

1. Man the Image of God

In the Biblical account of the Creation, we read the following words with which every Bible student is familiar:

And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them (Gen. 1:26-27).

One would be right in affirming, I think, that no other idea in all literature has so profoundly affected almost every phase of our Western culture as the idea embodied in this Scripture, the idea that every human being is the image or likeness of the Divine Being. This, in fact, is the concept which underlies the doctrine of the natural equality of men, and consequently the democratic form of the state; if the concept does not represent an objective fact, then human equality is only a myth and democracy a great delusion. Moreover, the truth itself is the foundation of the whole judicial order, that is, the order of human rights and duties; otherwise, such an order does not exist, and the alternative view—that Might makes Right—must be accepted as the true one.

Man is the image of God: so affirm the Scriptures. That is to say, as God is essentially Spirit, so man is essentially spirit, though in his present state clothed in a physical "tabernacle." Or, in equivalent terms, as God is a Person, so man is a person. In either sense, man is the image, the reflection, although no doubt a very feeble and imperfect one, of the Being of God. It will be remembered, in this connection, that Jesus was Scripturally declared to be "the very image of God's substance" (Heb. 1:3); that is, whereas the natural man is only the *personal* image, Jesus, Himself the God-Man, was both the *personal and moral*, image or likeness of God.

Now is this affirmation—that man is the image of God—a Divine revelation of an eternal truth? or is it a mere anthropomorphism? That is, did God actually create man in His own image, or did man create God in his own imagination?

The old Greek iconoclast, Xenophanes of Kolophon, the earliest rebel, in so far as our knowledge goes, against the anthropomorphic mythological deities of his time, is often quoted as having said: "Mortals seem to have begotten Gods to have their own garb and voice and form"; also, "Now if horses or

oxen or lions had hands or power to paint and make the works of art that men make, then would horses give their Gods horse-like forms in painting or sculpture, and oxen ox-like forms, even each after its own kind"; and again: "The Aethiop saith that his Gods are snub-nosed and black, the Thracian that his have blue eyes and red hair," etc.¹ Now we must not infer from these statements that Xenophanes was an atheist. Obviously he was not, for among other sayings attributed to him are the following, which clearly indicate that he was thinking in monotheistic, or perhaps it would be nearer the truth to say pantheistic, terms: "There's one God greatest among Gods and men, who is like to mortals neither in form nor mind",² the divine, a living thing, "is all eye, all mind, all ear,"³ "without toil it perceiveth and agitateth all things with its mind";⁴ "it ever abideth in one place, and never moveth, nor doth it beseem it to go now this way and now that," etc.⁵ It is evident from these fragments that Xenophanes was only repudiating the anthropomorphic polytheisms of Homer and Hesiod (who, said he, "have ascribed unto the gods all that is reproach and blame in the world of men, stealing and adultery and deceit"⁶) for a more rational conception of the Deity, just as did Socrates, and his pupil Plato, some two centuries afterward. Even so, this critique of anthropomorphism by Xenophanes, which has been parroted by so-called "free-thinkers" in almost every age, embraces at least two glaring fallacies. In the first place, his introductory *if* is an insurmountable barrier to the truthfulness of his statement. IF, said the old Greek thinker, horses or oxen or lions had power to conceive of Deity, or hands to represent Him in painting or sculpture, they would picture Him in a horse-like, or an ox-like, or a lion-like form, etc. But, as Shakespeare would say, "Aye, there's the rub!" Horses, oxen, or lions give no evidence whatever of any capacity to conceive of God; brutes are utterly incapable of receiving or entertaining the idea. A man might try to "explain" God to his old dog Rover, but Rover would be utterly unable to comprehend; Rover, in fact, could do nothing but wag his tail and lick his master's hand. Man alone,

1. *Elegy and Iambus*, Loeb Classical Library, 201, 203. J. M. Edmonds, translator. Fragments from *Miscellanies* of Clement of Alexandria.

2. *Elegy and Iambus*, Loeb Classical Library, 207. J. M. Edmonds, translator. From Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies*.

3. *Ibid.*, 207. From Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*.

