the whole  
17 idea of the Covenant is obedience. Christ said, shortly  
18 before in John's, 17, "This is my command that Ye love one  
19 another as I have loved you", and frequently, in the 15th  
20 Chapter of John, he refers to obedience, to doing his command  
21 and to love both for himself and for each other. Is that  
22 all a part, the essential part of the word in John's 17:  
23 "This is Life Eternal that they might know Thee".

24 A It seems to me that when God gives us a Commandment, the

1 purpose is not exhausted in simply going through the motions,  
2 but there is a further purpose and if he tells us to study  
3 the Scripture or example, it is not just to exercise our  
4 minds, but to learn what is there so that the knowing what  
5 the Scripture teaches is the end of obedient act of study  
6 and therefore, I don't want to make the final end just the  
7 act of obedience, but the purpose of that action, I don't  
8 think the purpose is all in itself.

9 Q Do you believe that Jesus meant, when he said:  
10 "Thou shall love the Lord, God, in order to know Him  
11 better", that that is what he meant?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Do you think Jesus ever said anything about the question  
14 whether he meant: "Thou shall love -- learn about God, in  
15 order to love him better"?

16 A He said - those are attributes.

17 Q That is not a paradox?

18 A No, not to me.

19 BY MR. ALLEN:

20 Q I want to know this:

21 I think you said it about 10 times, and I want to make  
22 sure that is what you meant, that every act of intellect-  
23 in every act of intellect, there is volition.

24 A That is right.

1 Q And love is included in intellect?

2 A That is right.

3 BY MR. KEIPER;

4 Q Just a few more questions, you said some time ago, Dr.  
5 Clark, that omniscion is incommunicable attribute of God.

6 A Yes.

7 Q It follows from that, does it not, that man's knowledge  
8 can never equal the knowledge of God.

9 A That is right.

10 Q Would you say holiness is a communicable attribute of  
11 God?

12 A No, no, in fact, I wouldn't say Holiness is an attribute  
13 at all, but Holiness is the fact that God is in a class by  
14 himself and he is in a class by himself because of the attri-  
15 butes, but that may at times become --

16 Q Would you say man's holiness will one day, equal the  
17 holiness of God?

18 A No.

19 Q God is infinite, you said that God is infinite and as  
20 to the question of man's mind being infinite, I think you  
21 said yes?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Would you say just for that reason, because God is  
24 infinite and man is finite, for that reason, man cannot com-

1prehend God?

2 A I don't think that is sufficient reason. We do not  
3 know God because -- that is, we do not know every attribute  
4 or proposition of God because we are temporal --

5 Q Would you call God an infinite item?

6 A Well, I object to the word, "item" but it is hard to  
7 use a word when you want to include God and other things at  
8 the same time. I was trying to include a word as empty of  
9 meaning as possible. "Object" -- if you wish, that would do.

10 Q Would you say that man would never comprehend God or  
11 would you say that man cannot comprehend God, or, would you  
12 say both?

13 A Oh, both - they seem to me to mean the same thing.

14 Q I asked previously a question - whether you could ex-  
15 plain or subscribe rather to this statement:

16 "God cannot fully reveal himself to his creatures" -  
17 because in that case, these creatures would themselves have  
18 to be God".

19 A Well, I would not have given that reason, that is such  
20 a peculiar way of putting it.

21 Q To me it is a paradox that God offers salvation free-  
22 ly and sincerely, I don't hesitate to use the word, to all  
23 who hear the Gospel, now He also said that to the reprobates,  
24 and those two teaches of Scripture, seem to me a paradox.

1 I think I heard you say for you, they were not a paradox.

2 A Yes.

3 Q Just what do you mean when you say that, can you re-  
4 concile those two teachings or do you believe those teachings  
5 or reject one or the other or hold to both?

6 A I gave an answer to that in my particular response be-  
7 fore, and I have proved to my own satisfaction that they are  
8 not contradictory and I have tried to indicate that they fit  
9 together and hence, that is no longer one of my problems.

10 Q I don't remember just what you said in that Article.  
11 I'm sorry, would you mind stating briefly what you did say?  
12 It might be helpful to me.

13 A I tried to base the responsibility on the Sovereignty  
14 of God so that instead of making responsibility and sovereignty  
15 anthesis, one shall be subordinate to the other and there  
16 seems to me that the paradox has disappeared.

