

[Along with Dr. Clark, this panel included Dr. Elmer B. Smick, Professor of Old Testament at Covenant Theological Seminary, Dr. Leon Morris, an Australian New Testament Scholar, and a "Dr. Benton," who, it seems likely, is presbyterian minister, Dr. Wilson Benton.]

Questions and Answers

A panel including Gordon H. Clark.

Moderator: Dr. Clark, should the federal and state governments of the U.S. include the ten commandments in their basic body of ordinances?

Moderator: This is in line with your Puritan ethics, I suppose.

Dr. Clark: If you make the franchise dependent on church membership, it results in great hypocrisy in the church. And it has proved deleterious in the case of the Puritans. Now, what was further in that question?

Moderator: Should we, should the federal and state governments of the U.S. include the ten commandments in their basic body of ordinances?

Dr. Clark: Well, yes I rather suppose so. And in fact it has been done perhaps not completely. But people who say that you cannot legislate morality and people who say they don't want Christian morality imposed on them, don't seem to object to laws against theft. Particularly if they're the victims. And the law against theft of course comes from the ten commandments. So those who make these objections are inconsistent. They don't follow the logic of their principles. I don't see how they could sustain any laws.

Moderator: Dr. Clark, situation ethics. Three questions. I'll read the three and if you can make one answer to the three, very good. And if you'd like to have me repeat one, I will. Dr. Clark, please respond to the idea of lying. To the idea of lying to a person who is not worthy of the truth. I have heard this concept given as justification for Rahab's lie protecting Joshua's spies. And then, Dr. Clark, what would your answer be to those who claim that Rahab's lying about the Israelites spies justifies situation ethics? In the light of the fact that James and the author of the Hebrews speak of her as one of the heroes of faith for that very act. And the third question. Evidently, ??? has been going around, evidently you know the story of her life. Were the TenBoom's engaged in situation ethics when in defiance of the government they hid refuge Jews.

Dr. Clark: Rahab, of course, is mentioned with commendation, but perhaps not commendation of her lie, but rather of her faith. It is a little, it is not surprising that a person brought up in her circumstances should have told lies on several occasions. I don't suppose the morals of that city

or the girl herself were most excellent. But you can understand the scriptures to commend her for her faith in the God of the Israelites, rather than in the fact that she told a lie. Now then, the other question had to do with some disobedience to government and I think this is a very easy question to answer. We are to obey all the enactments of government except those that contravene the moral laws of God, summarily comprehended in the ten commandments. And if a government commands us to do something evil, it is our obligation not to do it. And in that case probably suffer the penalty. I tried to show you that very frequently, using Fletcher's horrible story, that there are often possibilities that a person doesn't think of at first. And you think the way to handle the situation is this one way only, when there are other ways that might occur to us if we stopped and thought. Now does that cover those questions, or did I miss one?

Moderator: No, that covers the two about Rahab and the Scriptures justifying Rahab. And then again the modern application. I'd like to give the other three panelists opportunity to address themselves to this question of situation ethics. Do you have anything to say, now is the time because this subject will not come up in any other way as I recall from the questions. Dr. Beckham?

Dr. Beckham: We should just bear in mind that the Lord in his parables you know, used the parable of the unjust judge to, not to commend his ill justice, but to command other aspects of what he was doing. And I think this issue, keep that in mind because Rahab lied in the New Testament, I agree 100% with Dr. Clark. It makes a commendation of her, doesn't approve her lying anymore than it commends David as the great man of God's heart who happened to sin too very severely, but repented.

Dr. Morris: I am somebody somewhat interested in Hebrew, I would point out that Rahab is not commended there for lying. The faith was mentioned and the fact that she received the spies with peace. They are the things that are accounted. But I am no real expert in situational ethics. I have been very interested in hearing Dr. Clark and very illuminated. I think I would like to put in one little footnote, namely that we live in a fallen world. And in a fallen world we may sometimes be confronted with a situation where there doesn't appear to be any good course. We are confronted with the lesser of two evils. If we are, it seems to me to be confusing the issue altogether to call that lesser of two evils good which the situational ethics people do. It is still evil, it is part of the fallen world in which we live. And we ought to recognize evil for the evil thing it is no matter in what guise it comes.

Moderator: Now is there anyone who wishes to comment on comments made?

