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LAMENT

When waking, dazed we bow
from heavy hand
Whose weight is force benumbed
and ceaseless grief:
From hounding questions thrust
upon our frame
Which we before disdained
with careless minds,
Now thrust upon our breast
without relent.

For some it may be new,
this grim rebuke,
When what we grasped with ease
is torn and gone;
When he who made us grow--
we seldom knew
How much we owed a debt--
now leaves us 'lone.
For some it may be new
this bitter void.

He too knew bitter pangs,
the cost of care,
When from his own he stood
the thankless mock:
Without relenting gave
e'en that which burned.
If we were ones who knew
his constant probe
And from it writhed with pangs...
he'd gone before.

(continued on p. 2)
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He had gone before
had tasted wine
Too strong for most he knew:
he yielded not.
Faced sin as much as Grace--
the bold torment.
If we now see some light,
a path secure,
Think not it was alone
we thus obtained.

For all the saints who rest
from labors sore
We thank thee, Lord, anew
though sorrow bear.
By them we labor still
though more with ease
Because they faithful stood
their lot endured.
Through them and us we pray
thy name be praised.

*** * * ***

EDITORIAL

The staff of the opinion presents this issue in memory of and tribute to our late-departed friend and teacher Dr. Edward John Carnell. The poem by Richard Bower, titled simply "Lament," expresses much of the feeling of us all. Then follows an address given by Dr. Carnell in the Fall of 1964 at the seminary's Junior Retreat. Permission was granted to edit the speech in order to make it more suitable in literary form. The next three articles, by students, are condensations of papers written to fulfill the requirements for Dr. Carnell's courses in either Apologetics or Prolegomena. It should be noted in connection with these papers that they represent the student's views at the time they were written (as much as three years ago), and that they have been substantially shortened in order that their length might not preclude their publication in the opinion. Rounding out this memorial issue are appreciations of Dr. Carnell by his close friend and colleague Dr. Paul K. Jewett, and by his former students and colleagues, Dr. Calvin R. Schoonhoven and Mr. James P. Morgan Jr. A Bibliography of Dr. Carnell's works is appended.

Additional copies of this memorial issue of the opinion may be purchased for fifteen cents from any member of the opinion staff.

T. F. J.
NEW OPPORTUNITIES TO BROADEH YOUR OUTLOOK

By Dr. Carnell

Junior Retreat

September, 1964

'At that time, the disciples came to Jesus saying, 'Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven?' And calling to him a child, he put him in the midst of them, and said, 'Truly I say to you, unless you turn and become like children, you will never enter the Kingdom of heaven. For whoever humbles himself like this child, he is the greatest in the Kingdom of heaven.'"

Matthew 18:1-4

Let us look at four brief points. First of all, the very strange context for sin to appear. We may read the daily newspapers, and read of murder, fornication, and crimes that cause us to ask ourselves if there is any hope for this generation. But the sin before us in our text is a subtle one, for it was brought up by those who felt that they had inside information about the affairs of God and the Kingdom. They weren’t like the rabble who were confined to the mystery of parables (they had had summer Greek). Now within this group there arose this sin, which is with us always - just like the poor; the sin of the tendency of man to think of himself more highly than he ought. And so we know from the parallel passages that this was a dispute between the disciples. WHO was the greatest? Jesus isn’t even on the list. They have come to him to make the selection.

As we think of the new opportunities we have, let us remember - at least it was there the last time I read the Scriptures - that there is such a thing as humility. In other words, our temptation as we gather together as a company of those who are learning the things of the Kingdom of God, is consciously or unconsciously to raise the question, "Who is the greatest among us?" So beware of the sin of the pride of office - the pride of being entrusted with wisdom denied others.

Now in the second place, behold the beautiful manner in which our Lord dealt with this sin. He didn’t say, "You grumbling, sinful, contentious followers! And you think you have a right to be my disciples. Why the audacity of you to bring up this question!" Oh no. "What a friend we have in Jesus, all our sins and griefs to bear" - even the sin, and maybe especially the sin, of thinking more highly of ourselves than we ought. No, Jesus in his loving way, took himself, and put himself in their place. And without giving them a feeling of being unworthy to be his disciples, he made something very, very clear to them, and let’s make sure it is clear in our hearts. There is nothing wrong with being great. Even the angels bow down in worship to our Lord Jesus Christ. He attained greatness, but not on Hollywood’s standards - not on the standards of this world. "He who humbles himself will be exalted. If you want to become great, be nothing in yourself, and be all for and
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in me." The Lord says to them in reply to their question, as it were, "All right, you want to be great, go ahead and be great. But there is a right and a wrong way to be great. Make sure you chose the right."

This leads us to our third, and next to the last point. Jesus took a child and put the child in the midst of them. Now I wish I had a platform here with a child on it so that we could all take a good look and remember that we are to be children as we pursue every aspect of the theological encyclopedia. For unless we become like a child - there is not an exception to this rule -- There is no option. What is there that is so conclusive in its illustrative power in a child? The answer is not that the child is intellectually lower than we are, and that it is therefore sinful to try to become brilliant. (I'd say that the opposite is the case: if God has given us any gift, let us use it to all our power and might.) It isn't the size of the child. It isn't the color; it isn't the background. The thing which is beautiful about that child which we find so hard to maintain as adults, - even those of us who count ourselves in the Kingdom of God - I say, isn't the beautiful thing about a child, the fact that the child, if you get it young enough, is not ashamed to love, is not ashamed to be dependent, for its very being on the lives of those that he loves, and who love him.

