

*logia fidei*, die bij hem ook omvat wat hij noemt de *analogia relationis* en de *analogia attributionis extrinseca*. Maar met de erkenning van de analogieën in het geloof wordt dit laatste weer implicite binnen de tijdelijke orde der modale ervaringsaspecten gesteld, hetgeen onverenigbaar is met BARTH's loochening van ieder aanrakingspunt tussen het christelijk geloof en de natuurlijke orde van het gevallen menselijk bestaan. Want juist de analogische structuur van het geloofsaspect verraadt zijn toebehoren tot deze tijdelijke orde. Wanneer de H. Schrift zegt, dat het „geloof uit het gehoor” is, dan wordt in die uitspraak op de innerlijke samenhang dezer tijdelijke ervaringsorde bijzonder de nadruk gelegd.

Hieraan doet niets af het door BARTH terecht benadrukte feit, dat eerst vanuit Gods Woordenopenbaring de geloofsanalogieën haar ware zin kunnen onthullen.

De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee dwingt door haar radicale transcendentale critiek van het theoretisch denken de dogmatische theologie in de eerste plaats tot zelfcritiek, gelijk ze ook zich zelve voortdurend aan deze critiek onderwerpt. Zolang het onbijbels en innerlijk dualistisch grondmotief van natuur en genade de theologie blijft beheersen, mist de laatste deze zelf-critiek en daarmee ook een inzicht in de werkelijke verhouding van theologie en wijsbegeerte vanuit het radicale en integrale bijbelse standpunt. De tweede dienst, die de Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee aan de dogmatische theologie kan bewijzen is het blootleggen van de totale tijdelijke orde en onderlinge samenhang der modale ervaringsaspecten, die zich in de analogische structuur van het geloofsaspect uitdrukt.

Daarom zullen wij deze structuur thans aan een nader onderzoek onderwerpen. Welke principiële betekenis deze analyse voor het theologisch denken kan hebben, zal naar ik hoop uit het vervolg van zelve blijken. Maar reeds thans wil ik opmerken, dat een juist inzicht in de bedoelde structuur de theoloog kan behoeden voor veel onjuiste probleemstellingen en conflicten met geverifieerde resultaten van andere wetenschappen, waardoor de theologie slechts in miscrediet kan worden gebracht.

(Wordt vervolgd)

## SUMMARY

### I

The “philosophy of the cosmonomic idea” (*Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee*) lays great stress upon the fact that its central biblical startingpoint is independent of any dogmatic theology. The latter needs, in its opinion, a philosophical foundation of a really christian character. For, a due delimitation of its scientific viewpoint from that of the non-theological sciences requires a theoretical total view of the different modal aspects of our temporal horizon of experience which in principle determine these scientific viewpoints. And this theoretical total view is necessarily of a philosophical character. Such a philosophical view, however, is always dependent on a central religious startingpoint. No single philosophy whose central startingpoint is of a non-biblical character can do justice to the proper theoretical field of research of dogmatic theology.

This gives rise to the question as to whether the latter is indeed a special science. From the theological viewpoint two grounds have been alleged to deny this and to deny the possibility of a christian philosophy of a non-theological character. They gave expression to two fundamentally different views of the relation between christian theology and philosophy. According to the one, dogmatical theology, as a theoretical explanation of the articles of christian faith, is itself the true philosophy, the "*philosophia christiana*". According to the other, dogmatical theology is a supra-natural science, since its principles of knowledge are taken from the divine Word-revelation, whereas philosophy takes its knowledge from natural reason alone. The former view was that of the Church fathers, especially of Augustine.

Augustine emphatically denies the autonomy of human reason. Without its illumination by the Word of God philosophical thought can only entangle us in fundamental errors. The *scientia dei* is the true philosophy.

But from the very beginning there was a fatal confusion between the Word-revelation in the sense of the central principle of true knowledge of God and ourselves, and the theoretical object of dogmatical theology.

The identification of dogmatical theology with the true philosophy testified to the dangerous influence of greek metaphysics which considered theoretical theology the highest level of the *prima philosophy*, and the queen of all other sciences.

