

We have the prophetic word made more sure: Natural Theology, Hermeneutics and *Sola Scriptura*.

© 2023 Daniel H Chew

How does man come to know God? Since God is God, infinitely above us creatures, there is simply no way for Man to know God with his own intellect and strength (WCF 7.1a). God must reveal Himself to us in order to make Himself known. According to Scripture, God made Himself known through the world (Psa. 9:1-4, Rom. 1:19-20), and through Scripture (Psa. 119, 2 Tim. 3:16-17, Heb. 1:1). The former is normally termed *General Revelation*, defined as the revelation from God that is “general, perceptible as such, and intelligible to every human,”¹ or “those active manifestations to the perception and consciousness of man which come to him in the constitution of the human mind, in the whole framework of nature, and in the course of God’s providential government.”² General Revelation is in things, not words.³ *Special Revelation* on the other hand is God’s special revelation to us in his “works and words,”⁴ codified into the written word the Scriptures.⁵ General Revelation is imprecise, inadequate, “uncertain, consistently mingled with error,” and its contents “for far and away the majority of people unattainable.”⁶ Thus, it should come as no surprise that General Revelation is fit only to condemn sinners (Rom. 1:19-23), not to reveal anything else but the wrath of the eternal God against their wickedness.

The Reformed tradition therefore has for the most part focused her attention on Special Revelation, as infallibly codified in the Scriptures. The heirs of the Reformers focus on the Scriptures and the reading of the Word of God. This has led to great learning and knowledge of the Scriptures. Historically however, Evangelicalism has fragmented into multiple diverse groups. This has led some to question whether the Reformers were correct to focus on Scripture for the Christian faith, of which sociologist Christian Smith in his book *The Bible Made Impossible* is merely one of the more recent to voice out this discomfort.⁷

Alongside this discomfort over the seeming fragmentation of Evangelicalism is the new *ressourcement* movement entering the Reformed and Evangelical mainstream.

¹ Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics – Volume 1: Prolegomena* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003), 310.

² Louis Berkhof, “Introductory Volume to Systematic Theology,” 129, in Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology: New Combined Edition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996). Also “the view that God has revealed himself through what he has made” [Michael Horton, *The Christian Faith: A Systematic Theology for Pilgrims on the Way* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011), 139], “what God makes known of himself through creation” [Robert Letham, *Systematic Theology* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2019), 55]

³ Berkhof, “Introductory,” 128

⁴ Letham, 62

⁵ Bavinck, 1.324; Heb. 1:1; WCF 1.1

⁶ Bavinck, 1.313

⁷ Christian Smith, *The Bible Made Impossible: Why Biblicalism is Not a truly Evangelical Reading of Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2011, 2012).

Borrowing from the post-Vatican II *ressourcement* impetus,⁸ and fueled by the work of historical theologian Richard Muller,⁹ a new generation of scholars has risen which aim to recover what they believe to be the historical legacy of the Church.¹⁰ As opposed to the Reformation which focused on recovering the Scriptures, this *ressourcement* aim to recover what they hold to be “pro-Nicene” orthodoxy and “Great Tradition exegesis.”

It is along this trajectory that Jordon Steffaniak, co-founder of the website *The London Lyceum*,¹¹ wrote an article for *Modern Reformation* arguing for the use of Natural Theology in reading and interpreting Scripture.¹² Steffaniak’s main point is that there is an errant view of *Sola Scriptura* within Evangelism, a “disordered variation,” called “biblicism.”¹³ As opposed to “biblicism,” the correct view of *Sola Scriptura* is one that must utilize external sources like Natural Theology as a guide to understand Scripture, although Scripture remains the “supreme source” of the Christian faith.¹⁴

Steffaniak contrasts what he claims to be the true *Sola Scriptura* with biblicism’s supposed distorted view of *Sola Scriptura*. But is Steffaniak’s contrast legitimate? How does one rightly interpret the Scriptures? Before we look at that however, we need to examine Steffaniak’s view of “Natural Theology,” which he asserts to be essential for reading the Scriptures.

What is Natural Theology?