4. *Ibid.*, 207. From Simplicius on Aristotle, *Physics* (on the All).

5. *Ibid.*, 207. From Simplicius on Aristotle, *Physics* (on the All).

6. *Ibid.*, 201. From Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Mathematicians*.

of all creatures of earth, is capable of apprehending the fact of God, capable of receiving a revelation from God, hence capable of religious belief and activity. Thus at most the statement of Xenophanes is only a half-truth and can never be anything more. In the second place, even man himself is compelled to think of God primarily in terms of his own experience; he can hardly do otherwise. This is no doubt the reason why so many of the presentations of the thoughts and acts of God, especially in the Old Testament, are put in anthropomorphic form; this form was in adaptation to man's finite intelligence; God was under the necessity of revealing Himself in terms of man's very limited experience. And particularly is this true of revelations that were communicated in the infancy of the race. In fact the entire Old Testament revelation gives evidence of having been constructed on what might properly be called principles of kindergarten pedagogy; the New Testament revelation, on the other hand, couched as it is in spiritual terms, is obviously adapted to a race that is supposed to have put away childish things. All this hue and cry of anthropomorphism, in so far as the content of the Old Testament is concerned, gives evidence of shallowness rather than of profundity of thought; in most cases it is but the outpouring of a profane spirit. As a matter of fact, these anthropomorphisms make our God more intelligible to us; they bring Him nearer to us; they make Him more "human," if indeed the use of this adjective with reference to the Deity is pardonable. The God of the Bible is far more lovable, far more attractive to mankind, than the God fabricated by human reason, the cold, intellectually-constructed Demiourgos of Plato, for example, or the Substance of Spinoza, or John Dewey's "humanistic" non-entity.¹ Besides, the anthropomorphic portrayals of God in the Old Testament are not to be taken in strict literalness; obviously they were not even intended to be so taken; undoubtedly many of them were consciously metaphorical. I quote here from Dr. Knudson:

What we are, however, here concerned about is not to determine the extent of the literal and the metaphorical in the Old Testament use of anthropomorphisms, but to point out the fact that the great purpose actually served by these anthropomorphisms is to emphasize the personality of God. He is a living, acting Being, a Being touched with the feeling of our infirmities. He does not stand apart from men but enters in the most intimate way into their experiences. He counsels them, commands them, blesses them, punishes them. In a word, He is the great outstanding fact of their lives. This truth it is that lies

1. Vide Plato, *Timaeus*; Spinoza, *Ethics*; John Dewey, *A Common Faith*.

back of the biblical use of anthropomorphisms and is enforced by them. In no other way could the personality of God at that time have been adequately and effectively expressed. Concrete conceptions and concrete modes of speech, such as we find in the anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament, were the only ones that could then be fully understood.¹

Man was created in the image of God; so the Scriptures declare. Every human being is a likeness of God. Certainly this likeness is not in any sense physical; there is nothing in Scripture that can be construed to support such an interpretation. This likeness is comprehended, rather, in the terms of Person and Spirit. Man is the likeness of the Divine in his possession of the attributes and powers of Person, of Spirit. Of course this does not mean that God is a Person in precisely the same modes, or in precisely the same degree, with respect to the intensity of His powers, that man is a person; hence, some writers have chosen to write of God as "super-" or "supra-personal." Granting, however, that due allowance must be made for the difference in rank and power between deity and humanity, nevertheless, again as Knudson puts it,

personality is the highest category of which we know anything. "Superpersonal existence" is a phrase without any concrete content, an unknown quantity that means no more to us than an algebraic *xyz*. If we are, therefore, to think of God, it must be either under the personal or some subpersonal form. There is no third alternative.²

C. E. M. Joad writes, *God and Evil*, 250-251: "Now it may be true that God permits Himself to be conceived as a personality, but if so, His personality can be at most only one aspect of the whole that He is." But, because Person is the highest category of which we have knowledge, reason forbids our conceiving God as being less than Person, for in that case He would be less than man—an unthinkable conclusion with respect to the Deity. Hence we must conclude that God belongs in the category of Person, but necessarily of Person in the fullest and most intense degree of those powers characteristic of the personal order of being. In a word, God must be Person or Spirit in perfection, eternal in His being, infinite in His inexhaustibility.