The Augustinian standpoint implied that philosophical questions were only discussed in a theological context. In fact it were greek philosophical ideas which in this way penetrated the christian theology.

The second view of the relation between dogmatical theology and philosophy originates in the unbiblical dualistic basic motive of nature and supernatural grace, which entered scholastic thought since the aristotelean renaissance. THOMAS AQUINAS made philosophy into the natural substructure of dogmatic theology and ascribed to it a relative autonomy. As a natural science, philosophy cannot be christian. But the ambiguous use of the terms "*sacra doctrina*", "*scientia dei*", and "theology" continued to impede a due distinction between the Word-revelation, as the central religious principle of knowledge, and the proper theoretical object of dogmatic theology.

Dr. A. KUYPER paved the way for a better insight into this relation from the biblical standpoint. He rightly established that christian theology, as a science, cannot be placed outside of the universal coherence of the human sciences, and that the determination of its proper place among the latter is a matter of philosophical examination. Therefore, he called his "*Encyclopedia of the holy theology*" a philosophical work. But he emphasized that only a christian philosophy is able to fulfill this encyclopedical task in a due way. In addition he returned to the biblical view of the heart as the religious centre of the human nature and broke in principle with the scholastic view of faith as a supra-natural gift which functions beyond the human nature.

Nevertheless, his view concerning the necessity of a christian philosophical foundation for theology was crossed by the scholastic line in his thought. The dualistic basic motive of nature and grace, which ruled the latter, led him back to the distinction of dogmatic theology from alle other

sciences by means of the criterion established by THOMAS AQUINAS. And this criterion left no room for a christian philosophy, nor for a due distinction between the central religious principle of knowledge and the proper theoretical object of theology as a science.

The unbiblical identification of dogmatic theology with the central knowledge of God, revealing himself in his Word, has led to a dangerous overestimation of the dogmatological and exegetic task of theology. It is, therefore, necessary to reconsider the traditional view according to which the "object" of dogmatic theology would be the Word-revelation in its full sense. This view cannot be correct, since it neglects the inner boundaries of theoretical thought. The latter is by its inner nature bound to the temporal horizon of human experience with its modal diversity of aspects or fundamental *experiential modes*. In the theoretical attitude we oppose the logical aspect of our actual thinking to the non-logical aspects of our experience in order to make the latter into the *theoretical* object or problem of our logical reflection.

In the specific empirical sciences the particular scientific viewpoint is always determined by one of these (non-logical) aspects of our temporal experience; the theoretical attention of the student of such a science, however, is not directed upon this modal aspect itself, but rather upon the empirical facts or phenomena, such as they present themselves within this aspect. It is not the full temporal reality of these concrete facts or phenomena which is the theoretical object or problem of these sciences, but only a *particular aspect* of it. In other words, the theoretical object of a special science is always the result of a theoretical abstraction.

We cannot arrive at scientific knowledge of such a theoretical object without a theoretical synthesis between our logical function of thought and the non-logical aspect of our temporal experience, which delimits the theoretical object of our scientific examination.

This theoretical synthesis starts from the I-ness, the central religious point of reference of our entire temporal experience, which surpasses the modal diversity of the latter.

The divine Word-revelation in its central religious sense addresses itself to this religious centre or core of our experience and existence, as a spiritual *dunamis*. As such it should be the religious basic motive and central startingpoint of our entire life and thought; it transcends all modal aspects or our experiential horizon in the order of time, and can, consequently, never be made the theoretical object of theological examination. This central religious sense of the Word-revelation is resumed in the theme of creation, fall into sin, and redemption by Jesus Christ in the communion of the Holy Spirit. It is the central principle and clue of the true knowledge of God and the true self-knowledge, which is a question of spiritual life or death, and not a matter of theological problems and dogmatological reflection. But the Word-revelation has also entered our temporal horizon of experience with its rich diversity of modal aspects. It has embodied itself in the Holy Scripture, just like the divine Word was made flesh in Jesus Christ. As such it presents itself in the temporal order of our experiential aspects; among which the faith-aspect occupies the limiting place.

