



Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

January 5, 1953

Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Department of Philosophy
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dear Doc:

I contend that the main emphasis in the Bible's own conception of itself is not truth, but power to convict, absolute authority, ability to penetrate into the deceptions of the heart; able to bring blessing, peace, and comfort; in short, it is that through which the Holy Spirit works in the accomplishment of the things which burn in the heart.

Of course the Bible is true; that is presupposed. But it is a peculiar kind of truth, one which is borne along to the heart in and through the Spirit, thus enabling it to bring life-through-truth.

points out
Inspiration refers to this life-through-truth quality in the Bible. It is this power to convict and bless, not the simple assurance that it is infallibly true, that the Bible posits as the ground of our joy.

The Scriptures are food-giving: "...that he might make you know that man does not live by bread alone, but that man lives by everything that proceeds out of the mouth of the Lord." Deut. 8:3

The Scriptures bring guidance and prosperity: "...for then you shall make your way prosperous, and then you shall have good success." Joshua 1:8

When Ezra read the newly found law before the people, this law (a) caused the people to stand up 8:5; (b) caused them to bow their heads and worship 8:6; (c) caused them to weep 8:9; (d) caused them to eat and drink and make great rejoicing 8:12. In short, the Scriptures are a weeping-producing body of truth; they are inspired.

Psalms 119: (a) blessing comes from keeping the testimonies 119:2; (b) the law moves a man to praise 119:7; (c) the word has power to keep a young man on the right way 119:9; (d) God's testimonies bring delight 119:24; (e) the ordinances bring hope 119:43; (f) the word is immutable 119:89; (g) the testimonies are a source of understanding 119:99; (h) the testimonies give a heritage 119:111; (i) the word is a source of light 119:130; (j) etc., etc.

A man has not received the inspired word until he feels the power of that word: "For our gospel came to you not only in word, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction." I Thess. 1:5.

II Tim. 3:16 stresses the profit of scripture as the value which an inspired text has, a profit which is not merely the infallible assurance that truth has been given, but, more dynamically, it relates to those things which bless and convict and move: "teaching, reproof, correction, and training in righteousness."

Hebrews 4:12 places the emphasis on the power of penetration in the word, discerning even the "thoughts and intentions of the heart." This suggests power to move and convict and shatter.

As I understand your position, you are content to pitch the entire significance of inspiration on this, namely, that the propositions in the Bible are infallibly true. As I meditate on the way the Bible looks at the matter, this is only the introduction to inspiration. The infallibly true statements of the Bible have a power to convict, bless, and fill with hope. Inspiration is a Spirit-through-truth force, moving first on the hearts of the authors to deliver their souls through writing and then on the reader to rend his soul through reading.

*— 1
false*

Your position only gives the assurance that, say, the words of Psalm 119 are infallibly the words which the Psalmist uttered--period. My position gives more than this. Presupposing the fact of their truth ("thy word is truth," John 17:17), I have the assurance that these words which the Psalmist uttered are the ones through which God convicts, blesses, chills, thrills, and shatters my own soul. Yours is a confidence before truth; mine is a confidence before Spirit-through-truth. And I rest my case on the Biblical emphasis on itself. Just as the emphasis is on the relation of a covenant God to us (not to His attributes in se), so the emphasis is on the relation of God's truth to us. I contend that inspiration is far more dynamic than you are willing to concede.

I deny that the unregenerate man can discover the word of God with power; he can use the law of contradiction to see the claim of the Bible to bless, convict, and move, but until he is blessed, convicted, and moved, he is not in possession of inspired truth. And this possession is possible, of course, only when the Spirit of God first enlightens him through regeneration. The word has no power until the vessel is first empowered.

On your view a person can have the infallible assurance that the chronologies in the Old Testament or the dimensions of the temple or the endless Levitical laws are true, and then yawn and go to sleep; on my view this truth must be probed until it blesses the heart, moves, and convicts: then inspired truth has been found. Our consolation in the Bible is more than that which comes from a rational assurance that it is infallibly true; it is a spiritual response based upon a source of life. It is the "holy heartburn" which those to whom Christ preached felt on the road to Emmaus Luke 24:32. Their hearts burned within them.

! My emphasis in no sense implies that the Bible becomes the word of God when men are moved. Heresy! It is objectively inspired whether it ever moves

Dr. Gordon H. Clark

Jan. 5, 1953

Page 3

anybody or not. But it does imply that when a man is moved, it is this power-to-move-the-heart-through-God's-truth which is the essence of inspiration, not the more academic assurance that the propositions are infallibly true.

To be candid to the point of ingenuousness, I fear that it is the type of position which you are trying to defend which has given rise to much of this Barthian teaching--an ironic outcome. Fearful lest we allow a dynamic text to become geometrized (attention here, please), the Bartians have flopped over to the other extreme of denying the objective truth. Their view is really a form of occasionalism. Would we not make our view more healthy if we expressed our concept of truth through more dynamic forms?

Farewell.

Sincerely yours,



Edward John Carnell
Department of Apologetics

- P.S.
- (1). There is no need to return this letter, for I have kept a carbon.
 - (2). Our home address is now 1090 Woodbury Road, Pasadena 6. Thanks for the thoughtful Christmas card.
 - (3). It seems to me that when you draw up your answer, you must prove your case by actual Scriptural references. Show from within the text itself that the Bible means no more by inspiration than that process by which an infallible body of truth has resulted. Where does it teach this?



Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX ~~9302~~ 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

EDWARD JOHN CARNELL, Th. D., Ph. D.
PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS

January 27, 1953

Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Department of Philosophy
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dear Doc:

I shall have a letter on inspiration in due time.

I am concerned with your reference to the Revised Standard Version and the opinion of the group which met at Wheaton. I am somewhat surprised by their radical conclusions. The language departments here at the Seminary are making a careful, objective study of the text, and to my knowledge they have unearthed a remarkably few number of what might be called major objections. I myself use the version exclusively, because I am entirely satisfied that it presents more of the Word of God to more people in a language they can understand than any version available. The blemishes in the text I can correct with a pencil. I hope you will pardon me if I say that the attempt upon the part of the evangelicals to produce their own version is sheer assinineity. I don't think the evangelicals could sit still long enough to do that kind of scholarly piece of work. It would end up with one version for the American Council and another version for the N.A.E. group.

I do not expect you to write to me on this matter or comment about it. I am merely mentioning that there is a minority group within the evangelicals which is far from satisfied that this negative attitude toward the Revised Standard Version represents careful scholarship.

I surprisingly received an appointment from Wheaton to teach at inter-session next summer. I hope this will cement our relations more firmly. I think you certainly are filled with graciousness to have gone to Wheaton over the Christmas vacation. I have a feeling that if I had been treated by Wheaton as you have, on sheer disgruntlement I would never want to see the place again. I admire your good attitude.

Trusting this finds you well, I remain

Yours sincerely,

Edward John Carnell

EJC:ip



Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

February 4, 1953

Dear Doc,

I have discovered that it does not pay to introduce too many points in one letter. I notice that you select rebuttal points, rather than dealing with each matter as it is raised. Hence, I shall confine my inquiry to one issue each time.

Before mentioning this problem, let me comment on your effort to dismiss the need for proof texts to support your position. It seems to me to be a tenuous position which is in want of exact statements of the Scripture's own philosophy of itself.

I at least have made an effort to show that when the Bible tells us about itself it speaks of a life-giving corpus of truth. You seem unimpressed with my contention that these two elements comprise inspiration: (a) source of vitality and life; (b) source of propositional truth. Until you produce textual support for your own view I am equally unimpressed with your structure.