"The spiritual, as we know it," writes Rufus Jones

is always superposed on the physical, the biological, the natural. It does not come down from above by a Jacob's ladder as a purely heavenly "emergent." It comes rather as a new and subtle elevation,

1. Albert C. Knudson, *The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament*, 61.

2. *Op. cit.*, 58.

THE ETERNAL SPIRIT — HIS PERSON AND POWERS

a sublimation, of what was here before. The spiritual, in some way not yet known, "breaks through" the natural as its organ of expression, somewhat as electricity "breaks through" into manifestation as soon as the dynamo is sufficiently perfected, though the analogy is very lame and halting. . . . In some unexplainable way, which remains as mysterious as the functions of Aladdin's lamp is the Arabian story, refined forms of matter—like that for example which composes our brain cortexes—allows consciousness, mind, intelligent purpose, to break forth. There comes a stage in the unfolding of life when a type of consciousness emerges which may quite properly be called *spirit*. It is characterized first of all by the truly amazing fact that it knows itself. It would seem to be mystery enough to be able to know an object in space. How that is done is and remains a fundamental mystery. But mind of what I am calling the spirit type not only knows an object but knows that it knows it, and knows itself as knowing it. The Jacob's ladder is now within, and mind can climb up and overspan as from a watchtower both subject and object, both self and others, and can know *that* it knows as well as *what* it knows. . . . The mind of man, throughout its experience of knowing, transcends the act of knowing an object, and in the same pulse of experience in which it knows the object knows itself as knowing it. This unique peculiarity of self-identity and the inner grasp of itself in all its intelligent processes belongs inherently to mind at this stage of spirit. We shall get nowhere with our theories of knowledge until we stop talking of the mind as though it were merely a receptacle—a bird-cage to be filled from the outside—and learn to think of it as a living active system of experience, unified and controlled from within. What Kant called "the transcendental unity of consciousness" is one of the most majestic of all our interior marvels. We need not be unduly bothered by his beloved word "transcendental." It does not imply something which comes from a mystical beyond, some vague addendum to our inherent structural organ of consciousness. It is native to us as men. It means here only that the *unity* of consciousness under consideration is presupposed in all our experience. This unity is an essential condition of knowledge. It is constitutive of knowledge, and cannot be a product of it. It is what gives our type of experience its *universal* and *necessary* character. It means that at every sane moment of our lives we look out upon each new fact of knowledge from a unified comprehensive self, which binds the new fact, with proper linkages of thought-forms, in with a larger background and persistent self-center, with slowly formed dispositional traits, and with the added mark and brand that *this is I that think and know this fact*. All knowledge that can be called "knowledge" involves something new confronted and apprehended by a larger apperceiving self which fuses the new with the old, gives it its place in the comprehending system, and weaves the new fact, with this mysterious inner shuttle of "I know it," into the web of persistent knowledge. There are certain well-known phrases, such as "psychological climate" or "apperception's mass," or "dispositional traits" or "meaning-mass" or "mnemonic mass," for the assimilation of the new experience with the old; but the current phrases are often used too loosely and with too little stress upon *the operating dominion of an identical self* which does the apperceiving, the assimilating of the new with the old. The structural unity of which I am speaking and the self-identity of our knowing self need to have signal emphasis if we are ever to arrive at the true significance of the life of the spirit. The dominion of meaning from within, all the time, dominates our perceptions.¹

1. *Spirit in Man*, 6-10.