Dr. Clark: If you please. In the ETS meeting up in Trinity sometime ago two types of ethics were discussed, and the third one was absent. One was Geisler, the other Lutzer. They were both present. John Murray was absent. And Geisler held that the higher commandments would erase the necessities of obeying more. He had a hierarchical scheme. Lutzer held that sometimes you ought to do evil since there is no other possibility. But on this I rather agree with John Murray that if God is rational and has planned all details of the universe, then his commandments must

apply, some commandment must apply throughout all the problems of our lives. And he would not have put us in the situation of having to choose evil. It would be my hope, but we often miss it or misunderstand, or don't analyze the situation, but I would insist that theoretically there is no situation in which we must do evil. There will always be some way in which the commandments can be obeyed. Sometimes this might be deceit which is not exactly the same as telling a lie. You remember that Samuel was apprehensive of the wrath of Saul and he asked God what he should do. And he said just tell Saul that you're going to Bethel, was it, to offer sacrifice. Which was perfectly true, but it wasn't the whole truth. And in many situations, the person who asks the question has no business knowing the truth. Has no business asking you the question. So in one way or another you don't answer it. One of the situations in World War Two that has been bandied around is the question of a Nazi trooper coming to the door of a house and knocking on it asking the person if there are any Jews hidden in the house. Well, a person flustered might say yes or no, but if you can maintain your presence of mind, you might answer the Nazi trooper, "Well if I told you, you wouldn't believe me anyhow." And let it go at that. What the consequences would be are not your responsibility.

Moderator: I hope the Nazi trooper would be satisfied with that. Would have been satisfied. Dr. Clark, I have another question for you. And this moves on to another area of your lecturing material. Dr. Clark, does God have feelings?

Dr. Clark: The Westminster Confession says that God has neither body, parts, nor passions. I suppose the word feeling is a contemporary word for passions and the answer of the confession is no God has no feelings, emotions, or passions.

Moderator: I have another one that speaks of God is love. Is the emotive or emotional aspect of man not also a part of the image of God in view of the fact that God is love and we're commanded to love one another?

Dr. Clark: Love is defined in the 13th or 14th chapter of Romans. Love is defined as obedience to the commands of God. You may say God is love and his love is defined as giving his Son as a ransom for the elect. In the history of theology, love traditionally has never been considered an emotion. There is something that is called love, particularly in these days that is quite emotional, but in theology love has traditionally been considered a volition and not an emotion. That's a partial answer.

Moderator: Dr. Smick?

Dr. Smick: Well, I would address myself to this question perhaps in this way that if we are speaking of God's essential nature, and I think that's what our confession is talking about, that God does not have passions, then that is true. But on the other hand, God in his wonderful mercy and goodness has seen fit to reveal himself in the person of Jesus Christ. And there is a sense, and this is the glory of the incarnation really, which no other religion in the world even approximates. That God as revealed in Jesus Christ does indeed have feelings and there is a

sense in which we may, you know, we say that God in Christ, Christ is God, so if you would define it in that sense you may say yes, the God does have feelings. If you are saying it is in terms of the incarnation, but after all we can only know the essential nature of God by analogy and this comes to us so wonderfully and so powerfully in the person of our Lord. We can know what God is like in the, in Christ, in a way that we can't possibly know otherwise.

Moderator: Dr. Morris?

Dr. Morris: I wonder if we could ask Dr. Clark to address himself specifically to bit in the question which drew attention to man being made in the image of God and man as having emotions. If he commented on that I didn't hear it. I'd like to hear his comment on that.

Moderator: Does God have feelings and is the emotional aspect of man not also a part of the image of God?

Dr. Clark: On one occasion I asked a professor of psychology to give me some competent books on emotions. He gave 4 volumes, each one 3-4-500 pages. Each one written by a professor of psychology in some American university. I read all four of those books. Not one of them ever said what an emotion was. Until you define emotion the discussion cannot continue.

[Audience laughter]

Moderator: Dr. Clark, what have you understood those people who do speak of emotions as referring to.

Dr. Clark: Well, they didn't tell me.

[Audience laughter]

Dr. Clark: I should offer perhaps not a complete definition, but at least an element of the definition. An emotion seems to me to be a sudden upheaval, disturbance in our ordinary calm state of mind. And I don't see that this is part of the image of God, I think this is part of original sin.

Moderator: Dr. Morris?