Here is the problem: The Bible gives us (at least) two propositions--1st, "All Scripture is true"; 2nd, "All Scripture is inspired." On what authority do you show that either is the consequence of the other? And I mean textual authority. No philosophical-theological speculation, if you please. If you succeed in showing that an analysis of the term "inspiration" yields the term "truth", proceed (on textual authority) to show that this exhausts the content of that term. Or, to put the matter negatively, establish the fact that an analysis of the term "inspiration" justifies the conclusion that nothing more than truth is meant by an inspired text. You see, my view is (a) truth, (b) life-giving source of vital power. Both are tied in with the single act of inspiration. This is why I cannot see how a volume of geometry could be inspired--except in a special sense not included in the Biblical understanding of inspiration.

Cordially,

P.S. You inquire how I harmonize these two propositions: (a) The Bible is objectively true whether it affects anybody or not; (b) The Bible is a life-giving source of power. The answer, it seems to me, is simple; and not the slightest damage is done to my position. The fact of a life-giving power no more depends on man's reception of it for its existence than does truth: both exist in rerum natura, anteceding all human interaction. Both are objective to man; both are offered to man in the preaching of the word: truth and power. If the written word cradles the living Word, what is so unworthy of thinking that it cradles both "grace and truth"? Grace is forgiveness and power; truth is enlightenment. Inspiration signifies both. I sense a sterility, a scholastic sterility in your position.



Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

February 6, 1953

Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Department of Philosophy
Butler University
Indianapolis 7, Indiana

Dear Doc:

Enclosed please find a small brochure discussing the problem of Isaiah 7:14. Since you were in Wheaton and were apparently impressed by the evangelical criticisms against the Revised Standard Version, I thought you might be interested in this piece of work done by Dr. LaSor here at the Seminary. If you have any critical comments concerning its thesis, I would be delighted to hear from you.

Trusting this finds you well, I remain

Yours sincerely,

Edward John Carnell
Department of Apologetics

EJC:ip

February 14 1953

Dear Ed,

In your letter of Feb. 4 you remark that it does not pay to discuss more than one point in one letter; and yet you try to force me to violate this excellent rule by sending me three letters in quick succession. And in addition, I had an extra point besides all the correspondence: to wit, a review of your Niebuhr book. It is plenty late, to be sure; but extra advertisement should always be welcome.

I shall say nothing further on the action of the Evangelical Theological Society to explore the possibility of producing another translation of the Bible, except to say that the action was unanimous (I heard no nays), and that the one man who defended the RSV was himself in favor of a new translation.

You also sent me an article on the PSV of Isa 7:14. Of course this is not the only sore point. Even in the New Testament there are many instances of disregard of MSS. In case after case it cannot be called a translation at all. Phrases are completely dropped, and changes made for which there is no evidence at all. But as for Isa 7 and La Sor's article, I note that he disagrees with Robert Dick Wilson. And I also remember that La Sor was on the opposite side of the ecclesiastical struggle from that which RDW took. Nor am I at all sure that the sign was intended for Ahaz, as La Sor says. And finally, I do not see that the birth of a son to some married woman is a sign at all. A virgin birth is surely a sign.

Now, to get on with our discussion of Inspiration. Perhaps the main point in your letter of Feb. 4 is that it dismisses the need of proof texts. And you seem to claim that you give many proof texts.

Well, you did not give any proof text in answer to my questions of the last letter. And I did. Although the Bible nowhere mentions Inspiration (so far as I know), it does mention Expiration. In conformity with historic usage (which apparently you do not follow) I am willing to use the English word Inspiration to refer to what the Bible calls Expiration. And Expiration is the process whereby God gives his message to the human authors of his word. The message is breathed-out by God.

Now, it seems to me, first, that your discussions have not been in accord with historic usage. This is no fatal objection, to be sure; but when we began to discuss Inspiration, I naturally assumed you were talking about what had always been called inspiration. Your letters show, however, that you have a distinctly different idea. But while your idea is distinctly different, I do not find it distinct. Far be it from me to put words into your mouth, but I would judge that by the word inspiration you mean "whatever the Bible says about itself, including all the results it produces."

What proof texts do you have for this definition?

There is no objection to a listing or a summary of what the Bible says about itself. It says for example, that my word shall not return unto me void, but shall accomplish that which I please. In II Cor. 2:16, where the reference includes Paul's preaching, and therefore the message in the Bible, explicitly mentioning the savor of his knowledge, it is said that we, and therefore the message, is a savor of death unto death. According to your meaning of inspiration (at least the meaning I get from your statements) the savor of death would be a part of the doctrine of inspiration. But you have only listed the life-giving results of the Bible. Hence on your own view, your ~~remarks~~ remarks are one-sided.

It seems to me, from similar considerations which ~~ya~~ could be extended along these lines, that the term inspiration, already a part of the English language and with a theological history, ought not to refer to "whatever the Bible says about itself." For this opinion on English usage, I have no proof texts.

But while I have no proof texts as to acceptable English terminology, I think I have adequate texts to answer your question in paragraph 3. You ask whether I can deduce All Scripture is inspired, from, All Scripture is true; or deduce the latter from the former. Well, is it not very simple. The first proof text is, All Scripture is inspired of God. To this text I would join all the instances where the message is ~~s~~ said to be given (breathed-out) by God. There are ~~qa~~ a host of such in the O.T., and sufficient in the N.T. Then I would quote the text, God cannot lie. Now, it follows by my beloved logic, that if God says something, and God is not a liar, the thing he says is true.

But your demand that I should show that this exhausts the meaning of inspiration by proof texts is no more possible that would be a demand on my part that you show by proof texts that you have not included

more than is properly designated by the English word inspiration.

I am willing to accept your PS in explanation of the sentences in your letter of Jan 5. I take it now that you mean that the Bible is inspired even if it does not actually give life. It is a mere power to move the heart that is the essence of inspiration, and not an actually moving of the heart. Of course, I insist that your meaning of inspiration is quite as much a power to harden the heart and to produce death. But if the power can exist without man's reception of it, as you say in your PS, why do you insist that truth is enlightenment. Cannot truth exist (in God's mind) without producing enlightenment in some man's mind? I would much prefer to think that truth can exist even if no man is enlightened.

Now, perhaps my remarks seem like scholastic ~~sterility~~ sterility to you. The Bible seems sterile to some people too. But the main question is, are they true? If true, I am not worried by the name sterility. The truth will produce precisely those results that God intends to produce by it.

Waiting for the next round,



Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

February 17, 1953

Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Department of Philosophy
Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Dear Doc:

I am enclosing for your perusal part of the data which Henry P. Smith introduced in his famous controversy with Professors Warfield and Hodge during the great Briggs' trial. I have yet to find a source which is able to answer Professor Smith convincingly. I have just checked the rebuttal of Warfield to Smith, and I fail to discover any point which remotely meets this particular objection which has been raised by Smith. I consider this problem of the harmony between the Kings and the Chronicles far more serious than the synoptic problem. The reason is obvious. As you can detect from the passages which Smith has listed, there seems to be a tendency in the Chronicler to overstate facts and to change them to suit his purposes. He is operating under a different philosophy than the author of the Kings.

I realize that this type of observation applies equally to myself as to you; but I would be indebted to you for any wise observations you may be able to make concerning this issue.

In a sense I envy you and your isolationism at Butler. Whereas you may continue to ponder the problem of inspiration as an academic issue, I have the awesome task of teaching fifty men each year their philosophy of the text. The course is coming up again in the spring term. I had eighty-seven men in the course last year. It is my hope to create a comprehensive philosophy of plenary inspiration.