The well known fact in psychological studies that one of the gangrenous elements which eats away in marriage relationships and adult relationships of all sorts and dissolves the beauty, is that "go-it-alone" spirit. "I don't need you anymore; I'm sufficient unto myself." In other words, it's kind of sissified to love. For me to admit that I need each one of you - every one of you, - not just in some sentimental way, but such that my life is woven into dependence upon your very being -- That is harder to confess than to say in a bland sort of way, "Well, welcome to the seminary, we're glad you're here; hope you have a good time: Study hard" and "Hope there is good service ahead;" and "Are there any more questions?"

Take another look at this child, as we come to our fourth and final point, which is Fuller Theological Seminary, and the opportunities which will be yours as you come to it. Our Seminary was deliberately founded within a pluralistic tradition. We have no illusions about the complexity of the development of the church of Jesus Christ, and the many and strange sources that God has seen fit to use to increase the present-day Church's knowledge of His will and His hope for all. I say we have consciously, without any illusions, accepted this and entered into it. This pluralism is represented on the faculty. I saw it represented typically and in a very inspiring way by the dialogue between Professors Bromiley and Jewett* - a pluralism which is represented by you as you come into the seminary.

How remember this child is still standing here. Do I, a Baptist, need to read Calvin's Institutes? Do I as a member of this or that denominational group, or non-denominational group, or whatever group I may come from? Is there any need for me to make peace with these sources? No, you don't have to. You'll probably march down the line

*The reference is to a debate which took place on the subject of Baptism.
and get your degree. But you will have cheated yourself. You will have cheated yourself of the privilege of standing next to Martin Luther and watching the tears flow down his cheeks as he contemplates the problems of the Reformation. And if the seminary perchance is wrong in your eyes at some point, we have been cheated, by your not having given yourself to us by sharing the enlightenment which God may have given you, and you may have brought to the school. When our Lord Jesus Christ contested with the devil, he defeated the evil one, and again we can sing with Martin Luther, "were not the right man on our side, our striving would be losing." But this defeated devil neither slumbers nor sleeps when opportunity arises to hinder the work of the gospel - even though his ultimate end is sure. And one of the most obvious ways he can go about this is by introducing into the lives of those who have surrendered themselves to full-time work, a competitive spirit: a holier-than-thou; a better-than-thou: an I-don't-need-thee, a cultic, and ideological spirit. Turn-it-as-you-will: it is that inflexibility of mind which sets itself up above this child and which does not have the grace and humility required to read and appreciate the sources both for and against the position we hold.

I think it might be a profitable thing, if, as part of the equipment distributed at registration, you were given a plastic model of a child to carry with you through seminary. You know what I would suggest? That even beyond that, a model be given to every single member of this faculty, to every member of the Board of Trustees, and everyone associated with Fuller Theological Seminary. Jesus took a child, and set him in the midst of them, and said, "Except you become like this child..." Unless, in other words, you have the willingness to learn the gentle art of love, which we may call the gentle art of being corrected as well as correcting; the gentle art of learning one's limitations; and the gentle art of dependence upon one another. We are dependent upon the Reformers. We are dependent upon anyone, anywhere, who has any contribution to truth. And through this dependence on the horizontal level, we learn more how to live in perfect dependence upon God. But if we can't begin here, I should say, Let's stop singing our pious hymns about dependence upon God, and how much we love him and all the rest. God is not a jealous God. He is not seeking our love as sort of an end in itself. The measure of our love for Him is the measure of love we are willing to give. This is a two-way flow, and it requires humility.

I pray that God may fully enable you and all others in the student body, and may God fully enable us as a faculty, to remember in all of our learning, that if we would lord it over the nations, we are no different from the pagans, and that the way ordained for us is the way of the cross. Let not a man think more highly of himself than he should. Our Lord came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give himself a ransom for many. We may find it easy to "get", but the acid test will be, can we "give", not simply something external, but our very selves. Remember every time this heart beats, the exact number known to God is lessened by one; and judged by the span of the flow of eternity, we are on the threshold of meeting God tomorrow. The only thing which will endure, when all else has been tested - the apostle Paul goes to extreme lengths in I Corinthians 13 to point this out - the only thing we can carry into heaven, with any compatibility with the divine essence, is love. I think this is your major opportun-
ity here at the seminary: that when you come across a threat to some­thing which you have held dearly across the years you don't, as it were, take your marbles and go home, but that you enter into friend­ship. There will be differences, and these may create disappointments, but such must have pleased the Lord God, for he made the world with these differences, and we are not here to tell God how he will run this universe. We are here to worship him, and to love one another.

Grant to us, our Father, increasing strength from day to day, to become in our total being - our heart and all that is within us - as a little child, that we might find joy in dependence, first of all and absolutely on Thee our maker and creator, and then, with sanctified joy, upon those whom Thou hast made in Thy image. Bless us as a family, and may we do our utmost to live as such. Amen.