17 Q Well, what bearing does that have on God's sincerity  
18 in making the offer?

19 A I thought that was part of the paradox, that God gives  
20 a command which some men cannot obey.

21 Q God, in all sincerity in inviting even the reprobates  
22 to Eternal Life and is pleased to have them accept the invi-  
23 tation. How can God, who already from eternity decided that  
24 certain men would be damned make such an offer, that is a

1 paradox to me.

2 A The solution to that paradox, is the distinction between  
3 the outward public call and the actual call of the Holy Spirit.  
4 The call of the spirit comes to God Elect only, I don't see  
5 a paradox there, it seems perfectly clear to me.

6 Q Even in the outward call, God is certainly sincere, He  
7 would be pleased to have all men accept.

8 A I don't think that all men should accept the call of the  
9 Gospel or the Sovereign pleasure of God.

10 Q In other words, you don't think he willed, from eternity  
11 at all that men should accept the Gospel, that is, that all  
12 men should accept the Gospel.

13 A That is correct.

14 Q How do you explain when he says:

15 "The wicked turn from evil in their way of life".

16 A I should suppose their pleasure would mean something  
17 from what it means where it occurred.

18 Q In other words, the reference is not to God's decree?

19 A It would not please God to effectually call every man.

20 Q You are not ready to say that the offer and invitation  
21 which God makes in the Gospel are sincere in the case of  
22 every individual.

23 A The word "sincere" is not a word in the Confession and  
24 it seems to me to be a peculiar word attached to a command.



- 1 Q Also an invitation and offer.  
 2 A I would quite agree with the statement in the Canon of  
 3 Dort, an unfamed command.  
 4 Q All who are called should comply with the invitation  
 5 that is acceptable to God, that all who hear the call should  
 6 comply. It is their moral obligation to comply with the  
 7 call of the Gospel, is that what you say?  
 8 A Yes, it is their moral obligation to comply with the  
 9 call of the Gospel.  
 10 Q Would you say acceptable here means - pleasing?  
 11 A Yes, you could.  
 12 Q You think it would please God that every single indivi-  
 13 dual believe?  
 14 A When you say - please God, it should be his reaction.  
 15 Q Please God, all who are called should comply with the  
 16 invitation.  
 17 A That is an expression of his preceptive will.  
 18 Q Its not only that, it is more than that, not only an  
 19 expression of his preceptive will, it is also an expression  
 20 what would please him, namely; men should obey his command?  
 21 A I know only two wills of God preceptive and descriptive  
 22 and certainly its not a matter of his decree -- his descriptive  
 23 will, obviously it is a matter of preceptive will.  
 24 Q It might be a matter of his emotions?

- 1 A God is without passion.  
 2 REVEREND HAMILTON: I move that Dr. Clark be sustained.  
 3 (Secoded from the floor).  
 4 THE MODERATOR: It has been moved and seconded, are  
 5 there any remarks? We are discussing the motion to sustain  
 6 the examination in Theology of Dr. Clark.  
 7 BY MR. THOMPSON:  
 8 Q One more question of Dr. Clark, please, to help round  
 9 out in my mind, so I can understand clearly what he holds.  
 10 I believe Dr. Clark said that God could reveal any  
 11 particular proposition concerning himself and my first ques-  
 12 tion is, Dr. Clark, is the propostion - God is just - is  
 13 that a proposition regarding God?  
 14 A Yes.  
 15 Q Do you believe that God can reveal that proposition  
 16 to his creatures?  
 17 A I believe he has done so.  
 18 Q Do you believe he has fully done so?  
 19 A Why, yes.  
 20 Q When you say that God -- or, would you say that God is  
 21 infinite in his justice?  
 22 A No, I would say he is perfect in his justice.  
 23 Q Would you say from the proposition - God is Just that  
 24 there might flow an infinite number of infinite things, is