Dr. Morris: I would certainly agree with that. It seems to me that the nub of the question is the definition of emotion which is why I started by throwing the ball back to Dr. Clark, I want to hear him on that. If we are thinking of emotion in the sense of some passion that overmasters us and takes us out of what we are in ourselves, then God is surely without emotions. And God's love doesn't mean that at all. On the other hand, to say that God is without body, parts, or passions, which in case you didn't know is part of the Anglican formularies as well as part of the Westminster Confession, means that God is not thrown off his balance by anything outside of

him. It means more than that, but it means that. It means that nothing that puny man can do, for instance, can cause God to deviate from his calmness. But it doesn't mean that God doesn't care. The Scripture is full of the idea that God does care. That caring is shown in his love. It is also shown in his wrath. And the wrath of God runs through and through Scripture. So in the sense that God is, dare I say it, passionately concerned with our well-being, then I would say that God does show emotion. But it's a question of the definition. We must not take up such a position that we can feel God can be wobbling from one state of mind to another one as we so easily are. That's not that. But we must hold that, I think, in line with the Scriptural position that God does care very much whether we do good or ill, and he cares for us, for our well-being, and the upshot of his caring we see on the cross.

Audience: Would you permit a follow up question?

Moderator: I'd like to have the panel finish first, and then I'll... because this is the only aspect we have directly on emotion. A lot more on the image of God in man. So, but, first the panel. Any more on this?

Dr. Clark: I wouldn't wish to be convicted of placing words in the mouth of Dr. Morris, but his last remarks sound to me to say that he has asserted that God's will is immutable. An immutable volition which he calls concern. I could agree with that.

Dr. Morris: Ok then let's not argue.

[Audience Laughter]

Moderator: Dr. Strong has asked for permission to place a follow up question. Would you arise and state your question please?

Dr. Strong: ??? emotion ??? What interpretation do you place on indignation, grief, sorrow in the Lord Jesus. That we would not associate most obviously with corruption. Let us have a response please to these questions.

Dr. Clark: The second person of the Trinity was incarnate for the purpose of living the life of a human being. This included our ordinary faculties. It included pain. I don't know that Jesus was ever sick, but he got tired and hungry. And although this is not a sin, I would suspect that being tired and hungry and having pain is nonetheless the sin of our first parents. And so Jesus experienced those penalties during his human life just as we do. This is a matter of his human nature, not his divine nature.

Moderator: Dr. Smick?

Dr. Smick: I don't have any... The Lord God got angry we must remember too. Of course, but I think that fits with what has already been said.

Moderator: I will entertain one more question if... cause I know there has been some debate and discussion on this. If not we will move on to the next question. And that is this: If the image of God is rationality, is Jesus Christ the perfect and full image, the perfect rationality?

Dr. Clark: Oh yes indeed. In him dwelleth the all the fullness of the godhead bodily. He is the logos of God. He is the wisdom of God. The wisdom and the power of God.

Moderator: The next question I have is: could you define more fully just what you mean by rationality?

Dr. Clark: Yes.

[Audience Laughter]

Dr. Clark: I suppose the easiest way is to give a little example, but I could put it in abstract terms if you wanted. But rationality consists in arguing according to the laws of logic. If you say, to use a 2000 year old example, if you say all men are mortal and Socrates is a man, therefore Socrates is mortal, you are acting rationally. You are thinking rationally. But if you say all men are mortal and Socrates is a man therefore Socrates will never die, you are irrational. So rationality consists in thinking, arguing according to the rules of logic.

Moderator: Dr. Benton? About the image of God is rationality, is Jesus Christ perfect rationality? Any comment?

Dr. Benton: Dr. Clark said he was.

[Audience Laughter]

Dr. Benton: I'm not going to argue with him.

Moderator: You never argue with him?

Dr. Benton: No sir.

Moderator: No comment?

Dr. Benton: No comment.

Moderator: Dr. Smick?

Dr. Clark: No comment? That is a comment.

Dr. Morris: Not this time.

Moderator: There are more questions in this area, probing this same subject. Does man bear the image of God, or is man the image of God?

Dr. Clark: I think it is better to say man is the image and glory of God. You'll find that in 1st Corinthians something or other.

Dr. Morris. Eleven, chapter eleven.

Moderator: Dr. Morris?

Dr. Morris: No, I'm happy with that. It is what 1st Corinthians 11 says.

Moderator: Dr. Clark, are those who, due to brain damage do not make decisions moral or otherwise, show inventiveness or have a knowledge of history, still the image of God?