AN OPEN LETTER

The recent passing of our esteemed professor, Dr. Carnell, gives us all reason to pause and reevaluate our concept of the Fuller family. As I reflect upon student reactions and some of my own to the deceased, I become rather uneasy. Such comments as "He is no longer suitable" or calling his courses "a waste of time" reflect American pragmatism at its worst. Only the cold question of "What can I get out of this course?" is asked. Perhaps a more basic question would be "What do I owe this man who has sacrificed so much for the ongoing life of Fuller Seminary?" For my own part, I learned more from his personal interaction with the class than I did from the course content, but perhaps this is the richest part of education for the ministry. His boldness and outright honesty will always be an example to me and have already assisted me through one trying experience with the Church. I yearned to get to know him more personally but never had the courage. Now it is too late!

Surely his untimely death will serve as a guidepost to drawing faculty and students together. Let us demythologize the concept of the "Fuller family". The part of honesty requires to admit that little concern exists between faculty and students. Even among the student body, the socially concerned have little interest in those caught up in evangelism, and vice versa. Youth Directors take little interest in the rest of seminary life. Let our prayer be together that Christ might melt our hearts of stone and give us lives of love such as was exemplified in the late Dr. Edward John Carnell.

Sincerely,

Harry Klassen
Perhaps the most basic question in Christian apologetics is that of the possibility of a knowledge of God. The issue has become more pointed since the singular rejection of natural theology by Karl Barth. Yet others quite alien to Barth share his reasoning in the rejection of natural knowledge of God (e.g. Cornelius Van Til, The Case for Calvinism). Both of these theologians intimate that Calvin would cast his lot with them if he were alive to see the tragic direction which theology has taken since his formulations.

Yet Dr. Carnell contends, with a great heritage, for something of a natural theology. What is it in this question which is so sharp as to be able to pierce even to the dividing asunder of Barth and Brunner? The horns of the dilemma appear to be synergism and enthusiasm. Either the theologian is so concerned to find a point of contact between God and Man that he finds a wonderful knowledge of God, moral law, and ordinances within natural Man, and natural Man begins to play a considerable role in his regeneration, or the theologian is driven from any real attempt to make Christianity evident to his fellow men, there being no knowledge of God apart from an individual act of God.

After appreciating Karl Barth’s theological journey, one is not shocked to see from which horn of the dilemma he shrinks. When he parted company with his own liberal background he brought with him an unusual sensitivity for criticizing the tendencies which had culminated in religious liberalism. He places natural theology at the very heart of the problem. In natural theology man takes his first steps toward being of some assistance to God in effecting regeneration. The progression toward anthropocentric religion is most natural. Because of this, Barth expects the position of Brunner, which he sees as a resurrection of the “rational orthodoxy” of the late 17th and early 18th Centuries, if successfully established to issue forth in time with another Wolff, Semler, Lessing and finally another Schleiermacher.

Barth holds the entire question of natural theology to be illegitimate. We cannot ask about hypothetical, abstract ways in which God might possibly be known. The fact is that He is known and He is not known in our abstraction, but only in the way which He has revealed Himself. We can only ask after the possibility of knowing God from a position in which we already know God. The central problem that Barth seems to have with natural theology is in his refusal to allow any knowledge of the true God outside of Christ. The conceptions of God that men have outside this revelation are so warped and perverted by sin as to constitute not a knowledge of God at all, but a knowledge of some other god or idol. "Natural theology is the doctrine of a union..."

---

2Church Dogmatics II/1, p. 63.
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of man with God existing outside God's revelation in Jesus Christ. It
works out the knowledge of God that is possible and real on the basis
of this independent union with God."3

In his thinking at this point Barth feels himself to be following
in the best tradition of the Reformers. He notes that when Calvin
speaks of a natural knowledge of God it is in the context "si integer
stetisset," if Adam had retained his innocence.4 John Calvin, suggests
Barth, went no farther than the Scriptures themselves go toward natural
theology in Romans 1, 2 and Acts 14, 17. Barth amplifies Calvin's ex­
egesis maintaining that these passages entail no explicit natural theo­
logy. "If we really wish to maintain the Reformer's position over
against that of Roman Catholicism and Neo-Protestantism, we are not in
a position today to repeat the statements of Luther and Calvin without
at the same time making them more pointed than they themselves did."5

On the point at issue, at least, the position of Dr. Van Til seems
to be precisely that of Barth and the reason for his position seems to
be exactly the same longing after a logically consistent Calvinistic
monergism.

The traditional position defended by Dr. Carnell has, perhaps, its
classic formulation in the apparent meaning of John Calvin in the first
parts of his Institutes. Here he seems to state the matter quite un­
equivocally.

But since the meanest and most illiterate of mankind, who are
furnished with no other assistance than their own eyes, cannot
be ignorant of the excellence of the divine skill exhibiting
itself in that endless yet regular variety of the innumerable
celestial host, it is evident that the Lord abundantly mani­
fests his wisdom to every individual on earth.6

Yet Calvin admits, "...(men) are constrained to know, whether willingly
or not, that these are proofs of his divinity, yet they suppress this
knowledge in their hearts."7 The question is whether this suppression
of the knowledge of God due to moral failure can be considered to de­
stroy any knowledge of God in man. It would certainly seem that there
must be some sort of knowledge there for man to suppress. Only when
man rejects the knowledge of God that he does have can the responsibi­

G

The critical review of Dr. Van Til's Case for Calvinism by James
Daane has two prongs to its attack. In the first place he depicts Van
Til as misrepresenting Calvinism. Daane charges:

It is not by traditional Calvinism but only by "another Cal­
vinism" that Carnell's theology can be judged as one that

3Ibid., p. 168.
4Brunner and Barth, op. cit., p. 109.
5Ibid., p. 101.
7Ibid., p. 15.
8Ibid., p. 19.
"requires the destruction of Christianity," one that "would require him to create God in man's image."9

The second branch of Daane's criticism is the more penetrating, for it makes Van Til feel the pressure of irrational enthusiasm. Even Van Til appeals to something in man to which Christianity will seem evident. Reason alone saves religion from mystical enthusiasm and saves life from utter chaos.