According to Steffaniak, Herman Bavinck posits a difference between “natural theology” and “supernatural theology.” Accordingly, Steffaniak asserts that Bavinck distinguish “natural theology” as that “which is ‘through’ the natural order, whereas supernatural theology is ‘from beyond’ the natural order.”¹⁵ “Natural Theology” is thus

⁸ Jürgen Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie— New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II* (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 201). “The *ressourcement* was “guided by a return to the Latin and especially the Greek Fathers of the church . . . employ[ing] a spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures.” [James C. Livingston and Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought: The Twentieth Century* (2nd ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000, 2006), 249]

⁹ Richard Muller’s work in historical theology revolutionised the field of historical theology in the Reformation and Post Reformation era, as seen in his magnum opus *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics* (4 volumes; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2003).

¹⁰ Some examples are seen in Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004); James Dolezal, *All that is in God: Evangelical Theology and the Challenge of Classical Christian Theism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage, 2017); Craig Carter, *Interpreting Scripture with the Great Tradition: Recovering the Genius of Premodern Exegesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2018)

¹¹ “About the London Lyceum,” *London Lyceum*. Accessed Feb 6, 2023, <https://www.thelondonlyceum.com/about/>

¹² Jordan Steffaniak, “Everything in Nature Speaks about God: Understanding *Sola Scriptura* Alright,” *Modern Reformation* 31:3 (May/ June 2022): 35-45

¹³ *Ibid.*, 37

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 42

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 38

stated by Steffaniak to be “the knowledge of God *through* his creation,”¹⁶ a revelation necessary for interpreting Scripture. The specific means of “natural theology” are then said to be intuition, tradition and creeds and confessions.¹⁷

When Steffaniak’s sources are analyzed however, things are not what they seem. Bavinck distinguished between supernatural *revelation* in nature and that above nature, not natural and supernatural *theology*.¹⁸ According to Bavinck, while the “Reformers indeed assumed a revelation of God in nature,” “the human mind was so darkened by sin that human beings could not rightly know and understand this revelation.”¹⁹ This stance on Natural Theology is reflected in Franciscus Junius’ *De Vera Theologia*, Steffaniak’s third source.²⁰ Natural Theology is thus invalidated as a valid means for fallen humanity to truly know God.²¹ Rather, it is supernatural revelation that is the way by which Man can know God. This supernatural revelation is indeed expressed in nature, in the works of God in creation and covenant, but nowhere did Bavinck state that such is one accessible to Man through his reason.²² The direction of supernatural revelation even in nature is one from God to Man, not from Man thinking towards God. Against Steffaniak’s reading that Francis Turretin hold that “supernatural revelation, rather than destroying natural revelation, ‘perfects it’ and makes it clearer,” the context makes it clear that Turretin was speaking of the relation between reason and faith in judgment of doctrinal matters,²³ not that there is a natural revelation accessible to Man that Scripture perfects.²⁴

By conflating “revelation in nature” with “natural theology,” Steffaniak misunderstands what the Reformed tradition understands by “natural theology.” Historically, the Reformed tradition states with Bavinck that “objectively needed by human beings to understand the general revelation of God in nature was the special revelation of God in Holy Scripture.”²⁵ Thus, Scripture is the ground to interpret “natural theology.” Over time, “Natural theology” in the Reformed tradition, became reduced to the theistic

¹⁶ *Ibid.* Or, more specifically, “The task of utilizing natural means via our renewed reason (i.e., the light of nature) in service of theological construction under the authority of Scripture, the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and the context of the church.” (Jordan Steffaniak, “Natural Theology and the Uneasy Conscience of Modern ‘Calvinism,’” *The London Lyceum*, July 10, 2022. Accessed Feb 6, 2023, <https://www.thelondonlyceum.com/natural-theology-and-the-uneasy-conscience-of-modern-calvinism/>)

¹⁷ Steffaniak, “Sola Scriptura,” 38-9

¹⁸ The mode of supernatural revelation in nature is supernatural, not natural as in natural revelation, as the context shows. See Herman Bavinck, *Reformed Dogmatics* (ed. John Bolt, trans. John Vriend; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic: MI, 2003), 1:307