Within this latter aspect the Word-revelation presents itself as holy doctrine and norm of the christian belief. It is this aspect of the revelation

which delimits the true theoretical object of dogmatic theological examination. In the theoretical attitude of theological thought this aspect is opposed to the logical aspect of theological thinking as a *problem*. As *basic articles of the christian doctrine*, creation, fall into sin, and redemption by Jesus Christ in the communion of the Holy Spirit are also to be made the theoretical object of theological reflection. But without the central knowledge of God and of ourselves effectuated by the operation of the spiritual *dunamis* of the Word-revelation in the core or heart of our existence and experience, even an orthodox theology remains a dead and useless knowledge of dogmas, on the same footing as the learning of the jewish scribes who knew neither Jesus Christ nor his Father.

Just like all the other modal aspects of our temporal experience, the faith-aspect has a modal structure, founded in the temporal order of our created world.

The modal faith-aspect should not be confounded with the *concrete act of belief* which, just like all other acts of our consciousness, starts from the core or religious centre of our existence and functions in the unbreakable coherence of all the experiential aspects. The concrete act of belief is only *qualified* by its faith-aspect, without being exhausted by the latter. The living christian belief, as act, can only originate from the regenerating operation of the divine Word in the heart, opened up by its central spiritual *dunamis*. Nevertheless, its modal character as belief is determined by the modal structure of the faith-aspect, which is founded in the order of creation in its temporal dimension, and, as such, could not be destroyed by sin.

It is exactly this modal structure of the faith-aspect which contradicts in principle the scholastical view of the christian belief as a supra-natural gift of grace, functioning beyond the natural order of our world. For in this modal structure the entire temporal order and unbreakable mutual coherence of the different experiential aspects expresses itself.

This is why an examination of this structure presupposes a philosophical total view of the aspects, which, as such, exceeds the boundaries of theology as a special science. Theology, as such, is not concerned in the modal nature and structure of the christian belief, but only in its origin, norm and content.

Nevertheless, it is confronted with the philosophical problem of the modal structure of the limiting aspect of our temporal experience. For, as a dogmatic science of the christian doctrine, it is obliged to avail itself of so called analogical or multivocal basic concepts, which are also used in the other special sciences, but in a different modal sense, be it that these different modal significations reveal an inner coherence which each other. This analogical character of the theological basic concepts is only to be explained from the modal structure of the faith-aspect which delimits the theoretical object of dogmatic theological thought.

In its general theory of the modal experiential aspects the philosophy of the cosmonomic Idea has shown that this structure contains a nuclear moment, guaranteeing the irreducible meaning-character of the aspect concerned, and a whole series of analogical moments, maintaining its unbreakable coherence with all the other modal aspects.

Scholastic theology has tried to explain the analogical character of its

basic concepts by the metaphysical doctrine of the *analogia entis*. This metaphysical doctrine was of greek origin and had no single reference to the modal aspects of our temporal horizon of experience. It had not its startingpoint in the central motive of the Word-revelation, but rather in the pagan religious form-matter motive of the greek philosophical thought.

K. BARTH rightly rejected this doctrine and called it an invention of the anti-christ, since it pretended to arrive at a true (though incomplete) knowledge of God by means of the autonomous natural human reason alone. He replaced it by the *analogia fidei*. But by so doing, he implicitly contradicted his thesis, that the christian belief has no single point of contact with the natural order of human experience and existence.

It is exactly the analogical structure of faith which confronts the theologian with the necessity of a christian philosophical foundation of his theological thought.

The reason is, that the philosophical presuppositions which lie at the foundation of the theological reflection have an essential and material influence upon the whole manner of positing the theological problems. It is useless and uncritical to speak of a merely *formal* use of philosophic notions in dogmatic theology.

Theology is in need of a radical self-critique as to its philosophical fundamentals. So long as theological thought is ruled by the unbiblical and dualistic basic motive of nature and grace, this radical self-critique is impossible; for this motive impedes the religious insight into the radical and central sense of the Word-revelation which, as a spiritual *dunamis*, should rule both theological and philosophic thought.

*(to be continued)*