

ANAIKAINOSIS

Volume Four, No.2

December, 1981

Vollenhoven, Dooyeweerd and Law - A Rejoinder

by Michael M. Morbey

Astute *Anaikainosis* readers can hardly have failed to detect the superabundance of *ad hominem* argumentation and loaded rhetoric directed my way by Anthony Tol in his emotional article, "Vollenhoven, Dooyeweerd and Law" (*Anaikainosis* 111:4 June 1981). I wonder whether it would even be possible to engage in fruitful scholarly discourse in the face of opposition such as this, but the seriousness of the matter for the reformational Christian community constrains me at least to try.

Tol is the one, not I, who confuses Idea with reality by treating Vollenhoven's merely *intentional* Wetsidee as concrete truth discernible in Scripture, even to the point of asserting that Law really does have some sort of independent existence apart from God "out there." The fact that he is willing to admit an implied logical analysis of the Holy Trinity so far removed from Biblical truth that it is nothing short of speculative heresy, should be ample warning that he is on very shaky ground indeed. Granted, various strands of Law may be intentionally abstracted out of creational coherence as a Wetsidee, for purposes of analysis. But, as the Toronto version of the Law-Word metaphysics would strongly insist, the alleged "Law" must exist in the real world as an *integral totality* in which the various metaphysical, ethical, and religious components should not be scholastically played off over against each other to casuistic advantage. It would be a gross misunderstanding of theoretical dialectics to suppose that ambiguous juggling of the various meanings of Law compressed in a Wetsidee could yield a genuine solution of the classical theosophical and reformational problem, namely, the contemplation of God, not as He is in Himself, but as He is in His relation to creation.

"Through various editions of the *Isagogie*," observes Henk Hart in his masterful paper, "On the Distinction between Creator and Creature," "one can see Vollenhoven struggle with this very difficult matter. His formulations change and as time goes on he writes less and less on this problem."¹ Although Vollenhoven had been writing less and less, some of the North American Reformationals were writing more and more, downplaying Dooyeweerd and boosting Vollenhoven in favour of what came to be known (unbeknown

to Tol) as the “Toronto position on the Word.”² This position posited a “third thing” between Creator and creation, and generated considerable controversy and literature particularly during the 1970’s. Vollenhoven’s role as a prime mover was so poorly recognized by opponents on this side of the Atlantic, that Robert A. Morey launched his 1974 attack under the misleading title, *The Dooyeweerdian Concept of the Word of God*.³ Already, much earlier, a Vollenhoven-Runner formulation had set the stage by claiming that “the law, which is the boundary between God and cosmos is neither divine being nor created. It is with God and cosmos, a third mode of being. God creates the cosmos, puts the Law. The Law’s mode of existence is a ‘holding for,’ an ‘obtaining for,’ a ‘being valid for’”⁴

Notice the similarity in pattern and even in terminology of the Vollenhoven-Runner Idea of Law (God/Law-Word/Cosmos) to a neo-Kantian pattern.⁵ A much more Biblical formulation is to be found in the canonical Byzantine/Orthodox theology of St. Gregory Palamas which also distinguishes the *creation of the cosmos* from the *putting of the Law* but interprets the verbal “putting” not as an objectified and reified, monarchian “third mode of being” but as “God putting,” i.e., as the *dynamic immanent presence in Grace* of the transcendent Triune God in His Uncreated Energies and Light (Byzantine Law-Words). This procession or manifestation (____) of God in His Uncreated Energies would shine forth even were there no creation. Orthodox tradition “recognizes no distinction, or rather division, save that between the created and the uncreated....”⁶

Jim Olthuis has explained to me that the reformational God- (Law-) Word-creation distinction is merely an attempt to safeguard the Scriptural Creator-creature distinction in a philosophical conceptual scheme in which God would not become far removed from His creation (dualistically) or lost in His creation (monistically). It was introduced into reformational circles by Vollenhoven, although Jim is of the opinion that it is not absent from Dooyeweerd. So far, however, I have never found any clear documentary evidence that Dooyeweerd ever conceived of Law as a “third thing.” His introduction to the 1973 *Philosophia Reformata* essays in honour of Vollenhoven (to which Tol refers) is not at all decisive in this regard. At a certain point in his *New Critique* he does seem to argue that the Law is both other than God and other than creation, since law “is necessarily related to a subject, is thus relative and consequently cannot be the absolute Ἀρχή of meaning.”⁷ But the “third thing” here may be nothing more than an artifact intruding during rational argumentation, when, as Henk Hart suggests in connection with Nicholas Wolterstorff’s *On Universals*, the temptation to rational autonomy urges logical necessity to unbiblically exceed its created limits.⁸