Dr. Clark: The image of God, as I think everyone here would agree, has been defaced. We talk about total depravity and sin affects all of our functions. It is also obvious that sin affects some people more than others. There are degrees of heinousness in sin. The effects of sin are clearer in some people than others. And these would be examples of degrees of these effects. The image is not destroyed, but it is damaged in various ways. Some in one way, some in another, some in greater degree.

Moderator: Panel, any comments?

Moderator: If rationality... the next question Dr. Clark, is God's image. If rationality is God's image, no. That doesn't quite read right. If rationality is God's image, or is rationality that which is unique as evidenced by animals, the image.

Dr. Clark: In my lecture I tried to show that animals were not rational. They can't do geometry, nor do they have any such thing as narrative. These I think are two essential parts of rationality. And the animals do not have it. They are not rational beings. They can't learn Aristotelian syllogisms.

Moderator: I guess the point of the question is, do you really limit this aspect as the only distinguishing feature between animals and man?

Dr. Clark: I think it is the root, well of course there are physical distinctions. I don't suppose that's in contest. Now, but yes, the rational principle of man would be the basis of what other distinctions you might think of. At least I don't know of any exception to that at the moment.

Moderator: Comments from the panel please. Dr. Morris?

Dr. Morris: No expert on animals.

Moderator: No expert on animals. On the image of God, another question Dr. Clark. And as soon as we finish this subject we're going to stand up for a few moments. Dr. Clark, is man more purely or clearly seen as the image of God in the intermediate state than in his created or resurrected body.

Dr. Clark: Well, I would think that man's essential nature is more clearly seen in the intermediate state than it is now. Because it seems from Christ's words to the thief on the cross that the thief was to be divested of the effects of sin and be united with Christ by the end of that day. Now as for the resurrection body, you have the account of it in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. You have the analogy of the grain of wheat being rather small and the stalk of wheat which is somewhat of a plant. And we have the impression that our resurrection bodies are going to be more glorious than our present bodies. Unfortunately the description in the fifteenth chapter is not too lengthy or detailed. It leaves us in considerable ignorance. But I should suppose that, although the intermediate state is a clearer example of man's rationality than the, than our present state, that at least we will have some tools, a body of some sort, to work with that might express our rationality more clearly. But in any case, rationality per se is this logical criterion and that would not change in any of these three states.

30:25

Moderator: I have another question that is very closely related to this. And the point of this question then basically is this. You would say then that the body is in no way related to the image of God.

Dr. Clark: Well, "in no way," that is entirely too general. I would say, and this is a rough analogy, I would say it is related the way a jammer is related to a carpenter.

Moderator: I'm afraid I'd come out on the loose, on the short end of the stick.

Dr. Smick: I would say that we ought to bear in mind that, according to the Bible, God created man to have a body. And apparently that was God's ultimate purpose for man, not that man should be a disembodied spirit, but that he should have a body. And so that the resurrection is a very important phase. I mean, we just don't become disembodied spirits, but we receive eternal bodies to be united to our spirit and we are not the total being that God originally purposed until that is so. I would say the, there are aspects of the body of man that do reflect the image of God. The very fact that our bodies function so that we can see. One of the great glories that I think distinguishes us from animals too, has to do with our bodies. You know, even if a monkey could be taught to some small thing, I mean to speak shall we say, the monkey wouldn't be able to do it because he doesn't have the voice box to do it. I mean if theoretically he could do it, which he cannot, I think I agree with Dr. Clark, that he cannot truly reason. But even if he could, he doesn't have the voice box to do it. He doesn't have the body to do it, and this body which God has given us by which we can make words and articulate, we must remember that that

articulation was done before writing. That is one of the great distinguishing features of man, his ability to speak and use words.

Moderator: Anyone else, Dr. Morris?, Dr. Benton?

Dr. Benton / Dr. Morris ?: Carry on, no sir.

Moderator: One last word, Dr. Clark? For this is the last on the image of God and God's rationality. And I mean the rationality aspect. All has been said?

Dr. Clark: I thought you said you were going to give one more question.

Moderator: No, I gave this last question here. That was about the ...

Dr. Clark: Oh, if you want me to make a comment on Dr. Smick, I would agree with his description of some physical parts or so on, but the previous question had to do with the relation between the physical parts and the image of God. And I would regard the relationship as being a tool, rather than an essential part of reason.

???: Can I ask a question?

Moderator: Yes, you may ask a question.