Dr. Jones then goes on to say:

Mind, when it reaches the stage of spirit in beings like us—the only beings in whom we see it manifested—is no longer completely dependent on objects perceived, objects “given” in space. It can now attend to objects of its own order, to that which is mental, spiritual, ideal. It can produce and attend to what are well called “free ideas.” Free ideas become detached from the experiences and the settings and the occasions in which they arose. Free ideas are explicit thoughts which are independent of what is given at the time in sense. They are our universals, our working concepts, our ideas of connection and relationship. These free ideas are the basic unities, the linkages, and the forms through which we interpret all our experiences. They are the patterns and forms for our experiences of beauty and goodness. They are the controlling ideals in our forecasts of life. . . . These “free ideas” become the instruments of new ranges of thought, and they enable us to anticipate and handle situations not yet experienced. The mind rolls up and accumulates a body of experience which not only conserves the past but which outruns its stocks of income and creates values of its own. It can perceive with an inward eye—“an eye made quiet by the power of harmony”—and can behold what never was before on sea or land. It can, through its accumulated powers, deal with those intangibles and impalpables, which crude senses are bound to miss, as they also miss the vibrations which apparently make sensations possible. It is thus that we become *creative* beings.¹

This power, Dr. Jones continues, “to save the past by memory and to anticipate the future by creative imagination makes ideal forecasts possible and gives us a prophetic faith that the gates of the future are open to us.” It creates “a beyond within us.”

The characteristic of a beyond within us belongs essentially to spirit in man, and is one of our most momentous characteristics. An *immanent* ideal, operating in all our life aims, is essential to our nature as persons. There is always a “more yet” which carries our minds over and beyond the margins of any given situation. . . . This feature of a beyond within us, this capacity of before and after, this power to see our deed in the light of an ideal forecast, furnishes us with a fundamental form of distinction between what was, or is, and what might have been—between a good and a possible better. Then we slowly roll up and accumulate through life-experience with others a concrete or dispositional conscience which becomes, or may become, a perennial nucleus of inward moral wisdom and guidance. This becomes, or may become, to us the deep self which we really *are*, the self we propose to *be*, the self which we would even die to preserve. This deep-lying nuclear moral guardian in us is one of the most amazing features of a rightly fashioned life, but one must have it in order to appreciate it.²

Finally, in this connection:

First, last, and all the time, *i.e.*, in our sanity, we possess an integral, self-identical self, which knows what it knows and does what

1. Rufus M. Jones, *op. cit.*, 10-11.

2. *Ibid.*, 11-12.

3. *Ibid.*, 12-13.

it does. It is, or at least can become, a highly complex spiritual reality, with a sphere and range of its own. We are in large measure the makers of ourselves; but fortunately we start with a precious impartation, of birth-gift, which is big with its potentiality of spirit—otherwise we might have ended as a hop-toad,

A creature predestined to move
In a well-defined groove,

with no power to build a self from within, such as we now possess. And that self of ours, whatever its ultimate destiny may be, is utterly *unique*.¹

It is only by the cultivation of the “nuclear moral guardian” within him, Dr. Jones points out, that a man attains ultimately to the status of a *real person*; by failing to cultivate it, he simply drops back to the biological level. Where there is life, there is growth, in the moral as in the biological realm; the only alternative to growth, to advancement, is atavism. One is reminded here of the words of Jesus; “Enter ye in by the narrow gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many are they that enter in thereby. For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few are they that find it” (Matt. 7:13-14). The attainment of the status of a *real person*, moreover, is contingent upon a man’s cultivation of the Mind of Christ within himself, upon his living the life with the Holy Spirit. Obviously, then, in the light of both reason and Scripture teaching, this attainment of the status of a real person *can* be realized only by the saints of God, and *will* be realized by them only in their ultimate union with God in knowledge and love. And the necessary concomitant of this union, as we have already seen, will be the putting on of immortality—the saint’s exchange of his physical for his spiritual body. This spiritual life, moreover, emerges from within a person only as a result of the fructifying of spiritual seed, the Word of God, implanted from without. For it is a law of the moral as well as of the biological realm that each living thing shall reproduce after its own kind; hence “that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit” (John 3:6). There is no reversing of the orderly processes of Nature.