Among the ancients, rationality was commonly expressed in terms of the ascent and descent, in which intellectual detachment passes over into contemplation absorbed in experience of coherence and totality before the face of the Origin. Though not a stranger to detachment himself,⁹ St. Paul rejected all attempts of the mystery religions and philosophies of his day to construct genuine ultimates or even find personal salvation through such “ecstatic reason.”¹⁰ Humanistic ascent or descent applied in this manner can be no more than Law righteousness, mere “metaphysical soteriology.” Genuine Salvation and all ultimate connection and coherence is given by Grace. It is to be found by faith in Christ alone, the only One Who has truly descended and ascended.¹¹ Yet, history abounds with examples of self-deified rationality’s productive penchant for establishing ultimate causes and connections in its own right. C.S. Lewis speaks of the Law of the Triad (perhaps one with the Principle of Plenitude) most clearly stated in Plato (*Timaeus*) and “assumed in the assertion of the *Symposium* that god does not meet man.... We shall find Plato himself, and the medievals, endlessly acting on their principle;

supplying bridges as it were, 'third things'--between reason and appetite, soul and body, king and commons."¹²

A genuinely critical Christian philosophy will recognize the presence of a "third thing" as pathognomonic of a gnostic system. Vollenhovenians who agree with Tol that the reformational movement would "miss what must be counted as one of the most central moments of biblical revelation and man's historical response to it" if it were to "argue away or reject any and all 'third things' between God and His creation," would do well to look again and to heed the Biblical Wisdom and warning of that early Reformational, Vollenhoven's teacher, Herman Bavinck, who wrote, "...In God there can be nothing which is other than or less than God. Between Creator and creature there is no transition or half-way station. Either Father, Son, and Spirit are all equal in essence and very God, or else they are creatures. From the Christian point of view there is no third possibility.... The O.T. offers no trace of this dualism. In the O.T. "word" and "wisdom" are not viewed as intermediaries between God and the world, but stand wholly on the side of divinity. They pertain to God and are the originating causes of the created universe. In Philo the mediating entities are self-contradictory. They are neither divine nor human, neither persons nor attributes, neither independent substances nor energies, but they partake of the nature of both. They indicate that the boundary-line which in the O.T. always separates the creature from the Creator has been erased, and pave the way for the philosophy of Gnosticism and for the cabala."¹³

In the matter of National Socialism, Tol apparently did not recognize that I was not speaking of a full-blown *Schöpfungsordnungen* theory but merely suggesting that, with the introduction of a "third thing," cosmological philosophy cannot help but be forced back into the *spiritual direction* of the 19th century idealistic ideas of organic total-unity and becoming out of which Abraham Kuyper and Bavinck had wrought their original Antirevolutionary reformation. Recall that Kuyper had taken up the political task of Groen van Prinsterer who was greatly influenced in his second period after 1850 by the Lutheran legal philosopher, Friedrich Julius Stahl.¹⁴ Stahl had appealed in particular to the "positive philosophy" of Schelling¹⁵ who sought to solve the problem of the relation of God to creation by the method of *theosophy*.¹⁶ Schelling had become friendly to the mysticism of Jacob Boehme through the Roman Catholic theosophist, Franz von Baader, who had been stimulated by both Boehme and Boehme's French, occultist prophet, St. Martin.¹⁷ Kuyper himself confessed that he once had been tempted "to slide off into Baader's theosophic stream, entranced by its hypnotic spell and tempted by its ethical force."¹⁸