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 1:304

²⁰ Franciscus Junius, *A Treatise on True Theology* (trans. David C. Noe; Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage, 2014), 159-160

²¹ Bavinck, 1.303-7, Junius, 145-58

²² Bavinck, 1.307-8

²³ Francis Turretin, *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (ed. James T. Dennison, trans. George Musgrave Giger; Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1994), 1:30–31

²⁴ This is not to deny that Turretin affirms Natural Theology; he did (Turretin, 1: 6-8). Rather, he did not do so in the passage cited by Steffaniak. Turretin’s notion of “Natural Theology” combines both what we call “natural theology” and “natural law,” and therefore is not helpful for the current discussion.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.304

proofs, as seen in Geerhardus Vos' book *Natural Theology* in Questions 2 and 15.²⁶ Thus, as aptly summarized by Robert Letham, "general revelation differs from natural theology. *General Revelation* refers to what God makes known of himself through creation. ... *natural theology*, as it is called, refers to attempts by humans to argue for the existence and nature of God based on what is known or observed in creation and providence."²⁷

It is this misunderstanding of "Natural Theology" that leads to one of Steffaniak's confusion: that of accidents of revelation with revelation itself. Steffaniak asserts that in reading Scripture, we need "other aids, even as simple as basic rational capacities to hear, read, and understand."²⁸ Of course for humans, eyes are necessary to read words off a page, or ears to hear the preaching of a sermon. But that has nothing to do with the revelation itself. That these are needed for reading Scripture has nothing to do with whether there is "natural theology" in the same way as the sun continuing to shine (so that we have energy from the sun and can live) proves the need for "natural theology"!²⁹

On the term "biblicism"

Steffaniak misunderstands the Reformed tradition's view on Natural Theology. What can we say about the term "biblicism" however?

In using a term, a good principle to abide by is to use the terms according to how the term has been previously used. The term "biblicism" is most probably coined, though most certainly popularized, by church historian David Bebbington. Written in 1989, Bebbington's magisterial work *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain*³⁰ was well received and revolutionized the story of Evangelicalism (capital "E") as a distinct movement with its beginnings in 18th century Great Britain.³¹ To capture the essence of Evangelicalism, Bebbington invented his famous Quadrilateral, where Evangelicalism is marked by the four points of conversionism, activism, biblicism and crucicentrism.³²

²⁶ Geerhardus Vos, *Natural Theology* (trans. Albert Gootjes; Grand Rapids, MI: Reformation Heritage, 2022), 1, 6

²⁷ Letham, 55

²⁸ Steffaniak, "Sola Scriptura," 43

²⁹ Steffaniak's argument is similar to the one made by George Mavrodes, in George I. Mavrodes, "Revelation and Epistemology," in Gordon H. Clark, *The Words of Gordon Haddon Clark, Volume 7* (Unicoi, TN: Trinity Foundation, 2009), 224-5

³⁰ D. W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (New York, NY: Taylor and Francis; 2005. Kindle Edition)

³¹ On the reception of Bebbington's work, see Timothy Larson, "The Reception given *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain* since its publication in 1989," in Michael A.G. Haykin and Kenneth J. Stewart, eds., *The Advent of Evangelicalism: Exploring Historical Continuities* (Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2008), 21-36

³² "There are the four qualities that have been the special marks of Evangelical religion: conversionism, the belief that lives need to be changed; activism, the expression of the gospel in effort; biblicism, a particular regard for the Bible; and what may be called crucicentrism, a stress on the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Together they form a quadrilateral of priorities that is the basis of Evangelicalism" (Bebbington, 2-3)

Reading through Bebbington's work, "biblicism" is stated to be the belief that "all spiritual truth is to be found in" the pages of Scripture, that the Bible can be clearly understood,³³ and that creeds and confessions and systematic thought are minimized in favor of the explicit teachings of Scripture.³⁴ We can therefore state a working definition of biblicism according to Bebbington as follows:

Bebbington's Biblicism: A view of the Bible that (1) all spiritual truths are found in the Bible, (2) the Bible is clearly understood, (3) creeds, confessions, and systematic thought are less important or unimportant compared to the explicit teachings of Scripture.