Dr. Ockenga is with us for his annual winter visit to the Seminary. He gave a powerful message in chapel this morning on John the Baptist, urging all the men in the Seminary to stand before kings and rulers, fearlessly declaring the whole counsel of God. He had just returned from Wheaton College where he had given the winter evangelistic meetings. It is rather facetious for me to say that it is winter here, since the weather is almost mid-summer outside. We have had a gorgeous season thus far.

I want you to know that all the letters which you send me are carefully put on file, and that from time to time I take them out again and reread them. Do not think, therefore, that you are wasting your time. As usual, I have the profoundest respect for your judgment.

Trusting this finds you well and thanking you again for your continued friendship, I remain

Yours sincerely,

Edward John Carnell
Department of Apologetics

EJC:ip

II Sam. viii:4. And David took from him 1,700 horsemen and 20,000 footmen.

x:6. The children of Ammon sent and hired the Syrians of Beth Rehob and the Syrians of Zobah 20,000 footmen, and the King of Maacah with 1,000 men, and the men of Tob 1,200 men.

x:18. David destroyed of the Syrians 700 chariots.

xxiv:9. There were in Israel 800,000 valiant men who drew sword, and the men of Judah were 500,000.

xxiv:24. So David bought the threshing floor and the oxen for 50 shekels in silver.

I Kings, iv:26. And Solomon had 40,000 stalls for horses.

vi:2. The height [of the house] 30 cubits.

vii:26 It [the brazen sea] held 2,000 baths.

I Chron. xviii:3. And David took from him 1,000 chariots, and 7,000 horsemen, and 20,000 footmen.

xix:6. Hanun and the children of Ammon sent 1,000 talents of silver to hire them chariots and horsemen. So they hired them 32,000 chariots and the King of Maacah and his men.

xix:18. David destroyed of the Syrians 7,000 chariots.

xxi:5. There were of all Israel 1,100,000 that drew sword and Judah was 470,000 that drew sword.

xxi:25. So David gave to Ornan for the place 600 shekels of gold by weight.

II Chron. ix:25. And Solomon had 4,000 stalls for horses and chariots.

iii:4. The height of the porch 120 cubits.

iv:5. It received and held 3,000 baths.

"Now, it will be said at once that these are all discrepancies in numbers which are very liable to corruption, and that, therefore, these are all cases of error in transmission. But I ask you to notice that these are all but one, cases in which the larger number is in the text of the Chronicler. Where the age of a king or the length of his reign is concerned I have not taken account of the difference. But in matters of statistics it is curious that the errors should be nearly all one way. Remembering that the Chronicler was much further away in time from the events narrated, we find it natural that he should have an exaggerated idea of the resources of his country in the days of her glory. In the case of David's purchase of the field of Ornan, he finds the price a niggardly one for a prince to pay. He, therefore, does not hesitate (supposing that a mistake has been made) to put in a larger sum."

"I Kings ix:11. Solomon gave Hiram 30 cities in the land of Galilee.

xv:14. But the high places were not taken away. Nevertheless, the heart of Asa was perfect with the Lord all his days.

"II Chron. viii:2. The cities which Hiram gave Solomon, Solomon built them and caused the children of Israel to dwell there.

II Chron. xiv:3. For he took away the strange altars and the high places (cf. v.5: Also he took away out of all the cities of Judah the high places).

"These certainly look on their face like direct contradictions, and if we allow for the personal equation of which I have spoken we can easily explain them. It would be hard indeed for a Jew of the Persian period to imagine Solomon giving away the sacred territory of Israel to the heathen king. Rather must he suppose the mighty Solomon to be the recipient of gifts of territory. The same line of reasoning is followed in the second quotation. The high places were the old sanctuaries of Jehovah, regarded as legitimate before the building of the Temple even by the author of the book of Kings (I Kings iii:2), and used without reserve by Samuel. As time went on they fell more and more into disrepute, and after the Exile the requirements of the Law were carried out, and the only sanctuary of the people was the temple at Jerusalem. The remembrance of the high places was only that of illegitimate places of worship. The Chronicler and his generation could not imagine a good king as even tolerating them. Hence the change in his account. Allow me to call your attention to one more instance. If you will compare the two accounts of the coronation of the young King Jehoash, which are found in 2 Kings xi:4-16, and 2 Chron. xxiii: 1-15, you will be struck by some remarkable differences."



Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

February 23, 1953

Dear Doc,

My only interest in mentioning the Revised Standard Version is that I think we evangelicals ought to recognize the good wherever it can be found. It is my modest opinion that too many of our men (Dr. Woodbridge, e.g.) are so sullied by their disregard for the persons who did the translating [liberals, one and all] that they have lost all perspective. This is tragic. Again, e.g., I do not see what relevance your observation about La Sor's past Presbyterian record has to the question of truth. Shall I think less of your view of Plotinus because you were evicted from Wheaton with a kick? I only ask one thing: let us not subject the RSV to higher criticism or standards than we do any other version. If we continue to use the American Revised Version (which I used exclusively until 1946)--when it blasphemed the name of Christ by saying that worship paid to him was "paid to a creature," (footnotes) when it translated II Tim. 3:16 in such a way that it diluted the absoluteness of Biblical inspiration etc.--I cannot see why it is not possible to take the good of the new version and condemn the evil. There is no doubt in my mind but what it places more of the word of God before more people more lucidly than any other version. To my way of thinking this is the highest criterion. The Bible must be in the language of the common man.

You seem to think that "expiration" means "the process whereby God gives his message to the human authors of his word." I note two things here. First, where is your proof that this is what it means? It may mean that it excited them mystically to write things which they learned in wisdom books. At least such "expiration" cannot apply to passages which cannot be called revelation proper--such as Paul asking for his cloak and manuscripts. Second, when you show that "expiration" means giving the message, you go to the Bible's self-testimony, showing from O.T. illustrations that the prophet received propositional information from God. Of course this only applies to the prophets; but worse than this, you are doing the very things which I am trying to do: go to the Bible to figure out what inspiration is. You say it is the "expiring" of thoughts of God; I claim it is the "expiring" of "thoughts which shall have the power of bringing life-through-truth." I, no less than you, go to the Bible's self-testimony to show this. When propositions were given to the prophets, they were propositions which had this unique feature: they were the forms of truth in and through which God is a blessing to his people. The blessing potentiality (actuality) of Scripture--potential to the

OR

receiver and actual whether anybody receives it or not--is itself part of the "expiring."

In short, your proof is no better or worse than mine. You use the assertion "expiring" and then promptly comb the Bible to find out what it means. Our difference is that I include the power of the Bible on men as part of the content of the "expiration", while you are impressed with the objective, propositional element. We both choose a position. I choose mine because I am worried over the anemic way that your position applies to the non-revelational portions of the Bible. In the case of the friends of Job, their inspired speeches mean: they are the ones who infallibly gave these very speeches. How delightful! What use is this? What expectations may we ground on such a consolation? What fruits issue from its admission?

I have no basic objection to the addendum that inspiration renders the propositions in the Bible such that "harden those who reject its counsel." Good. Very good. If the properties of hardening clay and melting butter lie objectively in the rays of the sun, I see nothing unworthy to believe that this double effect is included in the objectively expired Bible.

Certainly many things may lie dormant in the Bible objectively without producing fruits (such as truth producing "enlightenment" in the mind of man). But the expired text is such that, were it not for conditions lying in man, it would enlighten, judge, guide etc.

No, your remarks do not sound scholastic to me. I like the straight-off-the-shoulder way that you discuss this. But I do think there is a danger of stating our view of inspiration that we abet the criticism of our own position by rationalists and liberals.

