

5

~~Sub~~ al or mystical contemplation irrespective of the date of rev. This is the primary emphasis of Calvin here.

④ There may nevertheless be in Calvin's formula something which is not really in accord with Ref. position (theology).

b. Evaluation of this pt. of view.

① If by this we mean our dependence upon rev. then the proposition is true.

② If we mean we do not know God as he knows himself immediately as to mode and exhaustively as to content, it is true.

③ If we mean by this that we do not know God as he really and truly is, in Himself, inherently, essentially, & necessarily, then the proposition is devastating to the interests of both faith & love.

④ The statements of Ref. theologians have not always been properly guarded against these misconceptions. It is true that we can know God only through the phenom. of rev. But we must not fall into error of thinking that all we know is phenom. It is God Himself whom we know. If we know Him at all we know Him as He really & truly is. While we insist upon rev. as the only ground of love, we must not think the object of knowledge is simply rev. Our love is not an inference we draw on rev'd data, but God Himself confronts us thru the rev. & rev. is the medium of that confrontation. In 17<sup>3</sup> "αὐτὸς δὲ ἑστὶν ἡ ἀκίνητος ἰσχύς, ἕνα πρῶτον κωσὺν οὐ τὸν μόνον ἀδελφόν θεόν."

⑤ Cf. I Jn. 5:20. In Jn. ἀδελφός is not contrasted with θεός, but with that which is partial, ultimate, abiding reality.

⑥ Jn. 1<sup>14</sup> "And we beheld His glory as of His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace & truth."

⑦ ~~Who~~ "who being the effulgence of His glory and of the only the express image of His person." He expresses here this truth, cf. Jn 14; Jn 1<sup>18</sup>. Such passages in Jn. must be compared with:

⑧ Matt. 11<sup>25-30</sup> "... neither knoweth any man the father, save the son, and he to whomsoever the son will reveal him." There is a sharp distinction between