

The Complaint uses Kno in the sense of information.

p. 4. col 3 "man is dependent upon the divine revelation for Kno of God."

p. 4 col 3. "Only the Son has a Kno of the Father ...
Fathers Kno of the Son ...
~~an~~ exhaustive Kno."

| obviously not exhaustive mental
activity - but exhaustive information

p. 2. col 3 "he has given a Kno of himself through his
works words."

p. 3 col 1. "the Kno. which God possesses of himself"

" that human Kno is a Kno communicated
by God."

" man may possess true Kno "

cf. bottom of page 35 of 1947 4 D Report

* N.B.: Complaint p. 5 col. 1. if they refer to distinction of
"contents" as possibly quantitative - they must be
referring to information.

p. 5 col 2. "human Kno. has this propositional character"
evidently Kno = information.

" Kno is a matter of prop."

" item of Kno."

Complaint 5, 3. § 2. ~~to~~ Know = information.

five times in one §

|| We grant the Compl also intends Knowing
But it includes information.
+ "any single point" emphasizes this inclusion.

Note also 4 D Report p. 39 = the Son's Know of the Father
this cannot mean the Son's mental activity of the Father
it must mean - the Son's information of the Father
+ ∴ it may be called comprehensive
mental activity is not properly called comprehensive.

The distinct meanings of the word Kuo. were made clear
in The Answer p. 20

N.B. Funk & Wagnalls, Standard Dict. 1941

" Knowledge : ① A result or product
of knowing; that which is known.
Specifically: any ~~truth~~ fact or truth or
the aggregate of facts, truths, and
principles known, acquired, or
retained by the mind; information
... "

Complaint p.5 col 1

"there is a qualitative distinction between
of S. Kuo's & S. Kuo's force / man."

p.5 c.2 has may not safely include S's Kuo
is proportional in character. [not exact note]

5/2 "a proper word have / have same mean x
p.5. as for man." q. p.7 c.3.

QUALITY

and to which the word is applied to mean an ad

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

below which is the evidence of evidence in evidence and in evidence

Complaint p. 7 col 3

"I don't have / same / what, /
mean / same, / to / a man."
P. 4 repudiate; also repudiated
on p. 5 col 2

p. 5 col 3 "we dare not maintain it
as / his / our / coincide at
any angle point
our / know - be analogical
to / know which / possesses

p. 5 col 3

to be / as /
of one /
unlike of /
unlike of /
unlike of /
unlike of /
unlike of /
unlike of /
unlike of /
unlike of /
unlike of /

K.

Dr. C's Theory of Kuo.

p.4 "Dr. C holds that any one who can

be understood or apprehended apart from
existence. But this is impossible. For
implications. But this is impossible. For

implications are [if so, one must] a relation that

is not a relation of a being to a being, but a relation
of a being to a being, related (implication, it is) Kuo
is a being, a being, a being, a being, a being, a being,
expressed by a human mind.

might seem to be a skepticism in which the question has become

from that one has taken as the end of the matter. The result
p.5. "There is no such X in mind. as I know

of a being, a being, a being, a being, a being, a being,
implication, it is a being, a being, a being, a being, a being, a being,
it is never Kuo, a being, a being, a being, a being, a being, a being,

that is the second place, — an inference from the first remark, —

and that he cannot have the truth. The world is disconcerting.

so that he cannot have the truth. The world is disconcerting.

and the difficulty of reason is now more real and clearly that

that is described is convinced that the "truth" value of today

the truth. Beyond this simple conception of ignorance the emptiness

of a man who is conscious of ignorance and who is seeking for

is a being, a being, a being, a being, a being, a being,

the statement that Buddhism describes is not that of a man who

is a being, a being, a being, a being, a being, a being,

implication is required. The remark may lead to show that these

this statement is not intended as a statement, though the

Com. for 1 Compliments : The Incomprehensibility of G.

p. 3. "Man may + does know & sense truth & it is in & divine mind. . . . [yet] when man says & G. is eternal he can) ~~have~~ possibly have in mind a cap of eternity & it is identical or it coincides w/ G's own ~~ph~~ of his eternity."

∴ no concept & same - no point of coincidence -

p. 6 "A distinction betw know of a truth & a know of its implicat is artificial & atomistic."

"A human mind likewise can) know it as a bare opoi apart (an actual ~~of~~ of implicat."

Continuation of Report of Com. on Four Doctrines

p. 1 "The actual contents of the human mind

- truth as it is held in mind - is

analogical to & abstr. truth of G. and

may be identified w/ it at any

point. ~~These~~ while man grasps

abstr. truth, yet & every act of grasp

involves & truth & a relative truth, a diff kind of

truth. & truth (is held in mind as know is therefore, and scheme, analogical truth."

not by the Compl.