This murky milieu of Gnosticism and cabala, which Bavinck witnessed first-hand, and against which he contended,¹⁹ figured prominently in the rise of National Socialism understood in the sense of Eric Voegelin. "The National Socialist Third Realm..." writes Voegelin, "authentically derives from Joachimite speculation, mediated in Germany through the Anabaptist wing of the Reformation and through the Johannine Christianity of Fichte, Hegel and Schelling."²⁰ Dooyeweerd himself explicitly acknowledged and clearly warned about the inner connection of his Antirevolutionary background with this philosophico-religious occult stream of which National Socialism is, of course, just one of a number of modern transformations.^{21, 22} The Afrikaner-Puritan *Weltanschauung* is another transformation, very close to home for many Reformationals, in which various leaders, and the Broederbond in particular, draws from Kuyper himself, subverting Kuyper's reformational direction back to a fascist--and "national-socialist"--type view in which *sphere-sovereignty* is inverted into its opposite, *apartheid*.²³ More recently J.A.L. Taljaard has subverted the Vollenhovenian *Wetsidee* into the *apartheid* lie.²⁴ Here, Vollenhoven's Law-Word metaphysics, or at least its metaphysical component as Tol would have it, must unwittingly lend a helping hand as just another of the idealistic ideas

of total-unity from which fascisms are born. But, significantly, Taljaard acknowledges the strong debt of “ontic law” philosophy not to the Judeo-Christian tradition but to the demiurgic law tradition of Plato. “Ontic Law” is simply an accommodation of Platonic ideas to Calvinism.²⁵

Contrary to Tol’s evaluation of my position, I am well aware that the status of the Law-Idea, for Dooyeweerd, is never one of idealistic self-sufficiency. I could not have been more clear in stressing the complete creation-embeddedness of the Idea, not as *donum superadditum* infused, but in its mere created *meaning-character* incapable of seclusion. Moreover, I spoke, not of spiritualistic “identification,” but of Biblical assimilation and fulfillment also of the Idea, together with both Law and angels in the One (Galatians 3:19-20), as does Dooyeweerd with reference to Calvin who wrote, “and therefore He is above the laws, because He is the Law to Himself and to everything.”²⁶ God is the Law. Unpalatable as this may be to Tol, it is absolutely not at all a violent misrepresentation of Dooyeweerd’s position.

The Dooyeweerdian Law-Idea discovers the complete and only fulfillment of its *intention*, and its ultimate reference, not in a demiurgic, “third-thing” Law (metaphysical, ethical, or whatever), but in the living Lord of the Covenant Promise (Galatians 3:15-18), Jesus Christ Himself, Pantocrator, both God and man, the Word made flesh, the only link between Creator and creation through the Spirit of the Father. Any attempt to insert the Law as “boundary” between the Divine and the human (created) natures of Christ, even Law construed as “covenant” or “love,” would run contrary to the historic intention of our confession, “Who, although He is God and man, yet He is not two but one Christ” (Athanasian Creed, #34). The peculiar problem of whether the Law-Idea refers to the side of the Divine or to that which is created results from its intentional concentration on the Lord Who is both.²⁷

Apart from its inner connection with the long tradition of Christian contemplative mysticism and theosophy, the dynamic unfolding of the Dooyeweerdian cosmonomic Idea, indeed of any Dooyeweerdian Idea, cannot be grasped in its original intention. This structural state of affairs must more or less elude those of the Vollenhovenian school who reject the reality of the transcendental return inward to the supratemporal self, and who make a separation between science and religion. For Dooyeweerd science itself is religion.²⁸ Theoretical reflection is inescapably devotional. The cosmonomic order of the Law-spheres functions as a “ladder of contemplation” not only for naive religious self-reflection but also for scientific philosophy. In theosophic contemplation (*theoria*), the inter-modal meaning synthesis gives rise to a transcendental synthetical Idea (to be distinguished from a foundational concept) which is “in the full sense of the word, a *limiting concept* ‘par excellence,’ the final transcendental *foundation* or or ὑπόθεσις of philosophy, in which we retire into ourselves when thinking....”²⁹

