really is, but simply as He wills that we should think of Him. CH. p 354 "which tell us not what God is in Himself, but how He wills that we should think of Him (Mansel)" Mansel says we compelled to affirm by way of faith and duty what we must not think of Him in terms of kn. We cannot know things perse, but we know only phenom. We do not know God as He is in Himself. Ritschl constructed his theology on this premise. The postulates of faith are not theoretical judgments or existence judgments, but simply judgments of value. If we use the word "kn" in this connection, kn comes to us by way of value judgment.

a) Analysis of this point of view.

① In Ref. theology, we come across positions which are rather similar to the phil. position. Jn. Calvin: Inst. I:10:2 Ex. 34 [6,7] Not of what He is in Himself, but what he is to us. "non quis sit apud se, sed qualis erga nos." It is quite apparent that Calvin here is inveighing against curious abstract speculation in re. the Divine essence.

② It is not certain that Calvin means what this statement appears to mean in the Eng. Inst. III 2:6 "For it is not of so much importance to us to know what He is in Himself, as what He is willing to be to us." (quis in se sit). It is not our most important concern to know God in se, but it is to know how He is related to us. It doesn't follow that we do not know God as He truly and really is.

③ There may be an important distinction in Calvin between in se & apud se. The latter might mean we do not know God as he is known to Himself, which is undoubtedly true. God knows Himself immediately. We only know God as He is pleased to relate Himself ~~immediately~~ ~~we know God~~ only to us in rev. Hence it should not be too readily assumed that this formula of Calvin was intended to deny that we know God as He is in Himself but intended to underline what is a canon of Christian faith, that we do not know God as He is pleased to reveal Himself to us. We must refrain from all attempts to know God by abstract speculation ~~to know~~