The only way to hammer out the superiority of one view over the other is to put our respective positions to a case test. I select Psalm 84:11: "For the Lord God is a sun and shield; he bestows favor and honor. No good thing does the Lord withhold from those who walk uprightly." (RSV)

As a propositional judgment about reality, this verse is manifestly false. Many Christians have starved to death. The reports of the horrors of Christians in Korea today are unbelievable. God does withhold good things from those who walk uprightly. Unless you want to exclude basic bodily needs from the category of the "good", which is contrary to both common sense and the Bible; since the Bible elsewhere lists these under the good.

In a former letter you have said that the Psalms are true in content--meaning, I suppose, that they are pure sections of revelation (or at least they are didactic sections). I here cite this incidence as prima facie evidence that elements in the Psalms, like the speeches of the friends of Job, are not factually true. This is the first embarrassment on your position. But there is more.

If you rebut: "Expiration here means that we have infallible assurance that this is what the Psalmist uttered--even though, like the speeches of the friends of Job, it is materially false." This leads to my dissatisfaction. What if this is what the Psalmist thought? What good does that do us? If I assure you that I have written this letter, have you any more from the Bible in the case of the Psalmist than you have from me? Surely if God said, "Yes, Carnell wrote this letter," it would not add anything new. Unless you are content to say that all human judgments are freighted with a modicum of error. But this would indeed be a strange reply from one who has insisted over the years on a univocal point of reference between human and divine truth.

On my view, the expired statements of the Psalms which (in fact) contradict either other revelation or the witness of experience nevertheless are propositions in and through which God brings his blessings to the church. They are no less a source of effecting the creation of Christ in us than those which are purely revelational.

You rebut: "But we are not to determine expiration by the analysis of the effects which the Bible says that it has had or will have on people who read it. This notion of expiration goes beyond the classical statements." I do not see for a moment why we may not go to the text and list the effects, making these part of the content of expiration. The "breathed out" only tells us the fact that God is related to the text in such a way that he himself is willing to stand by the finished product as bearing a system of propositions which please him. It does not say that he approves of all that is said, but he approves of the presence of such sayings. "Expiration" only means that the text has cleared with God. But it does not give us a content to the expiration. I insist that, since we are dealing with an inspired text, we go and see what are the elements which go to make up this condition, one of the basic (along with truth) is the sum total of those effects which the text has on people who come to it. For some reason you do not want to go in this direction. You prefer to restrict the meaning of expiration to the communication of truth. Then you say, "truth is truth." I say that there is a qualitative difference between geometry and the Bible. The latter has the spirit of the living God in its very fabric, so that the truth is not seen until it makes a difference in the life.

Analogy: only the lover sees the truth in a letter from the beloved, for only he has the heart to receive the spirit of the other. Other men may read the propositions and develop a "system" from the letter, but they do not hear the words of the beloved as her words.

It looks as if our big fight is going to be on our definition of truth. Apparently your view means that if science could develop an electron machine capable of employing the law of contradiction perfectly, it could see the truth of the Bible. On my view only a man of a humble and contrite heart can see it. Biblical propositions are truth only (so far as the receiver is concerned; I do not refer to the objective state of the text) when they transform.

When you get tired, quit.

PS Thanks for the Michael refs. -

Cordially,





EDWARD JOHN CARNELL
PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS

Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX ~~889~~ 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

March 24, 1953

Dear Doc,

I certainly must employ words faultily. When I use the RSV "exclusively", I mean that I "preach from it". Not to compare it with other versions would, of course, be puerile, if not asinine. But now: Where has the RSV omitted "whole phrases"? You make the assertion; please fortify it with citations. As for the conjectural emendations, there are simply more of them than in the ASV. But this opens up the whole question of an authorized Hebrew text. Not all are convinced that the Masoretic Text is free from defect. I am not sure where I stand on this.

I do not see for a moment why you are disturbed when I say that "No good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly" [Ps. 84:11] is a judgment upon the part of the Psalmist and not a statement of doctrine. Don't take my word for it that the Psalmist was in error here. "Shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" [Job 2:10, ASV] Take your pick. Either "X" (the unknown author of the Psalm in question) or Job. It makes no difference. Both--on your view--are giving infallible doctrine for the church. Job filled every condition mentioned in the Psalm, and yet Jehovah withheld from him good things.

You think that an error in judgment in the Psalms is damaging to my presupposition that the Bible is an errorless revelation. Not at all. Not any more than the errors in judgment by Bildad, Zophar, or Eliphaz. The Bible infallibly records the fact that this is a judgment which the Psalmist made. What is so terrible about that? After all, you are the one who has happily introduced this bifurcated conception of truth: (a) truth as to content, (b) truth as to the fact of accurate reporting. I can see no point at which I am going out of this structure.

But you protest: The New Testament says the Psalms have divine authority as law. Answer: the references ["law, Psalms, prophets", "in your law" etc.] include the whole Old Testament. Obviously, then, if you have a right to question the office of Bildad as a teacher, so have I a right to question "X" in Psalm 84.

If you are willing to equate "it is written" with "divinely authoritative doctrine" [as R take it you must, since you continually throw back at me the hoary 'Reformation' doctrine of inspiration], then, sir, I recommend you place the speeches of the friends of Job in a higher category. In I Cor. 3:19, Paul says: "For it is written, He that taketh the wise in their craftiness" (ASV). But the quotation happens to be from Job 5:13, part of one of the extended speeches of Eliphaz the Temanite!

You confess you have nothing to say about the Kings-Chronicles problem. Neither did Warfield and Hodge; neither did Goddard at Gordon; neither do

Archer and LaSor here at Fuller. When Henry Preserved Smith was on trial, he pointed to this problem and said, hand over heart, these are errors in the Bible. God helping him, he could not in conscience declare otherwise. All the evangelicals have ever done with this problem is to sigh and say that "difficulties are being overcome from decade to decade." This optimism is without foundation. As far back as Augustine the church has admitted errors in the harmony of Kings and Chronicles. James Orr did; Matthew Henry did; Richard Baxter did. I remember a saying from high school. It is remembered, not for its eloquence, but for its truth: "Either put up or shut up."

What is wrong with saying that in these non-doctrinal sections of the Old Testament, the reach of the Holy Spirit in inspiration did not include a correction of the sources which the historians used. Orr and Henry are candid to admit that the Chronicler used faulty source materials, that is all there is to it.

Do not conclude that I have scuttled the Reformation view of the Scriptures. Hardly, I teach it here, and with considerable force. But now the time has come for me to write a book on the subject, publically setting down our view. The more I ponder the problem the more complex it comes to be.

The last sentence in your second-from-the-last paragraph is illuminating: "If the Bible is not true, if the Psalmist inculcates falsehood, then no contrite heart is going to receive any benefit that I would estimate very highly." This, as I see it, is a confession on your part that the content of what is asserted must be true, or no good can be extracted. And it is exactly at this point that I said there is need for a definition of inspiration which makes the Bible valuable even where the content is not true. You admit that there are errors in the speeches of the friends of Job; hence, I may conclude that "no contrite heart is going to receive any benefit that I would estimate very highly" from these speeches. And if you say that benefit can be found from these erroneous passages--the idea being that the Bible infallibly "reports what they said"--then you surely ought to admit the theoretical possibility that the Bible infallibly reports what the Psalmist said. Why is infallibility of content guaranteed in the one any more than the other? Neither announces (as do Christ and the prophets and the apostles) that he is delivering doctrine.

And you might chew on this for a while: much of the Psalms is poetry. How can you call poetry "true?"

I detect the familiar Clarkeian impatience cropping out in the last letter. I really had looked for it to appear long before this. When you are ready to drop this topic, go ahead.