Only as a Christian contemplative and reformational theosophist could Dooyeweerd write,³⁰ “In the *Idea* of a meaning-modus philosophical reflection oriented to our cosmonomic Idea passes through a process of successive meaning-coherences in the transcendental direction of time [the direction of the return inwards ‘towards the religious root of our cosmos, in which our selfhood participates in its transcendence beyond cosmic time’].³¹ The internal unrest of meaning drives it on from anticipatory sphere to anticipatory sphere,---and so from one anticipatory connection to another. At last we arrive at the transcendental terminal sphere [the faith function³²] of our cosmos and reflect on the insufficiency of the modal Idea [apophatic impossibility of an ‘adequate intuition of essence’³³]. We then direct our glance to the transcendent meaning-totality and the Origin, in which at last our thought finds rest *in its religious root.*”

The inadequacy of mere “Law” as the interpretative principle of Christian cultural action can be readily understood through reflection on the Cultural Mandate. As itself Law, the Cultural Mandate must be related to Gospel as Law is to Gospel—We are no longer subject to Law but under Grace (I Corinthians 9:19-23). We can no more perform the requirements of the Cultural Mandate of ourselves than we can depend on ourselves for Salvation. By Grace is the Cultural Mandate effected, through the living faith which issues in works. Calvary is therefore no mere parenthesis in world history, for it is here that Jesus has wrought the whole of the Mandate we failed in our first parents. Considered from the point of view of the fallen world, from the perspective of sin, the Way of the Cross is Salvation. But considered from God’s ultimate point of view, the Way of the Cross is THE CULTURAL ACTION PAR EXCELLENCE. As the life of perfect obedience to the *whole* of God’s Law, it entails perfect obedience also to the Cultural Mandate of which it must be an exemplary display. Any dualism posed between Salvation and the dynamics of creation is consequently absolutely unwarranted and unbiblical, and is rooted in sin. Life in its entirety is religion. Not the way of the Law which was nailed to the Cross, but simply the Way of the Cross itself, as revealed in Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, is the restoration of the true order of creation, the fulfillment of the Cultural Mandate, and the hope for the Glory that is to be. This restoration of nature by Grace is no mere repristination but the transfiguration in Christ of the whole creation into the Age to Come.

Notes and References

1. Hendrik Hart, *On the Distinction between Creator and Creature*, (Institute for Christian Studies, Feb., 1979, p. 1.) (Also in *Philosophia Reformata*, second issue of 1979).
2. Ibid.
3. For access to the literature see Robert A. Morey, *The Dooyeweerdian Concept of the Word of God*, (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974); Harry L. Downs, *The Distinction between “Power-Word” and “Text-Word” in Recent Reformed Thought*, (Nutley, N.J.: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974); and L. Kalsbeek, *Contours of a Christian Philosophy*, (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1975) (Bibliography selected by Dr. Bernard Zylstra).
4. Vollenhoven and Runner, *Syllabus for Philosophy 220: The History of Ancient Philosophy*, (1958-59, pp. 18, 19-20). See also H.E. Runner, *The Relation of the Bible to Learning*, (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1970, p. 53).
5. This neo-Kantian formulation has to do with the mediation of values. See H. Dooyeweerd, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co.), Volume I (1953), pp. 129-137, 132, 92-93, 76, 328-329. Compare Th. de Boer, *Beyond Being, Ontology and Eschatology in the Philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas* for comments on the “ethical” side of Vollenhoven’s problem of “boundary,” in *The Idea of a Christian Philosophy: Essays in Honour of D. H. Th.; Vollenhoven*, (Wedge, 1973); (*Philosophia Reformata*, 1973). But ontology, metaphysics, and ethics can no more be compartmentalized apart from each other than can facts and values, except in abstraction.
6. Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1976, ch. 4: “Uncreated Energies”). See also John

Meyendorff, *St. Gregory Palamas and Orthodox Spirituality*, (Crestwood, N.Y.:St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1974); Christos Yannaras, "Scholasticism and Technology," *Eastern Churches Review* 6: 162-169 (1974); Kallistos Ware, "God Hidden and Revealed: The Apophatic Way and the Essence-Energies Distinction" *Eastern Churches Review*, 7(2):12~135 (1975), and various critical papers on *Palamism Today* in *Eastern Churches Review* 9 (1-2) (1977).

7. *New Critique* I, p. 136.