Brunner presses the same argument against Barth: the Church cannot bear to reject completely natural theology, because it is to the "remnant imago Dei" in man that the Church must address itself.10 If the Holy Spirit alone effects regeneration then the Church may as well wave her hands in meaningless gestures as preach the Word of God.

Dr. Carnell in Introduction to Christian Apologetics, expands what seems to be inherent in the passages of John Calvin on the subject of natural theology. His emphases upon the sense of God which all men have, the moral awareness of natural man, and God's natural revelation are all familiar themes in Calvin. The distinction of the text seems to be in presenting the argument for God from the rationes aeternae. The warning voice of Barth causes uneasiness as we glide through the happy syllogism claiming that God is truth, man knows some truth, and therefore man knows God. Much of the text seems to be a projection of man's abstractions - a casting of God in the image of man. Even when the chapter heading claims that the starting point is to be God, we find ourselves projecting man. But just when we think we are well on the road to anthropocentric religion, the old tension appears even in our strongly rationalistic text. It is admitted that we do not really know God until there has been His self-revelation.11 It might also be submitted that we do not know the real God until His revelation has encountered us. Even in the excellent vertical and horizontal epistemological formulation the tension is not absent, for internal consistency could refuse a fact or the facts might baffle internal consistency.

The one-sided argument of Barth cannot, it appears, be embraced in its full consistency. Reason must be allowed to criticize each area of life or chaos ensues. But at the same time we must recognize full well the dangerous doors that we have unlocked. We must be careful how far we allow our system to go beyond the Revelation lest we press our biblical premises to absurd conclusions. We must realize that we have, as Barth points out, taken the first step toward anthropocentric religion and ever be wary that we don't have a religion devoid of God.

It would appear that the ultimate issues involved in the question of natural theology admit to no easy resolution. Without being unduly fond of the Kierkegaardian propensity for paradox we might at least posit that where the tension refuses to resolve it is but a mark of being near the Ground of Being, or ultimate reality.

---

10 Brunner and Barth, op. cit., pp. 56-58.
"As man has tried to define for himself a home in the universe, he has developed religious concepts to express his belief in God, human destiny, sin, salvation and the good life. One might expect that with the tremendous changes wrought in human life by science and the modern industrial world, church people might have forsaken the traditions of supernaturalism. Such is not the case...Religion is not primarily an intellectual process. Religious concepts and beliefs are hammered out in human experience. They are projections of human needs and wishes. What men believe about God is a reflection of their unique human nature and culture. More particularly each individual probably attributes to God some of those qualities he admired or feared in his own father. The whole anthropomorphic frame of reference within which we view God is a projection of what man believes to be his highest values as he sees them in human personality."

Such an attitude is commonly found in books of social psychology. It is very clearly non-supernatural, critical toward the claims of special revelation, and definitely a threat to Christianity.

In this paper I would like to do a critique of the discipline of social psychology, refuting its claims concerning religion by showing its faulty foundations, explaining how in some areas it may have truth and in other areas be wrong, and give what I feel to be an acceptable Christian approach toward this discipline.

Before a critique can be made of the discipline of psychology, we must first look closer at this and distinguish between true valid science and that which is not valid. We may distinguish these two by the terms science and scientism. Scientism is a 'science' which claims that its working principles can be used as universal principles, in terms of which the whole of reality can be controlled.

Science, as with every other field of study of intellectual endeavor, has certain presuppositions which must be accepted if one is to utilize this field. These have been identified as four principles. The first is the empirical principle which states that no belief is to be regarded as scientific unless it can be tested (by the scientific method). Another is the qualitative principle. This is that science must confine its studies to the observable and measurable aspects of reality. The third, the mechanical principle, says science, because it is concerned with laws, is restricted to the study of that kind of behavior which consists of natural cause-and-effect series. (Nothing whatsoever is said concerning the possibility of free behavior which would not come within the range of scientific explanation). The last principle is known as the progressive principle. It states that no scientific theory is regarded as final. Science's theories are constantly being refined and its techniques steadily improved. These are all acceptable presuppositions and not at all in conflict with the Christian faith, because they define the limits of science.

Scientism is a different story, however. These four basic working principles just mentioned become extended into four fallacious principles...
assumptions. The empirical principle becomes the empiricist axiom which says that in order for a belief to be respectable, it must be scientifically verifiable. The quantitative principle becomes the materialistic axiom. This states that since the empiricist axiom is true, the physical is the only kind of reality that we can genuinely come to know. The mechanical principle of science is extended and becomes the mechanistic presupposition: real knowledge is restricted to knowledge of mechanical behavior. Finally, the progressive principle becomes the optimistic assumption. This is the tendency to think men and all their works are steadily advancing and soon science by itself will bring them to perfection.

While the working principles of true science should not be unacceptable to anyone because of the limitations which they themselves set, the presuppositions of scientism (and thus also the conclusions drawn) need not necessarily be accepted by anyone. The reason for this is that they are completely unproved and unprovable metaphysical assumptions which go beyond the allowable limits of true science.