Cordially,

March 31 1953

Dear Ed,

We are certainly breaking our good resolves to keep a letter to a point at a time; but it seems so impossible to observe such restrictions inviolably. And if I sounded impatient, I apologize; here I shall try not to be impatient, eventhough I must repeat some things I said before. But taking your paragraphs one by one, let us begin with the first on the RSV.

You question my assertion that phrases have been omitted. I was assuming that you had looked over the evidence and had a grasp of the methods of these new translators; but I can only conjecture that you have not considered the evidence. Of course you cannot expect me to type out all that may be obtained in Allis' examination (which I advise you to read), but I am quite willing to give examples and justify my assertion.

In Eph. 1:11 the Greek text has the phrase, in whom also we were made a heritage; Nestle does not indicate any noteworthy rejected reading, though Tischendorf records MSS that have a slightly different verb; however, the RSV entirely omits the phrase. Ergo: my assertions is justified.

Since you seem to be unaware of the sloppiness of the RSV translation, let me also refer you to their results in I Cor. 15:44-46. The Greek word for psychical is mistranslated three times as physical, in such a connection as to cast doubt on the doctrine of the resurrection of the body. That this passage is mistranslated can be seen by the RSV's own admission in I Cor. 2:14 where the word is correctly translated.

Since I wish to say something about your remarks on the OT, I leave it to you to find out more on the NT.

To say that the RSV has more conjectural emendations than the ARV seems to me to be a most peculiar argument in favor of the RSV. My conclusion would be that the more conjectures a translator indulges in, the worse his translation is; not the better. And further, not only does the RSV indulge in numerous conjectures, but it gives the impression in the Preface that it has warned the reader where they occur. This is untrue. There are many conjectures without any note at all.

Nor do I follow you precisely when you say that this opens up the question of an authorized Hebrew text. In one way of course it does; since every translation must be of some definite text. But conjectural emendations are violations of all texts. They are subjective shifting of letters or substitutions of words. The modern translator just feels that Isa or Judges cannot possibly say what the MSS have; so he changes it to suit his own subjective preferences. Note too that this is not a matter of the Masoretic text or points. It has to do in some cases with shifting consonants, and in other cases altering the ~~xxxxxx~~ meaning of words. Unfortunately I run the risk of incurring your condemnation, for I do not have the material before me at the moment; but as I recall, the RSV refuses to use the word "sprinkle" in Isa 52:15, and puts a note to the effect that the meaning of the Hebrew word is doubtful. But the same word is used at least a dozen times and even the RSV translates it sprinkle. However, in this place they say ~~startle~~, which was a footnote in the ARV. But this is not the text. And further, some evidence is now available on the consonantal purity of the Medieval MSS of the OT. The Dead Sea Scrolls, written about 200 B.C., have almost the identical text of the MSS written 1000 years later. The variant readings are much fewer than could have been guessed a few years ago. Hence there is no justification for wholesale doubt of the Masoretic consonantal text; and no justification for rearranging letters without any objective evidence.

Now, I have written a page and a half on one of your paragraphs, and have not said half I would like to. If I keep on, my letters will form a bulky volume.

In paragraph two, on which I would have to write as much or more than the above to do the job completely, you make a point by producing a verbal contradiction between Job 2:10 and Psa 84:11. Incidentally, and you may think it superficial, the two texts do not contradict. One says that God withholds no good thing, and the other text says he sends some evils. Now, in ordinary logic there is no contradiction here. A father can withhold no chocolate ice cream from his child and also give him castor oil. Hence, since I seem to be the one who insists on logic, I must insist that here you have not produced a contradiction. Both statements may be true. But with your dislike of cold and sterile logic, you want more. And the more is a matter of interpretation. The Hebrew word for evil in Job 2 has several meanings. It often ~~xxxxxx~~ means wickedness and sin. Now, it seems to me

that the context forbids this meaning --though in other places sin and wickedness are quite appropriate, and in some cases all possible meanings may be intended. But in Job the particular evils which God sent upon him are listed. There is no doubt as to what they are. And therefore I would accept Job's statement that God sends evils to the righteous. At the same time I would insist that God withholds no good thing from the righteous. But the word good in such a connection does not mean good weather, as opposed to stormy, or wealth, as opposed to poverty, or sickness as opposed to health. These items simply are not goods simpliciter. They may be evils; they may be goods. Chastisement is unpleasant, but it is a good. And the physical evils, the loss of wealth and children, which Job suffered, were indeed goods to him. For the NT says that those who have lost children or wealth for Christ's sake will be repaid a hundred fold. And it seems clear from the book of Job that Job was not repaid in this life only, but in the ~~is~~ life to come.

Hence I refuse to say as you do that the Psalmist was in error. And I continue to insist that both Job and the Psalmist were by the inspiration of the Spirit telling the truth. For this reason your third paragraph seems confusion to me. Whether an error by the Psalmist is inconsistent with your theory of Scripture, I would not say; for I have no clear picture of what your view of Scripture is. But an error by the Psalmist would surely be inconsistent with my view of the Bible. The Psalmist is an inspired writer; the friends of Job ~~xxx~~ are not. If you try to say that the Psalmist may be 100% wrong, but that the Bible is still an errorless revelation, it seems to me that you are placing the writers of the Scripture on the same level as anyone whom they may quote. I have not introduced any bifurcated conception of truth; I have merely distinguished what an author asserts on his own authority and what he quotes from another. He asserts on his own authority that someone else said so or so -- not that the quoted material is itself true; but when he is not quoting but giving his own views, he asserts that what he says is true. The Psalmist was inspired; the friends of Job were not. Of course the whole OT is "law" and authoritative; but what you say in paragraph four does not follow. There is no sensible interpretation that would insist that Esau, Potiphar, Pharaoh, Rabshakeh, as well as Bildad, are "teachers" as you say. When I deny that these men always told the truth, you cannot infer by the same reasoning that the Psalmist may not have told the truth. Your implication in paragraph is clearly a fallacy.

Now, you may force me to retract some of what I said, for you bring to my attention something that I had not realized before.: viz. that Paul introduces a quotation from Eliphaz with the words It is written. Now, offhand I would think that such an introduction is an assertion of the authority of the quotation, from which it would seem to follow that Eliphaz was inspired and told the truth - not merely once or twice, but could always be relied upon. And yet, it seems that Eliphaz cannot be relied on, for in Job 22 E. accuses Job of great sin; and in Job42:7, it says, "Jehovah said to E. the T. My wrath is kindled against thee . . . for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath. Apparently others before me have been puzzled at this, for Lange says that It is written, means merely that the words are found in the canon, and does not indicate that E. was inspired any more than Paul's quoting the Stoic poet means that the Stoic was inspired. So, I confess I am puzzled on this point. But suppose I was completely mistaken, and suppose that E. was inspired. Does it follow that the devil was also inspired when he said Thou shalt not surely die? I cannot see that even the greatest admission I would have to make about the book of Job would lead to accepting all the quotations in the Bible. And hence I cannot see how my original suspicion that Bildad and E. cannot be trusted give you or anyone the right to say that the Psalmist does not tell the truth. For, if the Psalmist does not tell the ~~xxx~~ truth, how can you conclude that any particular part of the Bible is true? Maybe Matt. did not tell the truth in the first or 28th chapter. Maybe I Cor 11 is false. I questioned the truth of Job's friends on the basis of Job 42. This does not apply to the Psalmist or to Paul. Make as much as you will of my confusion, I still cannot see the force of your argument, nor can I accept your assertion that the Psalms tell falsehoods.