According to Steffaniak however, biblicism is defined as follows:³⁵

Steffaniak's "Biblicism": Scripture is authoritative for all concepts of God (and any other theological locus such as morality, anthropology, etc.). Therefore, theological commitments must emerge from Scripture alone and be consistent with Scripture. Intuition, creed, confession, tradition, or any other source is incompatible with the supremacy of the Scriptures.

We see immediately that Steffaniak's definition asserts a more negative assessment of the creeds, confessions and traditions in historic Christianity than Bebbington's definition. Steffaniak also attacks a modified version of "biblicism," which he defines below:

Steffaniak's "Temporal Biblicism": Scripture is authoritative for all concepts of God (and any other theological locus such as morality, anthropology, etc.). Therefore, theological commitments must emerge from Scripture first and be consistent with Scripture. Intuition, creed, confession, tradition, or any other source is incompatible with the supremacy of the Scriptures if they are understood temporally prior to Scripture.³⁶

The commonality behind Steffaniak's "biblicism" and "temporal biblicism" evidently is the refusal to grant independent authority to what Steffaniak holds to be "Natural Theology." This is clear since "temporal biblicism" is open to the authority of creeds and confessions and church traditions insofar as they are biblical. All of these have nothing to do with how "biblicism" is used by Bebbington, and it is rather illustrative that Steffaniak does not once reference Bebbington at all in his article.

Instead of Bebbington, Steffaniak references Christian Smith as a support against "hard biblicism."³⁷ Steffaniak's version of "biblicism" thus seem more tied to the American Reformed cultural context rather than a scholarly examination of the topic. Given that Smith's thesis is that even Reformed confessionalism is guilty of biblicism

³³ *Ibid.*, 12

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 143. See also David W. Bebbington, "Response," in Haykin and Stewart, eds., 427

³⁵ Steffaniak, "Sola Scriptura," 37

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 40

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 39

and that anyone who holds that the Scripture is inerrant and sufficient is a “biblicist,” it is a misrepresentation of Smith’s position to argue that Smith is merely against “hard biblicism.”³⁸

The American Reformed cultural context, in its rejection of Evangelicalism, legitimate or otherwise, has latched onto the idea that Evangelicalism is guilty of distorting the work of theology through its rejection of historic Christian tradition. Called *Solo Scriptura*, modern Evangelicalism’s view on Scripture absent of the historic creeds and confessions of the faith is decried as a bastardization of the Reformed doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*.³⁹ On the relation of Scripture and tradition, Keith Matthison, building upon the work of Heiko Oberman and Alister McGrath, has delineated 4 views on the topic, of which *Solo Scriptura* is termed “Tradition 0.”⁴⁰ Tradition 0 is contrasted with Tradition 1, which is argued to be the historic Reformed position and which holds to the validity of Tradition as the *regula fidei* (rule of faith), but its content is essentially what the Scripture teaches. Matthison argues that a reaction to the Roman Catholic view of Tradition 2 (Scripture and Tradition are both sources of authority) first in Anabaptism and then in individualistic Evangelicalism has resulted in the formation of Tradition 0.

In comparison to Bebbington’s work on the history of Evangelicalism, we can agree that Bebbington’s “biblicism” is indeed a form of Tradition 0. However, we note that Tradition 1 does not grant an independent authority to any source of authority. Steffaniak’s “temporal biblicism” therefore, which allows for the authority of creeds and confessions in a subordinate position, is compatible with Tradition 1, and therefore should not be termed “biblicism” at all. In fact, I would argue that Steffaniak’s “temporal biblicism” is merely the historic view of *Sola Scriptura*, and that Steffaniak’s article is an attack on *Sola Scriptura* for a view that could conceivably be called Tradition 1.5.