8. Hendrik Hart, *op. cit.*

9. II Corinthians 12:1-10.

10. Deuteronomy 30:11-14, Romans 10:1-13, II Corinthians 10:1-6.

11. Ephesians 4:7-13.

12. C.S. Lewis, *The Discarded Image: An Introduction to Medieval and Renaissance Literature* (Cambridge University Press, 1964, 1976 reprint), pp. 41, 43-44, 56-57, 58, 72-73, 74, 79, 166.

13. Herman Bavinck, *The Doctrine of God*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977), pp. 261, 331.

14. H. Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture: Pagan, Secular, and Christian Options*, (Toronto: Wedge Publishing Foundation, 1979)[tr. John Kraay; eds. Mark Vander Vennen and Bernard Zylstra], pp. 51-52.

15. Herbert Marcuse, *Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory*, (New York: Humanities Press, 1963), p. 366.

16. W. Windelband, *A History of Philosophy*, (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1893, 1901), p. 616.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 618.

18. G.C. Berkouwer, *A Half Century of Theology*, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977)[trans. and ed. Lewis B. Smedes], pp. 196-197.

19. Examine Bavinck's many references in *The Doctrine of God*. Eric Voegelin provides an excellent introduction to this problem in *Science, Politics, and Gnosticism*, (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968, A Gateway Edition) [Two essays: "Science, Politics, and Gnosticism" (trans. William J. Fitzpatrick); "Ersatz Religion"].

20. Eric Voegelin, *The New Science of Politics*, (University of Chicago Press, 1952,1974), pp. 134, 113.

21. Herman Dooyeweerd, *In The Twilight of Western Thought*, (Nutley, N.J.: The Craig Press, 1975), pp. 76-77.

22. Herman Dooyeweerd, *Roots of Western Culture*, pp. 49-55, 187-188.

23. T. Dunbar Moodie, *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid, and the Afrikaner Civil Religion*, (University of California Press, 1975).
24. J.A.L. Taljaard, *Polished Lenses*, Potchefstroom: Pro Rege Press, 1976 (Available via Wedge), pp. 88, 118.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 30, 42-44.
26. *New Critique* I, p. 518, n.l.
27. *New Critique* I, pp. 99-100, 101; II, p. 563.
28. “Science and religion are no longer opposites in the light of the Calvinistic law-idea. For behold, science *is* religion (*Godsdienst*) in Christ Jesus, just as life in every law-sphere is equally service of Cod (*dienst van God*) in him who has prepared us for an eternal redemption from the power of sin, which is rebellion against Cod and his law.” From *Anakainosis* I: 4, June 1979 reprint of Excursus II of H. Dooyeweerd, ‘The Problem of Juridical Causality in the Light of the Law-Idea,’ (*Antirevolutionaire Staatkunde, Driemaandelijksch Orgaan* 2 (1928), 25-28).
29. *New Critique* II, pp. 434-435, 187-188; I, pp. 87-88.
30. *New Critique* II, p. 284.
31. *New Critique* II, pp. 53-54; I, pp. 31-32.[Dooyeweerdian contemplation is in the line of Calvin’s *meditatio coelestis* (or *futuræ*) *vitæ*. What Dooyeweerd says philosophically of time and the supratemporal, (Eastern) Orthodoxy experiences liturgically in regular worship. See Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, (Great Britain: The Faith Press / New York: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2nd ed., 1975) pp. 34-35, 57-58. Dooyeweerd was earlier under the influence of Edmund Husserl who referred his method of intentionality and reduction to the way of the mystics: “If we restrict ourselves to the pure phenomenology of cognition, then we will be concerned with the *essence of cognition as* revealed in direct “seeing”... “*Seeing cognition is that form of reason which sets itself the task of converting the understanding into reason...* Thus as little interpretation as possible, but as pure an intuition as possible (*intuitio sine comprehensione*). In fact, we will hark back to the speech of the mystics when they describe the intellectual seeing which is supposed not to be a discursive knowledge “ [Edmund Husserl, *The Idea of Phenomenology*, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964) (trans. William P. Alston and George Nakhnikian), pp. 43, 50]. Also, “I must lose the world by epoché, in order to regain it by a universal self-examination. “*Noli foras ire,*” says Augustine,” *in te redi, in interiore homine habitat veritas* “¹ [1Do not wish to go out; go back into yourself. Truth dwells in the inner man. *De Vera religione*, 39, n. 72] (Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977) (trans. Dorion Cairns), p. 157). Calvin said as much and much, much more (*Institutes* 1.5.3.).]
32. *New Critique* II, pp. 302-305.
33. *New Critique* II, pp. 485-487.