Now, we pass to Kings and Chronicles. It is strange that you rebuke me for not being able to solve these problems. For, first of all, I am not an archaeologist. And if I were, still the problems might have no solution at this time. Seventy five years ago, it could not be shown that the Hittites ever existed. The evidence had to await digging. It seems to me that you are quite mistaken when you say this optimism is without foundation. So many corroborations of the Bible have been discovered, so much light has been shed on the meaning of passages, that we are not without foundation for a hope that other difficulties will be cleared away with future discoveries. To go back to Augustine, is to go backwards indeed. We do not find a foundation by going back before archaeology began. And the motto, put up or shut up, is inappropriate.

Someone could have said this about the Hittites: and he would have been wrong. The fact that the Hittites could not be proved in 1870 does not show that the Bible was wrong. Archaeological discoveries cannot be put up in such a fashion. We have to wait. But we wait with hope because of what has ~~ax~~ already been done. These critics have been proved wrong so often, there is reason to believe they are wrong again.

Furthermore, I repudiate your distinction between doctrinal and non-doctrinal passages. In I Cor 10:11 Paul says the OT history was written for our admonition. It is all doctrinal.

You say that you have not scuttled the Reformation view of inspiration. Then how is it you assert that the Psalmist told a lie in his teaching. Where in the Reformation view do you get the distinction between doctrinal and non-doctrinal passages. Paul says All Scriptures is profitable . . . for doctrine. And where is your Reformation basis for saying that the Bible can be profitable even if it is not true. Brunner says God teaches us by lying to us; but did the Reformers? Of course I admit that we can profit by the devils words, Thou shalt not surely die; but we profit by them only in the true context that says they are false. The Bible quotes Thou shalt not surely die, but the Bible does not inculcate this. Accordingly I shall stand by my assertion that if the Psalmist inculcates falsehood, we might as well throw the Bible in the wastebasket. I should very definitely say that the Psalmist as much as Christ and Paul claim to deliver doctrine. And Paul asserts that all the Old Testament teaches doctrine. It seems to me that this distinction of yours is neither Scriptural nor Reformed.

And why cannot poetry be true or false? You yourself said some of it was false. The fact that declarative sentences are put in some metric form does not remove them from the true-~~fx~~ false sphere. Psa. 79:1 says They have laid Jerusalem in heaps. 78:13 says, He clave the sea, and caused them to pass through. Is this any less true because written in poetic form than it was expressed in prose in Exodus? And is a command any less binding when expressed in meter? Really, Ed. don't you think I should get a little impatient at this?

Perhaps I owe you a note on the long time it has taken to ~~wkx~~ write this letter. Even with a week off after Easter, I ~~a~~ am jammed with work. Easter week

I spent a good part of two days in a garage getting the car fixed. We drove 150 miles to and 150 miles home from Presbytery, another day. A third day I took the family to a park - we thought we should have one day vacation. Then I was writing a radio program, reviewing a book, and trying to write a chapter on Aristotle. For today, I had to read a hundred pages in Voltaire's dictionary. I attend business meetings of directors of a rescue mission. I preach every Sunday. I am not complaining, but I do get jammed.

Further, I attended lectures in I.U. two days and one evening, and the Ind. Phil. Assn. all day last Saturday. I.U. is 60 miles each way, and the other was 75 m. each way. It all takes time and energy.

And incidentally, at these two places I argued with John Wild, who wished to be remembered to you, and said he thought your Niebuhr book was excellent and ~~xxx~~ spoke in complimentary terms of your ability. I think I shall not go to St. Louis next week for the Am Phil Assn; though Bill Young would like me to drive him there. I want to average five pages a week on Aristotle, and this means many more pages of *Die Syllogistik des Aristoteles* -- 2000 pages of fine writing, but I shall not read it all.

well, good bye for the time being. Reply when you can, and I shall answer the same way.



Fuller Theological Seminary

POST OFFICE BOX 750-M
PASADENA 19, CALIFORNIA

April 27, 1953

Dear Doc:

Psalm 37:25 reads:

I have been young, and now am old;
yet I have not seen the righteous
forsaken
or his children begging bread.

The only meaningful way that this verse can be called true is that it represents an infallible report of what the Psalmist observed. We cannot base doctrine on it, for we have information elsewhere that Christians do, in fact, beg bread. II Cor. 11:27: "often without food." Hebrews 11:37: "destitute, afflicted, ill-treated." If the range of experience of the Psalmist had been wider, he would not have made this statement; for covenant children do starve to death. All the text says is that the psalmist didn't see anyone do it.

Psalm 39:1 reads:

I said, "I will guard my ways,
that I may not sin with my
tongue.
I will bridle my mouth,
so long as the wicked are
in my presence."

This reference claims to give no more than a report of what the Psalmist "said". Why this, and many other such passages in the Psalms of 'reporting' do not fall within the same category of the speeches of the friends of Job [or of Job, for that matter], I simply do not see.

You wonder what criteria I shall use when employing the Psalms. First, coherence with the rest of Scripture (illustrated above in the case of the Psalmist's judgment about begging bread); second, whether the New Testament pins down a verse by actual quotation, as in Christ's quotation of the 110th Psalm; third, common sense, namely, that many of the Psalms are no more than the religious devotional material of the Psalmist, as "I will bless the Lord at all times; his praise shall continually be in my mouth", 34:1 etc. In short, whatever criteria you use in telling what is and what is not true in the speeches of Eliphaz the Temanite.

Farewell.

Cordially,

FULLER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
135 NORTH OAKLAND AVENUE
PASADENA 1, CALIFORNIA

EDWARD JOHN CARNELL
THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

December 12, 1953

Dear Doc:

No, I did not.

I do not mind risking the fare to Chicago. The situation is far less happy than this--providing your epistemology be valid. ~~Since~~ I cannot know whether or not there is such a place as Chicago, and ~~since~~ presumably you cannot know by any other way either, save by the if/then proposition in which we affirm the consequent [If I assume there is such a city, I can make better sense out of my experience; but better sense does come from this assumption; therefore, the assumption is justified.] But you call this a false conclusion. Hence, since it is false that there is a city, Chicago, it must be true that there is not such a city. Risk implies at least the possibility of attainment; but as it now stands the goal is nonexistent altogether. So, I presume I shall not be seeing you in what I used to think was Chicago.

not based on xpr.

You seem to think my reference to Columbus is trivial. I meant it to stand for all propositions referring to actual existence. Since you are unable to establish the truth of the proposition, "Columbus discovered America", for it obviously involves the if/then fallacy of affirming the consequent, you can neither prove any other proposition which has actual existence for its reference. "Columbus discovered America" and "Columbus did not discover America" are equally possible, since neither can be proved. And the same goes for everything else that includes existence: "This is a letter from Carnell," "Gold is heavy," "Christ died for our sins," and "The Bible is the Word of God." You are really in bad shape in your theory of knowledge, for you cannot get out of the circle of your own a priori.

Indeed, you say that if it is true that Columbus discovered America, it is eternally true. This is platitudinous. The issue is, Is it true? And, as I see it, you raise a question which you have no means of answering. And worse than this, you have no means of answering any other question which has reality as its reference. If it takes omniscience to know that this is a letter from Carnell, I certainly do not know how you can possibly prove the truth of the Resurrection.