Having made the distinction between true and false science, we must now look at one particular aspect of science - that of psychology. Psychology, as with science in general and Christianity, has some particular assumptions which must be accepted without proof in order to come to an understanding of reality. These have been named by one college professor of psychology as three. The first of these is determinism. Determinism can be held at three levels: methodological (a working orientation), empirical (strong belief in it as a principle), and metaphysical (no possibility of free behavior). Only the first of these is necessary, however, to psychology. The second basic principle is called "inter-subjective confirmability", which holds that discourse is restricted to areas which can be confirmed by appeal to empirical evidence repeated at will. This repeatability is necessary. The third assumption is materialistic monism. This view claims that there are no substances, forces, or events in human thought or behavior which are of an irreducible mental, psychic, or spiritual nature. All functions of humans could be formulated in physical-chemical terms.

Let us look at these three assumptions of psychology. First of all, we certainly ought to allow methodological determinism, that orientation which uses determinism as a working principle without trying to explain all of reality in terms of it. Inter-subjective confirmability is basically a limiting principle which says that science (or psychology in particular) cannot make statements about that which is not in its realm, i.e., the realm of repeatable empirical evidence. This presupposition ought to give us no problems. It is strictly a limiting factor. The last assumption is materialistic monism. This makes an unproved assumption about the whole of human reality, and it is most certainly in conflict with the Christian faith. As those who are unable to accept this assumption, what evidence is there on which we base our rejection of materialistic monism?

Over eighty years ago, a society was formed for the scientific investigation of phenomena which are prima facie supernormal. This phenomenon is known as "supernormal cognition" or "extrasensory perception". A group of men at Cambridge founded this Society for Psychical Research in 1882. In the eighty some years that this type of phenomenon has been systematically investigated, a great deal of evidence has accumulated, showing that beyond any reasonable doubt supernormal cognition takes place. The evidences are open for
everyone (psychologists included) and are of such a nature and quantity
that they cannot be rationalized away.

This being the case, what can be said for materialistic monism?
Such a view is a flagrant denial of the facts of reality and ought not
be accepted by any honest person. It should be noted at this point
that the evidence of supernormal experiences and characteristics in
people is not a proof for the Christian world view, but only used to
disprove the fallacious assumption of materialistic monism.

Having looked in an abstract way at the weaknesses of the disci­
pline of psychology, let us apply these to the particular situations
in which psychology denies the reality of the claims of Christianity.
Looking back over the statement of faith of Dewey and Humber quoted at
the beginning of this paper, I find two basic assumptions behind most
of their statements concerning man and religion. These are a natural­
istic understanding of reality and materialistic monism. The inference
that man ought to reject his belief in the supernatural because of the
great strides taken by science seems very clearly to be a case of
taking the working principles of science and, in a very unscientific
"leap of faith", making metaphysical assumptions out of them. The
statements that religious concepts are projections of human needs and
wishes and that people are held to religion largely by emotion, point
up, in my opinion, the belief that there is nothing within man which
is not capable of being measured and rationally understood but is
capable of communication and fellowship with something outside our
scientifically understandable natural order. This is just another
way of describing materialistic monism. Such statements can be reject­
ed, therefore, as not being scientific (in any meaningful sense of the
word) and based on unprovable and, in the case of materialistic monism,
patently false assumptions.

Having established that one need not accept social psychology's
claims concerning the naturalistic origin and explanation of religion,
we must be careful not to throw overboard all the claims of this
discipline. The behavioral sciences have explained much of man's
behavior and continually are learning more of the meaning of man's
actions. It must be admitted that there is much truth being uncovered
by this discipline and all of us are greatly indebted to it. This
being true, though, the question might be raised as to how a discipline,
having accomplished so much and having shown us all that it has about
man, can be completely wrong in the area of religion. If this disci­
pline is based on unprovable and false assumptions, how has it been
done?

My personal explanation of this might be called the "glasses" approach. Each of us views the objective phenomena that really do
exist in the light of certain assumptions and presuppositions. These
assumptions color our view of the phenomena, and different assumptions
will cause people to perceive the phenomena differently. The scienti­
fic as well as the religious (and every other) approach has on a pair
of glasses through which it perceives the world, and these glasses are
the same tint as the beliefs which it accepts by faith. There is no
such thing as an objective view, for it is impossible to perceive the
world without some basic assumptions with which to begin.

This does not leave us with relativism however. There is one
pair of glasses which the one who caused the phenomena to be wears
(for to him there are no beliefs based on faith), and this pair is the
correct one for perceiving the world. The phenomena which we perceive
do objectively exist, and the reason that most any approach has truth
in it is that the phenomena cannot be completely distorted no matter what kind of glasses one has on. The closer the color of the pair that one has is to the color of "the correct pair" the more correct his interpretation of the world will be. Thus, social psychology does correctly explain some phenomena, but because its glasses are not exactly the right color, it cannot be expected to explain everything.

At this point the possibility might be raised of a Christian scientist who would revamp his scientific assumptions in the light of his Christianity and would therefore have no conflict in understanding and meaningfully interpreting all the phenomena. This man would also discover and bring to light more than the non-Christian scientist. Such an attitude overlooks the basic dilemma of the sciences, however. Even though a person may have assurance that the Christian explanation of reality is the correct one, because of the nature of the Christian approach to reality (special revelation), as a scientist he is not able to utilize this means in discovering scientific truth. Those aspects of man and the world that are revealed by special revelation are not open to discovery by the scientific method, for through the scientific method only those measurable empirical aspects of reality can be dealt with. And these other aspects are revealed by special revelation precisely because they cannot be known through natural revelation.