I quote again:

We are so wedded by habit to the forms and moulds which the substantial matter of our bodies supplies here in this sphere of mutability that we are helpless to imagine a realm of real and actual life in which the enswathement of personality is of wholly different and far more subtle stuff. But a “spiritual body” is by no means an impossi-

1. Jones, *op. cit.*, 21-22.

bility, and it would be no more of a mutation than that of the butterfly that emerges from the chrysalis. What we really care for and must have, if immortality is to be a desirable gain, is real *conservation of personality* and the possibility of progressive personal life—of going on. . . . And, furthermore, it is not just “going on” that we are thinking about. It is not enough to attain the status of an infinitely extended Methuselah-type of life, with the mere dimension of length. What we mean when we talk of eternal life is life that opens expansively into the Life of God—the Over-World of Spirit—that takes on amplitude and that shares with God in the spiritual tasks of His expanding creation.¹

I trust that I shall be pardoned for quoting at such length from Dr. Jones' excellent—and stylistically exquisite—little book, *Spirit in Man*. I have done so because I consider it the clearest presentation of the subject that can be found anywhere in secular literature, and because, too, the presentation parallels so closely the argument I am trying to present here, namely, that *spirit in man is the sole ground for the attainment of real personality, through the life with the Holy Spirit here and ultimate perfect union with God hereafter*. There is a spirit in man; spirit in man is, in its attributes and powers, a likeness of Spirit in God; and in this likeness lies the potentiality of final union with God, Beatitude, Everlasting Life.

I think, therefore, that I may be permitted one more excerpt, in this connection. Dr. Jones writes:

There is a stage in this upward climb of our strange Jacob's ladder of spirit when we can see and can enjoy realities which to a certain degree are spiritual in their own sovereign right. I mean of course the intrinsic values of Beauty, Truth, Goodness, and Love A mind which can see and appreciate those realities has already transcended the realm of time and space and matter and *sensa* and the biological order, and belongs already to an intrinsic, that is, eternal order. These ideal values are the unmoved movers which shape our destiny; and in the realm of the spirit they are eternal, *i.e.*, they are time-transcending realities²

This “eternal order” is, of course, what we mean here by the order of sainthood.

The power of the mind to transcend the realm of space and time and sense and biological life, and consequently (1) to generate “free ideas,” and (2) to apprehend values, evinces unmistakably the *metaphysical* likeness of the human spirit to the Divine Spirit. By metaphysical likeness is meant of course similarity of attributes and powers, that is, beyond the merely physical and biological. What is yet necessary for man, that is, for him to attain his natural and proper end as a

1. *Op. cit.*, 69-70.

2. *Ibid.*, 14.

spiritual being, is for this metaphysical likeness to grow into a genuine moral likeness as well, through man's own voluntary choice of, and devotion to, the life of the Spirit; *in a word, for the human spirit to become possessed, guided, filled and moulded by the Spirit of God.* Such moral likeness existed as it has been pointed out already, in the person of Christ, our perfect Exemplar; He possessed the Holy Spirit without measure (John 3:34); whereas ordinary mortal man is the personal image of God, Christ the Son is the *very* image, that is, *moral as well as personal*, of the Divine Substance (Heb. 1:3). His supreme interest in life was to do the Will of the Father in all things; He is "Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:24). He could say in all truth, "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30), and, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (John 14:9); and in all truth He could pray to the Father, with reference to all believers, "that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, are in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me" (John 17:21). And, although the saint cannot ever, either in this world or in the world to come, attain to the ontological status of deity—any more than a rock can transform itself into a living thing, or a plant into an animal, or a brute into a man—he can, nevertheless, become more and more like Christ morally, and the more he attains "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. 4:13), the more he becomes like God or godlike, and in this manner comes to be in truth a partaker (sharer) of the Divine Nature morally and spiritually (2 Pet. 1:4). This attainment of moral perfection is the attainment of Wholeness or Holiness. In our use of the terms "spirit" and "spiritual," however, we must always be careful to distinguish between their metaphysical and their moral content. Every man is now, in his present state, the *metaphysical* likeness of God, that is, *personally* spiritual (in the sense that God is the "Father of our spirits" by creation, Heb. 12:9); only through the power of the Gospel of Christ and the life of the Spirit, however, can he hope to become the *moral* likeness of God, that is truly or *fully* spiritual. And to be fully spiritual is to be *whole* or holy.

Again, one readily sees the benevolence of God in His endowment of the human spirit with free will, that is, the power of self-determination and self-direction. That *conation*—purposeful striving toward a goal, striving that is not itself reducible to mechanism—is characteristic of man, can hardly be denied. Man's activity always has directionality. This fact was clearly

brought out by the investigations of Dr. C. Buhler and her associates.