I did not say so: I said my mind is not 60'

I am glad for the clarification about Berkeley. But a problem remains. You still have the (possible) truth that the city hall is 60 feet tall--and this is in your mind. While the city hall is not in your mind. But how do you know you have a true idea of city hall? Is this not the problem of "correspondence" in a disguised form? How do you know that the ideas you entertain are the true counterparts of reality? *I did not assert they are counterparts.*

I appreciate ever so much your continued correspondence. It is hard to find anyone to talk these things over with. Carl even seems in too big of a hurry to sit still for argument. But I feel I must work my way through these things before I can do a good job of educating these students. I want to write a book on inspiration some day, but there is no sense in starting until I have my theory of knowledge down cold.

For two weeks my office has been torn up while new book shelves go in. Now for some quiet work again. Gad, if it were not for students, what a happy job teaching would be. Cordially,

Ed

January 2 1954

Dear Ed,

After the rush of the week before Christmas, I took an eight day vacation in bed with the flu. I am still jittery and far behind in my writing. Maybe in two or three sessions I can make a reply to your letter of Dec. 12. Could we talk together for two hours, we would use ten thousand words. A letter of one thousand is long, and there is no opportunity of stopping the remarks at a point where they seem to miss the point.

One thing that worries me in this discussion is the type of objection you sometimes raise. Undoubtedly there are difficulties in my formulations; I am all too keenly aware of them; and I stay awake nights trying to remedy them. But what troubles me seems to trouble no one else, and the converse is also often true.

For example, in the letter previous to Dec. 12 you asked whether I was not adopting Berkeley's position. I replied to point out several differences between my position and the good Bishop's; and in your letter of Dec. 12, you profess to be satisfied. But what troubles me is that you should have so misunderstood me in the first place. Note: Berkeley is an empiricist, and I thought it was clear that I am not. Second, if you read the first paragraph of Book II of Locke's Essay, and the first paragraph (after the long introduction) of Berkeley's Principles, and the corresponding passages in Hume, you will see that they identify the object of knowledge as sensations, such as red, blue, bitter, etc, and their derivative memory images, and combinations. Now, have I not said often enough that the object of knowledge is truth, and that truth is always expressible in propositions, that it consists of a relation of subject to predicate? Perhaps some of the confusion lies in the term idea, which possibly you are using in the empirical sense. Try to find time to read Brand Blanshard, The Nature of Thought, the chapter in which he argues that ideas are not images. You continue by asking, "How do you know that the ideas you entertain are the true counterparts of reality?" And how can you ask? Have I not repeatedly rejected the correspondence theory? Do I not consistently deny that my ideas are counterparts of reality? Once for all, if I know ~~anything~~ anything, what I know is itself reality. I am trying to be an epistemological realist. Reality, i.e., the truths themselves are reality.

Before I go on with my second point, the above remarks lead to a parenthesis. I cannot usually tell from your letters when I have succeeded in making a point clear. You frequently drop points at issue, and I cannot tell whether you are merely no longer interested, or whether you have

come to agree, or what the state of the discussion. Some time ago I sent you evidence (against some of your prior statements) that the RSV was a poor translation. But you said nothing further. More recently --letter before last-- you said it was elementary that some concepts could not be given any symbols at all. Perhaps my reply was too brief. I asked you to defend your statement, and perhaps made a short mention that one can always invent a word, an X, for anything one thinks of. This item bore on the possibility of expressing any truth. Do you wish to continue explaining your views on symbolism?

Now, my second and final point for this letter has to do with the first few paragraphs of your Dec. 12 epistle. And the point is rather repetitious. Previously you looked askance at logic, and seemed satisfied with argument asserting the consequent. Of course, I can continue writing only on the basis of valid inference. Anything else is just nonsense. And, I must say, that your first few paragraphs are either nonsense or misquotations of my statements, or both. When I asked you to risk going to Chicago (and you would have lost the risk, so far as seeing me is concerned, for I was in bed), you said "I do not mind risking the fare to Chicago." But the situation, you continue is a less happy one. We cannot know whether there is a Chicago, except by affirming the consequent. "But you call this a false conclusion." "Hence since it is false that there is a city, Chicago, it must be true that there is not such a city." Now, my dear Ed, where did you get all that trash? If you are attempting to quote me, you misquote. If you are drawing inferences, you are drawing invalid inferences as bad as asserting the consequent. I must insist that you observe the laws of logic. Now note, If it is raining, I carry an umbrella; I am carrying an umbrella, therefore it is raining. This is an invalid inference; it asserts the consequence. But though the conclusion cannot be drawn from the premises, it does not follow that the conclusion is false. Your wild conclusion that Chicago does not exist is simply an horrible example of bad logic. If Chicago did not exist, there would be no point in taking the risk. If we do not know whether Chicago exists or not, we do not know that the risk would be unsuccessful.

You then pass from Chicago to Columbus, and then to Christ died for our sins. Certainly even you do not hold that Christ died for our sins can be deduced from experience? I suppose that this may be called a value judgment. And have I or have I not shown, in the chapter on Religion, that values cannot be derived from experience? Christ died for our sins is revelation, of which I can be far more sure than of the existence of Chicago.

Fuller Theological Seminary

135 North Oakland Avenue
Pasadena 1, California

Office of the President

October 25, 1954

Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Department of Philosophy
Butler University
Indianapolis 7, Indiana

Dear Doc:

Thank you for your warm letter of October 15th.

You are right: I was too modest to write you about my appointment to the presidency of the Seminary. I somehow have a sheepish feeling about blowing my own horn.

I suppose part of the reason for not writing also was that I was not able to predict how you would react. I had a feeling that you might think that I had betrayed the academic cause, having returned to the flesh pots of Egyptian fame and fortune. If you think that I have taken this post because it holds some egoistic delight, nothing could be farther from the truth. The egoistic pull is on the other side. I think I have a far better chance of making myself famous as a Christian apologist than I do as a president of this school. Presidents are popular, but they are seldom famous. Perhaps sometime we will have the leisure to talk the whole matter over. I would like to explain to you in detail why it was incumbent upon me to take the office. The situation was such that I simply could not sit back and watch the school go into the wrong hands by default. I hope you appreciate the fact that professors ~~in~~ academic freedom if they do not have the right administrative head working on their behalf. I think you would still be at Wheaton if Buswell had been more careful in his administrative decisions. I personally think that Fuller Seminary is a great school. To see this school fall into the hands of those who would let it develop into a mediocre, fundamentalist institution, would be more than I could stand.

There are angles to my appointment here which are not all unsavory. It is not my intention to be a promotional man or to run around the country raising money. I shall do all that is necessary at this point, but it is my intention to build up a staff of public relation men who will care for these details. My job here, by Trustee directive, is to create an institution with good education for the general reformed faith.

I may be going as far as Chicago during Christmas holidays, in which case I could just continue on to New York. I do not know if I shall be able to do it, however. I shall let you know the outcome.

I would urge you to continue working on your History of Philosophy, though I wouldn't pay much attention to the Zondervan contest. I don't think a book published by Zondervan carries much prestige. I would urge you to try for one of the big houses again. Like Harpers or Macmillan. Do not let the discouragement of your last manuscript stop you from making new attempts.

Where has Roderick Campbell's book been published? I have not seen it advertised anywhere. It looks like something I would like to get into immediately. Who publishes it? Please drop me a postal card so I can get right into it. I do not expect for a minute to let this office of presidency destroy my reading time. I hope to keep up with the literature in the general fields of my interest.

I am so appreciative of the confidence which you place in me. I shall do my best over the years to create the type of institution here that you and I would be proud to bequeath to our children. I think the hour has come for something daring in Christian education. Westminster Seminary has not risen to its opportunities. It may be that by default Fuller Seminary will reach a stature which surpasses that of even Westminster academically and spiritually.

Trusting this finds you well and sending my warmest greetings to your wife, I remain

Yours cordially,

Ed

Edward John Carnell
President

EJC:lb

I understand a blast against Carnell's
apologetics is soon to appear —
but it come, & may well (Carnell?)
prevail.