The supposed problems with “biblicism”

Nevertheless, let us accept Steffaniak’s definition of “biblicism” for the sake of argument. In his assault against “biblicism,” Steffaniak arrayed several arguments against it. Steffaniak’s first point is to utilize Christian Smith’s book to argue that “hard biblicism” is not possible, and therefore “it is unfeasible to derive any theological concept from Scripture without a secondary means apart from Scripture.”⁴¹ I have earlier stated that Smith’s argument is not against “hard biblicism” but against anyone who holds to the inerrancy and sufficiency of Scripture, therefore if Smith is correct, Steffaniak’s proposal is likewise errant. But what about Smith’s argument? Smith’s

³⁸ Christian Smith, *The Bible Made Impossible: Why Biblicism is Not a Truly Evangelical Reading of Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2011, 2012), 14, 186. For a review of Smith’s book, see Daniel H. Chew, “Babel babble: A Review of *The Bible Made Impossible* by Christian Smith,” *Reformed Energies*. Accessed 6 Feb 2023, https://puritanreformed.net/reviews/TheBibleMadeImp_Review.pdf.

³⁹ Keith A. Matthison, *The Shape of Sola Scriptura* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 2001; Kindle Edition)

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Steffaniak, “Sola Scriptura,” 39

main argument is that “biblicism” is false because many people interpret Scripture differently even while claiming to follow Scripture (pervasive interpretative pluralism).⁴² But as I have argued in my review, not all who call themselves “Evangelical” hold to *Sola Scriptura*, so how can the doctrine be blamed for the practice of its non-adherents? Secondly from church history, the New Evangelical experiment since the 1950s have broadened the boundaries of “Evangelicalism” to such an extent that many who call themselves “Evangelical” today cannot be truly called “Evangelical” if judged by older standards of doctrine, broadening the movement towards spiritual disaster.⁴³ Lastly, whatever differences remains between Bible believers is mostly a difference in theology not of exegesis, as seen in the common acceptance of biblical commentaries from believers of diverse denominations.⁴⁴ In summary, Smith’s arguments against “biblicism” are flawed and therefore Steffaniak’s case against any supposed “hard biblicism” is invalid.

One of Steffaniak’s major points is to accuse “biblicism” as tending towards doctrinal heterodoxy in the case of theologians K. Scott Oliphant and Bruce Ware, who both have voiced disagreements with aspects of Classical Theism⁴⁵ But even if it is granted that Oliphant and Ware are heterodox, that says nothing about whether “biblicism” is correct or wrong. Thomas Aquinas is regularly promoted by many in the Reformed *ressourcement* group, so by that standard would these Reformed theologians agree that all who are attempting *ressourcement* are necessarily tainted by Roman Catholicism?

Against “temporal biblicism,” Steffaniak argues that the presence of the Holy Spirit as the *principium cognoscendi internum* (the internal principle of knowing) precludes temporal biblicism. But this confuses the necessity of the Holy Spirit (an ontological necessity for the act of knowing) with the epistemic act of knowing itself, not to mention that the Holy Spirit is hardly “natural theology,” neither is the necessity of His presence denied by any serious evangelical Christian. Steffaniak elsewhere continues to conflate *revelation* and *theology*, confusing *revelation in nature* with *natural theology*, and supernatural revelation with supernatural theology.

***Sola Scriptura* and Scripture as the only independent authority**

Finally, we arrive at the flashpoint of *Sola Scriptura*, which Steffaniak defines as:

⁴² Smith, 17. Note that Smith likewise give his own idiosyncratic definition of “biblicism.”

⁴³ Iain Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided: A Record of Crucial Change in the Years 1950 to 2000* (Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth, 2000); Also see Richard Quebedeaux, *The Worldly Evangelicals* (New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1978); Richard Quebedeaux, *The Young Evangelicals: The Story of the Emergence of a New Generation of Evangelicals* (New York NY: Harper & Row, 1974); Francis Schaeffer, *The Great Evangelical Disaster* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1984)

⁴⁴ Chew. This is not to argue that there are absolutely no differences in interpretation, but rather that there are no major differences in basic exegeses.

⁴⁵ Steffaniak, “*Sola Scriptura*,” 40

Sola Scriptura: Scripture is authoritative for all concepts of God. Therefore, theological commitments must be consistent with Scripture. Intuition, creed, confession, tradition, and any other source is complementary to the magisterial rule of the Scriptures. They function as derivatively authoritative ministerial guides to right interpretation.⁴⁶

All parties agree that *Sola Scriptura* holds that Scripture is the ultimate authority of the faith.⁴⁷ The dispute is over the relation of Scripture with tradition and other sources of authority (where valid).