???: We have determined, I believe, that man is the image of God. And I'm wondering if man is body or soul or whether man is body and soul. And if man is made in the image of God and man is body and soul, how can the image be in one part and not the other part?

Moderator: You're asking this of Dr. Clark?

???: I'm asking it of anybody.

Moderator: Alright, Dr. Clark first.

Dr. Clark: The account in Genesis says that God formed the body of Adam out of the dust of the ground, then he breathed into his nostrils the breath or spirit of life, and that combination was called a living soul. Since the clay of the earth is not the image of God, and since there is only one other element that goes into the makeup of man, it's that other element that is the image of God, namely God's breath. So that man is his spirit.

Moderator: Comment?

Dr. Morris: With all respect to Dr. Clark, I don't find that particularly satisfying.

Dr. Clark: Animals have bodies and they were not created in the image of God. So how could the body be the image of God.

???: But the animal was also called the *nephesh hayah*, a living soul.

Dr. Clark: Of course, and animals also had spirits, but not rational spirits. The word *ruach* and *nepesh*, I'm good at Hebrew.

[Audience Laughter]

Dr. Clark: The words *nephesh* and *ruach* are used as of animals just as of men. That doesn't bear on the question of the image of God.

Moderator: Dr. Morris?

Dr. Morris: Still not very happy with it.

[Audience laughter]

Dr. Morris: That probably just points to my dumbness and not to the ??? But I think that Dr. Benton has put his finger on something of great importance, but I doubt that we could argue it out in the time at our disposal here. But, the body is spoken of in Scripture as an integral part of man so much so that as Dr. Smick has pointed out the resurrection is an important part of Scriptural teaching. Bodily values don't cease because we die. We are not continuing simply as rational spirits, but there is a spiritual body. Now, I am not here talking very much in my own field and I speak with great reverence and respect in the presence of Dr. Clark as this is his field, and he knows about it, and I don't. That's why I'm saying very little more than that I'm not terribly happy with the way it's... what's wrong with it, I don't know.

[Audience laughter]

Moderator: Two questions: the first is, in the light of recent archaeological discoveries, how do you evaluate Ussher's chronology?

Dr. Smick Well, I think we must face up to the fact that the purpose of genealogies in the Bible was not to give us the age of the world. That was not the purpose of the genealogies, and Ussher's chronology simply adds up all the ages one after another and goes back to a date at the end of the 4th millennium, which is impossible really from my perspective because we know too much. I mean writing had already begun by that time, and was well on the way. So I couldn't accept that. As far as dating, early dating generally goes, I am not a geologist. I don't propose to be competent in that field or paleontologist either, but I would say we have to allow, from the archaeological point of view, I think we have to allow enough time. I don't know when creation was. Students want to know that, they want to know when the flood was, and I simply say I don't

know. The genealogies were for the purpose of tracing the line of messiah, and the genealogies had gaps. If you don't believe that, just go to the New Testament and see the fourteen generation genealogies that are there and they are purposely set up that way with gaps for the purpose of being able to remember them. The genealogies in Genesis certainly have a, have to have such gaps too. I hesitate to try to date anything though, because I simply do not know enough to date, to give those dates.

Moderator: Any others wanting to comment on this? The next question we have for you, Dr. Smick, is would you comment on the Mt. Ararat expeditions?

Dr. Smick: Yes, I have little or no confidence in it. I hate to say that. I would be delighted if Noah's ark could be found, but unfortunately, I've told one or two of you who have asked me about this already that the, what you read about this is, brings forth the flimsiest evidence imaginable and builds a, tries to build so much on it, the books usually tell you about the travels, the travelogue and interesting incidents that happened while they were going up on the top of this mountain. We should bear in mind the text from the Biblical world, for example the Assyrian annals, mention the land of Urartu, that's the Biblical Ararat. And the land of Urartu, there was an ancient people who lived there and they were a military, a warlike people that the Assyrians had great troubles with and they lived in roamed those Ararat mountains. The fact that one such peak is called Mt. Ararat today doesn't mean that that's the one that the ark landed on. I think that if competent archaeologists were doing the work, I'd have more confidence in it. But men who really are not archaeologists at all write these books and do this work and they don't have any evidence to speak of except for the piece of charred wood that could have come from any people at any time.

Moderator: Any other comment? Thank you Dr. Smick.

Dr. Smick: Yes, I'm sorry I have to run, but I'm afraid I'll miss my plane and I'll have big troubles.