1 that what you mean?  
 2 A Yes.  
 3 Q How could God reveal that proposition fully?  
 4 A Why couldn't he?  
 5 Q I'm asking you.  
 6 A Just by telling it to him.  
 7 Q I thought you said awhile ago that man could not receive  
 8 an infinite number of propositions.  
 9 A I am not talking about impressions, I am talking about  
 10 propositions.  
 11 Q I am talking about implications.  
 12 A I thought you asked whether he could reveal?  
 13 Q I asked whether God could completely reveal that pro-  
 14 position to man.  
 15 A Certainly, in three words: "God is just".  
 16 Q You think then, God reveals a proposition, then man has  
 17 a complete knowledge of what the justice of it is?  
 18 A Not knowledge of the implication, just the proposition.  
 19 Two plus two, equals four.  
 20 Q Either I don't make myself clear or you don't respond  
 21 to my question.  
 22 It seems to me the proposition - God is just is a very  
 23 profound statement and it is a statement which gathers within  
 24 itself, an infinite number of truths regarding a particular

1 attribute of God. How could God reveal all of those truths  
 2 regarding his justice to his creatures?  
 3 A I said they would never all be revealed.  
 4 Q You think however, God cannot reveal all propositions  
 5 but nevertheless, he has revealed the proposition concern-  
 6 ing himself when he tells man, he is just.  
 7 A That is right.  
 8 Q That is not however a complete revelation of that attri-  
 9 bute of God, is it?  
 10 A The implications aren't there but the proposition is  
 11 there.  
 12 Q You say that God cannot reveal an infinite number of pro-  
 13 positions concerning himself, is that correct ?  
 14 A We are temporal and we always be temporal and never will  
 15 have everything revealed by God because those two things go  
 16 in conjunction, one with the other.  
 17 BY MR. BETHOLD:  
 18 Q Is there any knowledge which God has by virtue of which  
 19 he has, that he cannot reveal to man and still be God?  
 20 A I think God can reveal to us any particular proposition  
 21 he wishes, or he chooses to.  
 22 Q Are there some propositions which God may not choose  
 23 to reveal, the revelation of which and in which, he would  
 24 thus deny himself?

1 A I don't know of any phrase in Scripture which says -  
2 there is a proposition that God will not reveal to us and  
3 certainly whatever proposition he reveals to us does not  
4 make us God, it simply increases our knowledge.

5 Q I wasn't talking about making us God, I am talking  
6 about reducing God from the very essence which he has, as  
7 God, I must confess I fail to attain satisfaction through  
8 that answer.

9 A It seems to me, if I understand the Scripture right,  
10 there is --

11 Q I believe the Scripture says or contains that there is  
12 an essential character to God's knowledge which he cannot  
13 reveal, there is a certain essence to God, which, as God  
14 he cannot reveal save as denotes himself

15 A God can reveal any proposition he chooses but that  
16 doesn't make our knowledge such as God. We may know the pro-  
17 position itself and that would be the proposition revealed  
18 to us but that does not make our knowledge so that we are  
19 of the character of God's knowing which we will never possess.

20 Q I don't mean the method of attaining knowledge, I mean -  
21 the very character that God has the content of knowledge, not  
22 the manner in which he perceives it in a different way than  
23 we do.

24 A Nothing that God reveals makes of himself, no longer God.

1 How a proposition reveal like two plus two equals four, or  
2 those justified by faith shall live, I don't see how the  
3 revelation makes God, not God.

4 Q Then you would limit the infinite theories of proposi-  
5 tions which God could reveal?

6 A No.

7 Q Then I believe you said God could not reveal anything  
8 which would deny himself?

9 A That is correct.

10 Q Doesn't that limit the infinite theories of propositions  
11 which God could reveal?

12 A No, sir.

13 DR. STRONG: I should like to go on public record that  
14 I am very satisfied indeed with the examination of Dr. Clark  
15 and I'd like to pay public tribute to the clearness and cool-  
16 ness and patience with which Dr. Clark has taken this examina-  
17 tion. And, I want to say I tremendously admire the grasp of  
18 this man's mind and I most earnestly desire an opportunity  
19 of voting on this question.

20 (There was a long discussion at this time, off the re-  
21 cord).

22 (A vote was taken at 5:20 p.m., to allow the official  
23 court stenographer to leave, which was passed, and the  
24 court stenographer left at 5:21 p.m.)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me during the hearing on the above cause and that this copy is a correct transcript of the same.

-----

Reported by:  
Nathan C. Shapiro, Esq.,

  
Official Court Reporter.