Science's dilemma, then, is that even though it may, through special revelation, know of a transcendent reality, because of the limitations of its own method, it can never come to any knowledge of this. Beyond this, however, well-meaning science, because it is not aware of the transcendent realities made known by special revelation, may, due to the naturalistic approach which its method of discovery forces it to take, deny the transcendent reality and, rather than not deal with these aspects at all, explain them in purely naturalistic terms. Such is the dilemma of science.

Since this is the case, what ought the Christian attitude toward science be? In general, we ought to accept science (psychology included) and its claims, utilize them to the best of our ability, but when science (or scientism) is in conflict with that which is known through special revelation, we ought to carefully reject the scientific claims, having realized science's limitations.

3. Ibid.
4. Lecture notes from Normal Psychology, Dr. Peter Armacost (Augsburg College).
GENUINE FALLIBILITY: A NEW APPROACH TO "THE PHENOMENA"
by Robert L. Hubbard, Jr.

The task of the true scholar is a perplexing one. He is a truth-seeker whose daily bread is meticulously to sift empirical data through the strainer of his presuppositions and methodology: thus, he hopes to collect small deposits of both unalloyed truth and error, the latter to be discarded, the former to be preserved and somehow integrated into a systematic arrangement along with the deposits of previous siftings.

But things are not quite that simple. For some reason, either because of imperfections in his method or because of imprecise execution of the sifting process, completely unalloyed truth in all areas of investigation is never found. Truth is very often mixed with unsettling amounts of paradox and apparent inconsistencies.

The Biblical scholar who affirms the infallibility and inerrancy of Scripture is not exempt from this dilemma. On the one hand, he accepts the traditional historic doctrine of the church in regards to Scripture's infallibility and inerrancy. On the other, he cannot ignore the so-called "phenomena" of Scripture - the supposed errors and inconsistencies - that detract from the Scripture's claim to divine inspiration. The scholar's personal experience validates the teachings of Scripture, but his commitment to seek the truth at all costs requires that objective evidences, not subjective feelings, be his criterion for trustworthiness.

The purpose of this paper is to suggest a new approach to handling the phenomena of Scripture so as to account for them within the framework of infallible inspiration. It is my contention that God has given us an infallible scripture in that it is a completely genuine communication of redemptive truth. However, to say that it is inerrant in its genuineness is not to require it to be inerrant in its details, because I shall contend that supposed "errors" in details are due to imperfections in the vehicle of communication, but that they do not affect the infallibility of redemptive truth.

The method used to tackle the problem of inspiration is the inductive one. Thus, Scripture is allowed to speak for itself in regards to its exact nature. The data of Scripture to be considered include the indicia - the qualities and characteristics of Scripture which support its divine origin - and "the phenomena" - all Scriptural statements except those specifically concerned with inspiration. Both are co-factors, and both, ideally, will contribute to the formulation of a doctrine of inspiration.

That the Bible definitely asserts its own inspiration is indisputable. Paul clearly states that "all scripture" - meaning the Old Testament canon accepted by his Jewish contemporaries - is inspired of God. The New Testament writers appear convinced that the same divine guidance responsible for the Old Testament is guiding their own writing: thus, their works are equally as inspired as the Old Testament. In short, it is on the authority of Jesus and the apostles, and on their trustworthiness that we claim the Bible as the inspired, infallible Word of God.
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However, it is here that the phenomena - the supposed "errors" - rock the boat. Differences in statistics between parallel passages, apparent contradictory chronologies, and discrepancies between parallel Synoptic Gospel accounts suggest a Scripture that is something less than inerrant. We are, thus, confronted with the problem of accounting for these discrepancies while holding the apostolic teaching of the infallibility and inerrancy of Scripture.

To be consistent with our method, we must not avoid the issue. Certainly, time may eliminate some discrepancies, but what of those remaining? And, to honestly study inspiration, must we not include all the relevant data? It is my contention that Scripture is inerrant and infallible but that this infallibility is communicated through the imperfection of human authors.

The purpose of inspiration is the infallible communication of redemptive truth in such a way that the truth itself is not corrupted or distorted by the imperfections and limitations of the human author, nor the communicative vehicle forced into an unnaturalness which might make the truth unintelligible to its recipients. Thus, God communicated His infallible redemptive truth to man uncorrupted by the fallible human vehicle through which He spoke. The truth of Scripture is errorless and infallible. But, in communicating redemptive truth, the vehicle of communication is used naturally - that is, as it is commonly used - so as to not divert attention from the divine truth to the vehicle itself.

It is important to distinguish between the concepts of "error" and "imperfection of expression." Error carries with it moral implications. It is a violation of the law of contradiction and is mutually exclusive from truth. In this regard, it is significant to distinguish between the Hellenistic conception of truth and that of the Hebrews. Truth, for the Greeks, was that which was isomorphic to something in reality which it represents. The Hebrews, however, conceived of truth as that which corresponds with the nature and purpose of God. Thus, the "phenomena" of Scripture may be errors because they fail to correspond with reality, but to the Biblical writers they are insignificant because the truth being communicated still corresponds to the nature and purpose of God. The discrepancies do not affect the truth of God.