F. H. Klooster : The Incorruptibility of B.

Dissertation : Free Univ. of Amsterdam. 1951

p. 121

The question from a Report

It appears a tremendous assumption

without warrant | Scripture

dangerous speech implying upon doctrine

to say that all truth in
mind of B. is capable of being expressed
in propositions.

p. 129

differs betw. know. of a child & an
adult is simply a diff. in number
of objects known.

p. 134

"Of himself is not a Gegenstand for our
analytical activity."

previously he said not a Gegenstand
for science; he also despises
[analytical or] abstraction;
here B. can be known.

Compare with Branner

I Thow not it - truth.

p. 2.

The obj^t of Kno. is truth - one for all
 Knx minds. The char^r of Kno. is a
representⁿ of truth "The character of
 ✓ Knx mind itself fixes ✓ character of
 ✓ Kno. [∴ ✓ unreg. does have] ✓
 same representⁿ of truth

p. 4.

"Regeneration ... is not a change in the
 understanding of these words" It is an erroneous
view.

p. 6

"When he is regenerated, his Sp^s
 ✓ Sp^s may undergo no change at all.
 ... we insist it an unreg. man may
put exactly ✓ same mean^s - ✓ words
 ... mean ✓ regn. man - is C. Kusche
takes issue w^t.

p. 7.

✓ gospel is foolishness [> My Kn it
means]

- John 1:17 For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.
- 5:33 Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth.
- 8:32 And ye shall know the truth
 (dare anyone say that there is not even
 (a single point of contact between God's
 (knowledge and ours?
- 8:45 But because I say the truth, ye believe me not.
 Which of you convicteth me of sin? If I say truth,
 why do ye not believe me?
- 16:7 Nevertheless I tell you the truth
- 16:13 Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come,
 he shall guide you into all the truth.
- 17: 17 Sanctify them in the truth; thy word is truth.
- Cf. II Cor. 11:10 As the truth of Christ is in me, no man
 shall stop me of this glorying in the regions
 of Achaia.

And also: I Kings 17:24; Psalms 25:5, 43:3, 86:11
 119:43, 142, 151;
 Rom. 1:18; 3:7; II Cor. 6:7 & 7:14
 Gal. 2:5,14; Eph. 1:13

33
Throughout the history of this case, the difficulty of using terms in a single sense has led to a great deal of confusion. While I have gone to great lengths to define my terms, the complainants seem always to miss the point. And yet not always. They have on one occasion at least, grasped my meaning and have none the less distorted it.

7

dust shall be return. In the
meantime let man get along as best he
can ^{with} ~~the~~ an indifferent universe; but
he must also get along as best he can
with other men. And other men are
not only indifferent, but they are hostile.

80
34

The seriousness of not attending to definition, or of not attending sufficiently, is seen in the case of the word Emotion.

The Complainant's treatment of the question of Emotion is extremely revealing.

They wrote several columns opposing my theory of emotion & charged me with error. They allege p. 9. col 3. ^{not only} that my theory of emotion "does violence to the Scriptural & Reformed doctrine of man's religious life, but also to the tremendously important doctrine of God's creation of man in his own image."

But on p. 13 col. 2. They admit that my doctrine is correct; they admit if the word emotion signifies what I signify by it, my conclusions follow.

that is, they admit that if anyone pays attention to what I say, my meaning will be found correct! — ~~And~~ And yet they previously charged me with doing violence to Scripture & to the doctrine of creation. How can they make these charges when they know my theory is correct? And how can they circulate these charges throughout the country when they have this knowledge & after it has been explicitly called to their attention?

Note that I explicitly brought this point to their attention on Nov. 20 1944, before they circulated the Complaint to the public.

I said (Protest attached)

35.
6

In connection with this matter of emotion,
kindly compare the charge with what I actually
said in the exam.

Complaint: p. 9 col. 2 & 3.

|| forthright denial of anything that might
be called emotion.

Tr. p. 17, 6, 7. God is angry, God
loves his people

Are Emotions
The only
Active Deities.
The evidence thus directly contradicts the charge.
It seems ~~strange~~ ^{strange} that anyone should think
I deny God is active. My insistence on his
will indicates his activity. Is not
volition an "active principle" or "principle
of action" If will isn't, what could be?
And to call love a volition is not a new
way of speaking, but an old way that
seems to have been forgotten.

→ Kant vs Turretin

of Augustus Toplady
whom the Complainers
in a paper try to
explain away.

← They argue: the Bible speaks
of love (Second Head p. 4)
therefore love is an emotion.
This begs the question.

Further on the Emotions. In paper =
Second Head p. 7+8. Emotions

are to be distrusted & suppressed -

Where did I say this - I said exactly
the opposite

Tr. p. 13, 8-9. Intellect,
& emotion are equally essential to a
human being.

How can the Complainants
claim I said they should be
suppressed. I did say they
should be governed by truth
which the intellect grasps.

No right or wrong without truth.
Obtaining truth = intellection &
emotions shd be directed by the
intellect as it has the truth. & this

is exactly Calvin's doctrine & mine &
Chas Hodge also.

Appt & minority agree with me
all oppose The Complaint.

Another serious defect in the Complaint is found on p. 5. col 2. bottom. The phrase in question appears only once in the Complaint but the view it expresses underlies most of the charges of the section.