As opposed to Tradition 0, Tradition 1, the view of the Reformed Tradition, does allow for subordinate authority of tradition, creeds and confessions. However, as Matthison points out, tradition in Tradition 1 has the same content as Scripture. In that sense, Scripture alone seems to be the only independent authority, since tradition is not independent from Scripture.

The question is raised for Steffaniak and those in the *ressourcement* camp how Scripture can function as the ultimate authority if there is a necessary interpretative component (e.g. intuition, tradition, creeds and confessions) with its own separate authority that functions independent of it. After all, if a necessary component for interpretation of Scripture is not found in Scripture, then Scripture is not the ultimate authority. Rather, Scripture plus whatever the necessary component is together are that ultimate authority. That brings us closer to Tradition 2, the Tridentine Roman Catholic view. The *regula fidei* according to Matthison has the same content as Scripture, which means that everything in it can be proven by Scripture, and the reason why we use the *regula fidei* is because we generally do not want to reinvent the theological wheel every single time.

Steffaniak's position of *Sola Scriptura* therefore is not the Protestant view of *Sola Scriptura*. By making "Natural Theology" a quasi-independent authority needed for Scripture interpretation, it shifts the church closer to Tradition 2, in a move away from the Reformation instead of closer to it, a position that looks like Tradition 1.5.

Conclusion

How does one come to know God? The Reformation brought us back to the Scriptures as the only means we can truly know God in truth and in grace. The Reformed tradition initially retained parts of Natural Theology, but slowly and surely natural theology wilted away as the consistent Reformed teaching about sin and revelation worked out in the churches. Presuppositionalism in the 20th century marked the death of Natural

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 42

⁴⁷ Matthison; Steffaniak, "Sola Scriptura," 42

Theology, as both Cornelius Van Til⁴⁸ and Gordon Clark⁴⁹ effectively removed it from the field of battle. By the beginning of the 21st century, “Natural Theology” was gone from most of the Reformed churches.

Sadly, “Natural Theology” has made a comeback, partly from those who seem to prefer to do theology proper without having to wrestle with Scripture.⁵⁰ The return of “natural theology” and an improper and ahistorical attack on “biblicism” has lured believers away from the authority of Scripture. All of that has the effect of eroding the believer’s trust in reading Scripture. If “natural theology” is necessary for understanding Scripture on the issue of God, perhaps “natural theology” should be necessary for understanding Scripture on sin, or salvation, or whatever the doctrine one wants to modify. The fox is let loose into the henhouse, under the guise of “theological retrieval.”

It is with this thought that Steffaniak’s thesis has to be utterly rejected, along with his redefinition of *Sola Scriptura*. Heirs of the Reformation hold strictly to the sole independent and ultimate authority of the Scriptures, even while we hold to secondary derived authorities which we do use. But if something cannot be defended according to Scripture but must be defended solely by a creed, either (1) we interpret Scripture badly, (2) the creed is wrong, or both. If Scripture is to be supreme in authority, it must be always supreme in faith and life, not only when it suits our confessional tradition and preferences.

The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God will stand forever.
(Is. 40:8)

⁴⁸ Cornelius Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology: Prolegomena and the Doctrine of Revelation, Scripture, and God* (2nd Ed.; ed. William Edgar; Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974, 2007), 179-81. But note how Van Til’s argument for a “transcending” of natural theology is not necessarily a rejection of natural theology, and this is how Lane Tipton has interpreted him [Lane Tipton, “The Deeper Protestant Conception of Natural Theology,” *Reformed Forum* (Fall/ Winter 2022): 3-13]

⁴⁹ Ronald H. Nash, “Gordon Clark’s Theory of Knowledge,” in Gordon H. Clark, *The Works of Gordon Haddon Clark, Volume 7* (Unicoi, TN: Trinity Foundation): 121-4

⁵⁰ David Haimes, *Natural Theology: A Biblical and Historical Introduction and Defense* (Landrum, SC: The Davenant Press, 2021), 12, 168