Moderator. Very good, and let me bid you goodbye and be happy... we're so thankful you were here.

Moderator: Dr. Benton, since we as Christians bear the burden of repentance for our country, should we as Christians do that then individually or should we do that as organized churches slash denominations, or as confessing Christians united and active in the body politic?

Dr. Smick: I don't think it's an *either or*, I think it's a *both and* answer to be given there. It's as we do it individually that we began, but as we join together in acts of repentance that it becomes a corporate sort of thing. And I think the scriptural basis for calling on people collectively to repent of sins that are common in a group. And this of course is where we start with those who understand these things. The Christian community which is the church in any given community. So I would say, yes it is individual and yes it's corporate. Those who understand what true repentance involves.

Moderator: Any other comment?

Dr. Morris: Sounds right to me. You've got to start with yourself but in no way should you stop there.

Moderator: In this connection, but moving on to another aspect of it, Dr. Clark, if Christianity must oppose humanistic socialism as a false religion are we therefore justified in embracing the modern premises of capitalism as many evangelical Christians have? Does not capitalism too have anti-Biblical premises in its modern manifestations, thus suggesting that Christians should occupy a third position rather than baptizing any modern day particular structure?

Dr. Clark: Well, I would want to know what that third position is. I think that you have to choose between limited government and totalitarianism. And I don't know what a third position would be. Of course, we are all sinners. But to say that capitalism has some sinners somewhere around isn't to show that socialism has no sinners anywhere around. You'd have just as much sin under socialism and more oppression, bureaucracy than you do under capitalism. And the question really is, should the government set prices for political reasons under the pressure of groups or should the prices of commodities be set in a free market. And I think a free market is by far the best way of handling the economy. And I don't see any contradiction or antithesis between capitalism and Christianity. It was John Calvin who insisted on the right of charging interest on loans, and I take it that John Calvin was the originator of modern capitalism. Good Calvinistic doctrine.

Moderator: Dr. Benton? This is somewhere in your area. So no further comments, Dr. Morris?

Dr. Morris: I don't think that Christianity is shut up to capitalism, or that matter socialism. I think Christianity existed before capitalism did. And if some further form of organizing man was found that wasn't capitalistic, I don't think that Christianity would die out. I am no economic expert and I don't know much about the various systems that there are, but I would certainly not say that Christianity is wedded to any one particular social system or economic system. That's all the comment I could make on that one.

Dr. Clark: Well it seems to me that although Christianity can exist and has existed through totalitarian regimes, and in that sense is not dependent for its existence on capitalism. Nevertheless, I believe that Christianity has certain economic implications and that an elementary form of capitalism was found in ancient Israel. They had a hard money system. They insisted on correct weights and measures. I don't know that the devaluation of the shekel was a particularly Hebrew..., it wasn't a commandment of God and so on. So, I think sound monetary policy is an implication of Christian principles of honesty. That there are sins and crimes committed by capitalists of course is quite true, but look at the corrupt bureaucracies of the world.

Moderator: A subject that has raised quite a few questions, the matter of time and eternity. And the first question I have to ask in regard to time is this. Dr. Clark, how old are you now really?

[Audience Laughter]

Moderator: The next question. The next question is, please give a simple answer to this. Is our eternal God involved within time?

Dr. Clark: Yes.

[Audience Laughter]

Moderator: All right. The next question is, how does the God-man experience time as opposed to mortal man? And also, does the Son experience time differently from the Father? And let me ask the next question, would you comment on Dr. Buswell's denial of the eternity of God, especially his assertion that time and space are in God.

Dr. Clark: Now, let me see if I can remember all that.

Moderator: There is an introduction here which tells us how thankful they are for your lectures and have really appreciated what you have said. Its in regarding to your first two lectures which I would present my question. Am I correct that you start with the presupposition that God is timeless and spaceless? At least in his essences. Now there's another question, let me hand you these three.