In contrast to error, "imperfection of expression" is not antithetical to truth because it does not intrinsically make truth ingenuine or false. The incarnation of Christ illustrates this. The divine nature assumed the imperfect dust of created humanity, yet the infallible truth of Divine nature was in no way vitiated or falsified. Likewise, the Scriptures must be infallible because they are genuine representations of Divine truth; that is, they are infallible because they correspond to the nature and purpose of God.

But if they are infallible representations of Divine truth, they need not necessarily be completely free from imperfections, for the vehicle of communication is fallible humanity. The Biblical authors expressed genuine Divine truth as they were prompted by the Holy Spirit, but the Spirit did not correct imperfections resulting from the finitude and fallibility of His human instruments since the genuineness of truth was not involved. In short, "genuine fallibility" may exist without the revealed truth being corrupted or distorted by the fallibility of the communications medium.

To some, however, the concept of "genuine fallibility" is unacceptable. They contend that we assume a priori the existence of discrepancies which are incapable of explanation. Furthermore, they charge that we compromise by giving the phenomena precedence over the indicia.
In response, the assumption of the existence of actual discrepancies is admitted. We admit, also, the possibility of future explanations for some discrepancies. But the point is that, assuming the relative validity and precision of the grammatico-historical method, discrepancies do exist. If we apply this method to determine the historical trustworthiness of the Bible before we inductively formulate our theory of inspiration, why not apply it in handling the data while we formulate our theory of inspiration. To determine the trustworthiness of Jesus and the apostles by this method but not to apply it to determine the nature of inspiration denies the validity of the very method we rely on for establishing the trustworthiness of the Biblical documents.

Furthermore, we are not compromising and giving preference to the phenomena over the indicia. Rather, we are letting the entire Bible speak to determine the meaning of inspiration. We assume that the Bible is inspired - that it is the very Word of God - but we let the composite result of inspiration explain how it happened and what it really means. Furthermore, it is fallacious to assert dogmatically that the Bible itself claims inerrancy in details, for no such claim is made. To affirm that for Scripture to be inspired it must necessarily be free of error in details is to ignore completely the phenomena in spite of their being as equally inspired as the indicia and still a part of Scripture. This denies the validity of the grammatico-historical method and undermines the basis for the trustworthiness of the Bible as truth.

Moreover, the inclusion of the phenomena in the doctrine of inspiration does not deny the importance of the indicia but rather includes more data relevant to determine exactly what inspiration means. Both must be considered, for while one asserts the fact of inspiration, the other embodies the result of that process.

In addition, to deny the presence of "genuine fallibility" is to contradict the very moral environment in which we live. For example, suppose a husband expresses his love for his wife by offering her a gift. The wife is concerned with the genuineness of the expression - whether it in reality reflects love or disguised guilt for unfaithfulness. If the husband says that he purchased the gift at the Broadway while the wife finds a receipt from the May Company, he must account for this contradiction by pleading a fallible memory. If the wife senses that this is the case, then the gift is acceptable and the perfect love it expresses is communicated, though through an imperfect expression. In fact, he did buy it at the May Company and had no intention of deceiving his wife; it was simply a lapse of memory that in no way corrupted the revelation of his love.

The Scripture differs from this example only in the respect that it is God who is revealing Himself. Genuineness, not perfection, is the evidence necessary to establish the Bible as a trustworthy revelation of God. If the husband were later to use a memory lapse to deceive his wife, she rejects the expression not because it is fallible but because it is false. While a statement cannot be true and false at the same time, it can be both a true communication and a fallible expression because an infallible expression is not an intrinsic part of the truth itself.

The Scripture must pass the test of genuineness. Its historicity must be honest, its reasoning logical, and its humanity readily apparent. The important thing is that God is speaking through imperfect means. If God is speaking, the Word is neither more authoritative nor more genuine through perfection than through imperfection,
otherwise the incarnation itself would be an error.

It is in this conception that we affirm the inerrancy of Scripture as the Word itself implies. To admit the presence of fallibilities and imperfections in the expression of that inerrant, genuine truth does not violate the Scripture's own claim nor undermine its authority. It merely defines and explains inspiration in terms of the whole scope of relevant Scriptural evidence.

Perhaps this approach is not as novel as I first thought, but it is personal, the result of my own initial struggle with the integration of the phenomena and the indicia. The struggle is by no means complete, but it is a beginning, an attempt to break the log-jam of fear and apathy blocking the progress of free discussion on the problem of inspiration. At least it has broken one log-jam: the one in my own mind.

* * *

AN APPRECIATION GIVEN AT DR. CARNELL'S FUNERAL ON APRIL 28, 1967
by Dr. Paul K. Jewett

It can hardly be gainsaid that Scripture lays great stress on the importance of teaching, and consistently magnifies the teaching office. Moses in the Old Testament reminds Israel of the legacy of judgements and precepts he had taught them and enjoins upon them the duty to teach those who shall come after them. And in the New Testament, Paul's final word is to a young man, Timothy, whom he exhorts to teach faithful men who shall be able in turn to teach others.