Postscript (some years later)

In the early days of the Reformational movement in North America “a Vollenhoven-Runner formulation had set the stage by claiming that “the law, which is the boundary between God and cosmos is neither divine being or created. It is with God and cosmos, a third mode of being. God creates the cosmos, puts the Law. The Law’s mode of existence is a ‘holding for,’ an obtaining for,’ a being valid for’...” (Michael M. Morbey, Vollenhoven, Dooyeweerd and Law – A Rejoinder, *Anakainosis* 4(2):8-15(Dec., 1981). I suggested in this article that it would be theologically more orthodox to view the Law not as an ontic “third thing” neither created nor divine between Creator and creation but rather as pointing to its fulfilment, Jesus Christ, Who is both God and man. A number of other Reformational publications in the 1980’s also point in this more Biblical direction. Gordon J. Spykman prefers a three-factor (God-[Law-]Word, Cosmos) to a two-factor (God and cosmos) world view, but points out that “This *relatio* (God, law, cosmos), rooted analogically in the covenantal Word of God, should not be construed as a third ontic reality, having an independent existence alongside God and the creation. It is rather the dynamic historical/trans-historical religious point-of-contact and interaction between the revealing God and responding mankind. As Vander Velde puts it, “The creaturely lifeline to the Creator is of a religious nature which runs via Golgotha and the empty tomb.” Viewing this *relatio* as religious in nature, rather than ontic, should not be construed, however, as rendering it less real than the metaphysical constructs developed by scholastic systems of thought” (Gordon Spykman, p.180 of A New Look at Election and Reprobation, in ed. Henry Vander Goot, Life is Religion Essays in Honor of H. Evan Runner, St. Catherines, Ont.,: Paideia Press, 1981). Even though Henk Hart speaks of the three realities of his “radical distinction” he nevertheless seems also to reject the need for any sort of ontic mediation between Creator and creation. Rather than speaking of a link neither created nor divine, he describes it as both created and divine. The three realities of the “radical distinction” thus can be collapsed into two, the created and the uncreated (Divine). This, of course, is a vast improvement over the old Reformational formulation

since it is an affirmation of the Incarnation, of the God-man both created and Divine Who is the Mediator. (Hendrik Hart, Understanding our World An Integral Ontology, Lanham/ New York/ London: University Press of America, 1984, Appendix: A Concluding Prescientific Postscript, pp.341-342). Al Wolters also, appears to exclude any “third mode of being” when he states in his paper on Dutch neo-Calvinism in eds., Hendrick Hart, Johan van der Hoeven, Nicholas Wolterstorff, Rationality in the Calvinian Tradition, Lanham/ London: University Press of America, 1983 (p. 121) that “creation” becomes the category for all that is not God, including the whole range of visible and invisible reality.” In his discussion of “Law” and the “Word” in Chapter 2 of his book Creation Regained Biblical basics for a Reformational World View, Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1985, he has done an admirable job of overcoming some of the earlier attempts of cosmological philosophers to come to grips with the Creator-creature distinction. Although he provides some good reasons (especially good to those who are oriented to the categories of the Reformed tradition) why “Law” is very serviceable as an all-embracing cosmic term with Scriptural foundations (pp.13-14), he nevertheless does not elevate Law to the status of some sort of neither-created-nor divine entity between Creator and creature. Rather, he suggests the possibility of other Scriptural equivalents including in particular the “Word.” He writes, “There is a sense in which Christ is the “mediator of creation”.....Christ is at the very center of god’s act of creation...The all-powerful upholding word of God is also the word of his Son. In short, Christ is intimately present in the whole range of what we are calling the law of creation. He is the mediator of both creation and re-creation” (p. 21).