Dr. Clark: Now, there's the one on top at any rate. How does the God-man experience time as opposed to mortal man? This is answered of course by the doctrine of the incarnation. The second person of the Trinity is full deity. He is auto-theos, he is God in himself. And, as God, he could not have any human experiences. So in order to die he had to become man, and became man with a true body and a reasonable soul. He was rational, you see. But he was a man. And as a man his thoughts came and went. So that he had this temporal experience. Insofar as he was God, he did not have this temporal experience, he remained omniscient. During the years of his incarnation he still exercised all his divine attributes. And he was immutable and omnipotent. The world depended on him during those 30 years as much as it had depended on him for the previous part of its history. So that the doctrine of the incarnation, indicates that Christ had these experiences, not as opposed to mortal man, but the same kind of experiences. And I'm taking Augustine's view of time as the coming and going of ideas in the mind. Now the second part of this question I guess I've already answered, does the Son experience time differently from the way that Father. Well in his human nature yes, in his divine nature no. The difficulty with the question seems to me to be that it does keep in mind the two natures of Christ, the Creed of Chalcedon which would dispose of those objections. Now then, this is another question, is our eternal God involved within time. The simple answer was yes. But perhaps it must be indicated how the eternal God is involved within time. Well, he controls all his creatures

and all their actions, and these actions are not only physical actions but mental actions. So that God is the cause of the succession of ideas in our mind, and succession is time, so God is involved in time in that. But he is not involved in time in the sense that he thinks of one thing and one time and then forgets it and gets a new idea at another time. This is inconsistent with omniscience and that is the way that I answer that question.

Moderator: But no, well let me ask this question then again. Am I correct that you start with the presupposition that God is timeless and spaceless at least in his essences.

Dr. Clark: No, I don't start with that. As I said in the lecture, my fundamental proposition is the inerrancy of Scripture. The Westminster Confession and the authors of it had to face a question whether they should put the Scriptures in the first chapter and God in the second chapter, or whether, as in other creeds, God would be in the first chapter and the Scriptures would be somewhere down the line. They deliberately chose to put the Scriptures first and the doctrine of second, because it is in Scripture that a person learns what God is. And unless you have the revelation to begin with, you don't have the knowledge which is required for the writing of a creed. This question was, would you comment on Dr. Buswell's denial of eternity of God, especially his assertion that time and space are in God? Well, God of course knows that we think of things and forget them and so on. The answer to that question is the same as the answer to the previous ones.

Moderator: Do you have any comment Dr. Benton?

Dr. Benton: No sir.

Moderator: Dr. Morris?

Dr. Morris: No, except that I would certainly agree with Dr. Clark and I would like to underline that one, that the incarnation has to be taken as real. That when Christ became a man he didn't play at it, he really became a man and so he knows time as we know it. He entered our frame, but it just doesn't have any, it just doesn't involve any modification on his eternal function, the incarnation was something that was added to the functions of the second person of the Trinity, rather than substituted for the functions.

Moderator: I see that I'm going to have to start over omitting certain questions here. We're just not going to get to all of them, but there's a few here that we should touch on. Here's a question that I think we should address to Dr. Clark along with possibly a few others. Dr. Clark, how do you account for the fact that classical Reformed orthodoxy, Calvin, Turretin, Westminster Divines, Edwards, Hodge, Warfield, etc., with the exception of the more recent Dutch tradition, Kuyper, Bavinck, present day Free University, Van Til, Toronto School, so grievously erred, that in quotes, in opposing Judaism as exhibited in presuppositionalism? What in principle is the difference between criticizing the husk kernel slash form content distinctions as objective which

you do, and criticizing presuppositionalism for asserting subjectively a triune God who reveals himself in Scripture, which you will not do? (Would you pass this on to him?)

Dr. Morris: Gladly.

[Audience Laughter]

Dr. Clark: Well, what this question says I will not do, possibly I will do. At any rate, I think the answer is this. I'll repeat a part of the lecture I gave. Every system of philosophy, whether it's Platonism, Aristotelianism of antiquity, or logical positivism in this century. Every system of philosophy must have a first principle. Since it is first, it cannot have been deduced from anything prior. And in this sense, logical positivism or Aristotelianism is just as fideistic as I am. It means that a person accepts certain axioms from which he deduces conclusions. And I accept the truth of the Scriptures as my axiom and deduce conclusions from that. And you can all that fideism, which some people think is a nasty term. It simply means you have faith. The logical positivists place their faith in sensation. And you cannot, and I wish to make this clear, and you cannot guarantee the accuracy of observations by observation. If you wish to demonstrate the reliability of observation, you'd have to have something prior to observation. But there is never anything prior to your first principle. Now I think that takes care of it.

Moderator: ...Denominations that use Scripture to develop their doctrinal stance. How do you account for their different doctrinal interpretations? Is it a matter of subjective preference? If so, how does arriving at right doctrine from an orthodox standpoint differ from arriving at doctrine from experience?

[tape ends]