We have gathered here this afternoon to honor the memory of a man of God who was endowed with unusual gifts as a teacher. I have known many men who have aspired to the office of a teacher without the gifts, but in the case of Edward John Carnell, matters were quite the reverse. As a graduate student at Harvard and pastor of a small church, Dr. Carnell was supplementing his meagre income by working at a Boston mail terminal, when the opportunity to teach was unexpectedly dropped, as it were, in his lap by the dean of Gordon College, Dr. Burton Goddard who was pressed by a last minute cancellation of a summer teaching assignment in philosophy. Though he had but a few days' notice, Dr. Carnell proved more than equal to the task. By the end of the summer, he was urged to accept a permanent appointment and in the years immediately following became one of the most popular teachers on campus. Students were majoring in philosophy who, upon coming to college, had not known what the word philosophy meant.

In the classroom, he found himself, and his calling of God became specific. From that day onward he was to be a teacher worthy of the confidence of his students and the admiration of his peers. I can vividly recall the enthusiasm with which he shared with me the joys of teaching in those early days, and the zeal with which he sought similar opportunities for me.

Now that his labors are over, may I speak not only a word on behalf of the dead, but also a word of challenge to the living. This is the educated age. Never was there more education than now, but increasingly this learning is devoid of all Christian reference. We are drifting from the moorings of our fathers' faith. The challenge to the teaching ministry of the church staggers thought and beggars
description. Many of the young men gathered here have answered the call of God to serve as ministers of the Christian Church. To obey this call you must be teachers. This gift of teaching - which includes the ability to ask the right questions, and to frame lucid answers, to give apt illustrations, to make the subject live for those who hear, in all which Dr. Carnell excelled - this gift, I say, must be cultivated by a rigorous discipline and singleness of purpose. It was this discipline and devotion to his task that was the secret of Dr. Carnell's great contribution to the teaching ministry of the church. And it is here, it seems to me, that his life speaks preeminently to the young men in the course of their theological training today. He earned every degree that he was awarded the hard way. He was reduced to a bicycle because he did not have the means to drive a car and pay tuition for his doctoral studies. He submitted to the rigors of language study. Nothing deterred him from his purpose to be a worthy and competent scholar. His was a passion to frame arguments and to master ideas, to understand the truth as it has been revealed in Christ.

His life was a challenge, a call to all men who consider the Christian ministry, to be workmen who need not be ashamed, rightly discerning the word of truth. May we honor his memory this day with new resolves, to be obedient, as he was, to the vision which heaven shall give us.

* * * * *
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AN APPRECIATION
by Dr. Calvin R. Schoonhoven
Mr. Jaymes P. Morgan, Jr.

The seminary lecture hall is meant to be a place of intellectual stimulation, of ideals, of excitement, of labor, of spiritual enrichment. So to speak is to characterize the experience of those of us who some ten years ago were Dr. Carnell's students, and so recently his colleagues. The lecture hall experience with Dr. Carnell was really quite new: one remembers the question asked, then the slow saunter to the window, the long pause, the sometimes labored breath, the opening words of answer so carefully measured, and finally, the full-drawn thought delivered - cogent, coherent, and so aptly illustrated. We knew that our questions were not only heard, but that they were weighed in terms of the larger dimension and complex of problems, and that the answers were being shaped in such a way that our questions themselves
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were restructured and restated, given point and substance. As far as the content and the quality of his lectures, need we say more than that we listened to the phrases that would take printed form in Christian Commitment and The Case for Orthodox Theology. And if at times those eloquent phrases came slowly, it was a slowness born of deliberation and reflection, never that of boredom or the failure of nerve. We felt like men on the frontier, moving toward the prospect of the truly significant, grappling with issues that were of the very stuff of life.

During student days some of us came to know Dr. Carnell not only in the lecture hall, but in his office. We knew that intimate personal contacts with students were difficult for him, perhaps the most difficult aspect of his ministry. But we also knew that he cared, and when we made the effort to see him, we discovered that this man in whom we believed so strongly, believed in us, and believed in us enough to spend time unbegrudgingly with us. We found ourselves in the presence of a man who never needed to defend himself or what he had to say by hurried refuge in a professional mystique or the verbal smokescreen. With him we knew an openness and a oneness that revealed unsuspected and delightful lines of communication; he gave the word "fellowship" definition. And when we left his office, it was with the feeling that our lives had been touched for the better, and that perhaps we too could contribute in dignity to the ministry and cause which he so nobly served.

When Dr. Carnell preached in chapel, the students attended en masse. We went with the intuitive awareness that we would not only hear words, but experience something - something we could not afford to get second-hand. We had the confidence that something of substance would be affirmed, that a definite course would be plotted, that direction would be given. He eschewed the trivial theme, the refuge of rhetoric, and the deadly trap of dispensing unrelated bits and pieces of information. Although he moved across a broad range of topics, he had an instinct for the visceral issues of theology and Christian living. When he preached, he spoke not only to the subject, but to us, to our needs; he offered us encouragement, rebuke, consolation, hope, challenge. For us he was a man of God and a preacher of God's Word.

Dr. Carnell was also our president and leader; it was he who articulated for us what it meant to be a part of Fuller Seminary. He gave to us a vision of intellectually disciplined and evangelically impassioned commitment. When it was announced that he would field questions - any and all questions - from the student body, our frustration would ebb, for we knew that honest and forthright questions would be answered in like manner. Questions were never dodged, never oversimplified, never obscured by verbiage. He gave us the gift of honesty and candor in the public forum.

We miss him, and we shall continue to miss him, for he gave us not just intellectual guidelines, but he gave to us of himself. He formed us not only by the precision of his thought, but by the power of his person.
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