The Complaint implies that I hold that truth is divorced from the knowing subject, that truth consists of self-contained independent statements.

The knowing subject, of whom truth is independent, is God; since to say that truth is independent of some one man is not to the point.

Thus they charge me, by a clear implication, ~~to hold~~ with holding that truth is independent of God; and this charge seems to underlie a great deal of this section of the Complaint.

Plato in the Timaeus.

In class after class I have distinguished the Platonic from the Xn view - as some of you know.

The Compl. have not & cannot find evidence for their assertion. It is completely baseless

And the evidence that is found contradicts their charge.

The Platonic view is refuted by

Tr. 14, 15. God is not limited by anything external to him: therefore no independent world of Ideas.

cf. ~~14~~ same page 14, 20 His knowledge is not limited by anything outside of him.

Another point that underlies so much of the argument relates to my view of truth in general. For me truth is a system of truths. Each truth, i.e. proposition, is distinct, but not independent of every other.

In paper Incompre p. 6, they say the distinction between know of a truth + know of its implications (i.e. other truths) is artificial + atomistic. ^{Why artificial? all meanings merge - no real or natural distinction.}

I do not see anything artificial in distinguishing betw. ① David was ordered and ② Solomon ~~cut down~~ cedars for the temple.

It seems to me that the distinctions between David Solomon & trees are entirely natural distinctions, not artificial. They are related in one system, but they are indod distinct truths. This has

40.
a bearing on the confusion concerning
paradoxes & their solution.

It seems to me that the
Complainers actually hold, and
by their logic ought to hold, that
the solution of any paradox requires
an exhaustive know. of all truth.

The distinction betw truths is artificial
thence a problem or paradox anywhere
requires adjustments throughout all know.

I would agree that every truth fits the
system, and that if a truth is misplaced
(so to speak) or a falsity is inserted,
the whole system is disjoined. But
I do not hold that the solution of a
paradox requires us to know the
whole system. A paradox is

41/a

(by my definition) ^{contradict} an apparent contradiction.

What appears to one may not appear to another person. That is to say, a paradox is a psych. problem, it is not a real inconsistency in the system of truth.

To solve a paradox therefore requires only a proof that the 2 truths may be consistent.

a detective novel. ~~they are presented~~

~~paradoxically. They are solved~~

~~by fitting them together. But even~~

~~less is absolutely required. To show~~

~~that 2 clues, or 2 truths are~~

~~not contradictory is sufficient.~~

~~And to show that they do not~~

~~contradict is a relatively simple~~

~~matter of logic. It does not require~~

The Tr. indicates this clearly
Tr. 35, 12ff. The beginner in
physics meets a paradox relating
to the pressure of water.

This paradox is soon solved. The
students do not have to learn all
physics. They need only to see
that two statements are not
~~formal~~ contradictory. And
though at first the puzzle seems
so difficult, its solution is a
relatively simple matter of logic
& definition. If the solution
of a paradox required a complete
explanation of all physics or all
theology,

42.

~~a complete explanation of the whole related problem.~~

~~If it did~~ - no man could ever solve a paradox.

I hold that many paradoxes have been solved. Successive generations of students solve the same paradoxes year after year; but still they do not know all about the general subject.

Nor do I claim an exhaustive know. when I think I solve a paradox. To show they may be consistent as enough

Another point, very simple,
but it has been made to appear complex
& difficult.

Complaint p. 6, col 1. "Dr. C. does
not base his doctrine of incorp. upon
the distinction betw B. as inf. & man
as finite."

They refer to Tr. 45:24 ff.

But the Tr. says ~~nothing like~~ something
quite different from what they say
I said.

They say -

Tr. says - infinity is not
a sufficient answer.

~~Therefore~~

"Sufficient"

indicates that there is more to

44

the answer - it does not indicate that the factor called insufficient plays no part at all. A factor that is insufficient is often indispensable.

Z. B. Q. Is King George King of England because he is a man?

A. Obviously a woman cannot be King, ~~but his being a man~~
~~is not sufficient~~. Hence this
~~is~~ is necessary but not sufficient.
Also a French or U. S. man
cd not be K.

Q. Is he K because he is an Englishman.

A. Not sufficient - but because

he came next in the Royal line.

Now. is G. incomprehensible because
inf? This is not a sufficient
reason.

The Compl. says I take no account
of G's infinity > the Tr. shows I do.
I do - and add a more particular
reason.

God is inf. in several
ways; man is finite in several
ways. Now, which of these phases
of finitude prevents man from
exhaustively knowing God. And
my reply is: not because man
is finite in space; not because

man is finite strength; but because ⁴⁶ ~~the~~
man's mental constitution is finite
by reason of its temporality.

When I say Infinity is
not a sufficient reason, it is
distressing to be understood as
saying it is not a necessary reason.
And when I say temporality
is the particular finitude of man
that prevents him from knowing
God exhaustively; it is remarkable
that I am reported to have said
Inf-finitude is not involved
at all.

The majority report sees all this
with perfect clarity.

47.

p. 7. § 2.