In their study of approximately two hundred life histories, the most definite conclusion was that each life seemed definitely ordered and steered toward some selected goal; each person had something quite special to live for. Each had a characteristic *Bestimmung* and *intention*. The style, of course, varied; some staked everything upon one single great objective; others varied their goals from time to time, but goals there always were. A supplementary study of would-be suicides showed that life becomes intolerable to those who can find nothing to aim at, no goal to seek.¹

Human nature is purposive; God constituted it so, as an indispensable condition of man's attainment of holiness. In order to attain God as his natural and proper ultimate end, man must deliberately choose to attain God, out of the pure love in his heart for God. He must purposively direct his life in the path of *right*—the path that leads to ultimate union with God. Although God has indeed provided him with the indispensable means to his attainment of union with the Divine as his ultimate end, nevertheless, it is man's part to willingly and purposefully utilize those necessary means; otherwise, he will fall short of attainment. Man cannot travel in two directions at the same time; he cannot serve both God and Mammon. God has graciously provided the means whereby man may preserve himself in existence physically, and the means also whereby he may be reconciled to his heavenly Father, enter into covenant relationship with Him, and grow thereafter in the grace and knowledge of Christ (2 Pet. 3:18)—the means whereby he may become a partaker of the Divine Nature by living the life of the Spirit. But man must, in turn, accept those gracious provisions and utilize them to his own growth in holiness and ultimate attainment of the Life Everlasting. Thus God and man, grace and faith, working together in covenant relationship, in holy fellowship, effect the latter's redemption from the guilt, and ultimately from the consequences, of sin, that is, from mortality itself (2 Cor. 5:4). Hence the Apostle admonishes us as follows: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2:12-13). "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (John 3:16). But of what value is this priceless Gift to man, if man refuses to accept

1. G. W. Allport, *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*, 219. Vide C. Buhler, *Der menschliche Lebenslauf als psychologisches Problem*, 1933.

Him? Not even Omnipotence can compel men to love Him; that must come freely from their own hearts. As Lecomte du Nouy says:

It is clear that God abdicated a portion of his omnipotence when he gave man liberty of choice. Man—according to the second chapter of Genesis, and to our hypothesis—possesses a real independence, willed by God, and which becomes, in the human species, the tool of selection. It is no longer the strongest, the most agile, the fittest physically who must survive, but the best, the most evolved morally. The new supremacy can only manifest itself in man if man is free to choose his path. This is, therefore, an apparent limitation of the omnipotence of the Creator, consented to by Him in order to bestow freedom upon the chosen species, so as to impose a final test. Having been endowed with conscience, man has acquired an independence of which he must show himself to be worthy, under pain of regressing toward the beast.

As we shall see later, this self-determination, self-direction, purposiveness, characteristic of spirit in man, is also characteristic of Spirit in God.

Finally, the power of the human spirit, evident in every people in every age of human history, to apprehend and to enjoy such intrinsic realities as Truth, Beauty, Goodness and Love, points unmistakably to the Spirit of God, in whom such realities, such values, if they exist at all—and they surely do, otherwise the human race would have destroyed itself long ago—must have their source and being. The Eternal Spirit Himself is in the fullest sense of all these terms Truth, Beauty, Goodness and Love. Our God is Himself Love, and He is Spirit.

John 4:24 [the words of Jesus]: God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth. John 14:6 [again the words of Jesus]: I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me. 1 John 4:8—He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love.

In this manner do we reason from the human spirit, the image of God, to the Divine Spirit, very God. The attributes and powers of the human spirit become clear intimations to us of the attributes and powers of the Divine Spirit. And the Divine Spirit becomes knowable to us in terms of the potencies of the human spirit. Then, turning to the Scriptures, we find the voice of reason and experience corroborated, as is always the case, by the testimony of revelation. Nature and revelation are never contradictory.

2. The Triune Personality of God

Our approach to the study of Spirit in God, as that subject

1. *Human Destiny*, 197.