Fuller Theological Seminary

135 North Oakland Avenue
Pasadena 1, California

Office of the President

January 12, 1955

Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Department of Philosophy
Butler University
Indianapolis 7, Indiana

Dear Doc:

I would appreciate it very much if you would give me your candid judgment on a very serious problem.

In undertaking this office of presidency I tacitly assumed (possibly quite without justification) that the premillennial stand of the Seminary was a provisional concession to the clientele of the Old Fashioned Revival Hour. Since so many supporters of Dr. Fuller's are of the dispensational stripe, it was only natural that in the launching of this school a sop had to be given to this powerful lobby.

Now for the problem. Preliminary investigation has suggested the possibility that Dr. Fuller intends that the school shall be limited by the premillennial position until the Lord comes. This obviously is a matter of large disappointment. Dr. Fuller has not yet given his final word on the matter, and I have not pressed it, out of judicious reasons.

Do you think it is possible for Fuller Seminary to become a first-rate school if it is limited by this parochial emphasis in eschatology? Right now I am of the opinion that leadership in evangelicalism requires a far healthier view of the millennial problem than Fuller Seminary is willing to admit. Am I justified in making this an issue before I decide to give up my Department of Theology here to another? I still have time to decide the question one way or another. I would appreciate your candor on this, because I do not want to act unwisely.

I am of the opinion that if Dr. Fuller dies without changing his mind on this question the school for moral reasons will be committed to this provincial theology. I cannot see how greatness can come out of such a movement and I certainly am uninspired to cast my lot behind it as president.

If you can bring yourself to giving me a judgment at this point with haste I would appreciate it very much, since the disposition of the Theology Department is imminent. Greetings to everybody.

Yours cordially,



Edward John Carnell
President

EJC:K

1. Cantor or Kashe (?) neither prominent scholars,
2. I am ignorant of exact legal provisions
 - (a) It is Fuller's degree of control
 - (b) Why did you think pre-mil provincial
(news to me)

3. Pre-mil not new & provincial, provincial, any more than any other specific theory. don't see P Langens to Fuller et al.

4. In what way is ~~Langens~~ ^{Sem's} attitude on eccl. unhealthy. I have heard good reports of Ludd's work.

5.

6.

Sem came to great work in pre-mil. Though inclusion of other views would make it easier.

Questions arise through careful scholarship.

7. If you wish to include other views - ⁱⁿ begin now, or be hindered by Fuller's death.

8. Note Gordon Dis. Sch is not pre-mil. + Roger Winkle is not pre-mil, I believe. He is an excellent scholar.

January 14 1955

Dear Ed,

You have asked me to reply to your question on the premillennial position at Fuller Seminary with candor and with haste. These two requirements are easily met, but neither guarantees any wisdom.

In the first place I am ignorant of several factors which may be important. I do not know what degree of control Mr. Fuller retains. I had understood that he retained no legal control; but there may be moral or financial control. Then too there is Ockenga. If these men are on the Board of Directors, the question becomes what the Directors can do about the Seminary's doctrinal position.

In the second place I was ignorant that you or anyone else regarded the premillennial position as merely provisional. You must have had some reasons for so thinking, but what they are, I do not know. And it is natural to ask, how many of the present faculty are of the same opinion?

The above two paragraphs, I suppose, merely make the obvious point that whatever you do should have majority support from the faculty and directors.

Next, you refer to the premillennial position as parochial and provincial. Of course it is a single definite position, but as such it is hardly any more provincial than any other single position. At any rate, it strikes me that it would be unwise to use such adjectives in speaking with Fuller and others who are enthusiastically premillennarians.

You also say that the Seminary's attitude on eschatology is unhealthy. Do you mean anything more than that only one view is permitted at present; or do you mean more than this? I can only advise you insofar as I know the conditions. At the E.T.S. meeting after Christmas, I heard some complimentary remarks about Ladd's book, from which remarks I could infer that the eschatological situation at Fuller was quite good. I noted that men like Ferrin of Providence had come a long ways away from the wild dispensationalism of Dallas; and it was even hinted that Waalvoord did not stand exactly where Chafer had stood. And I was also under the impression that only your librarian is a dispensationalist. Therefore I do not quite know what you mean by a healthier attitude than the present Fuller position.

Next, you ask whether the Seminary can do a great work if it is limited to the premil position. Frankly, I think it can. But I also think that this limitation will make it rather more difficult. The greatness of a seminary is a function of the scholarship of its faculty members. Fuller Seminary would therefore have to choose premillenarians who are good scholars. The temptation would be to choose someone not too scholarly because there would be an opening to fill and you could not wait until a good scholar developed. Obviously if you open your ranks to other positions, you will have a greater choice. To be specific: I think Roger Nicole is a pretty good scholar (if only he could be prodded to publish something). But Nicole is not premil, if I understand correctly. Therefore he would not be in your present range of choice. With so many students, and therefore under the compulsion to offer so many courses, it is likely that you would appoint a premil who was not so good a scholar. And I wonder if you have not already done something on this order? If you can resist this temptation, you can do a great work; but obviously you will be working under a handicap.

To those who are more attached to premillennialism, you might point out that Gordon is not premil.

The nearest I can come to giving you advice in this. If you are correct in saying that a change would have to be made before Mr. Fuller departs this life, you ought to begin your campaign at the earliest possible moment. None of us knows when any of us will die; and according to your statement, his death would end your chances.

While trying to help you along this line, though I doubt that I can really be of any help, I might mention that there is something that worries me more than the premil situation at Fuller. I am afraid that appointments may be made, or better, be denied, on bases not stated in your doctrinal position. That is to say, that certain doctrinal requirements will be tacitly enforced, without the sanction of the public statement. Then too, there is the danger of disregarding the public statements. In the Jan 15 issue of ExX U.E.A., page 12, I have a review of Warren Young's book, A Xn Approach to Phil. I take him to task for not saying that the Bible is a revelation from God. He seems to think of the Bible as merely a record of a revelation. I was quite disturbed to see in your Bulletin that ExxidxEx Daniel Fuller says that the Bible is the record of God's message to man. This sounds like neo-orthodoxy to me. Is not the Bible the message itself, and not a mere record of a past message?

Now, to change the subject a little. In your letter of Oct. 25 1954, you added in ink that there was soon to come a blast against your apologetics. Maybe you meant Warren Young's book. But if not, I wonder what you had in mind. I have seen

nothing else, and that book is hardly a blast.

In connection with your earlier letter also, I may say that I have followed your advice, which agrees with Carl's, and I have given up the idea of submitting my MS on the history of philosophy to Zondervan. I hope to get several chapters in final shape to present to the commercial publishers this spring. Two of them have asked to examine ~~it~~ it. But it takes so much time. I am up to Hegel now, and after him one full chapter to go. Then I took on a series of about 30 articles on the Westminster Confession for the Southern Presbyterian Journal. These men are winning a tremendous victory against the ecumaniacs. Just this week another Presbytery voted 32-16 against union. I wish I could be down there with them.

Cordially,

Fuller Theological Seminary

135 North Oakland Avenue
Pasadena 1, California

Office of the President

January 17, 1955

Dr. Gordon H. Clark
Department of Philosophy
Butler University
Indianapolis 7, Indiana

Dear Doc:

Thank you for your letter of January 14. I appreciate your candor.

I shall act upon your counsel in every way possible. It is my intention to proceed with care, love, and patience in this matter. I simply have the personal conviction that scholarship has a greater chance of following if an institution gives Christian liberty in the details of eschatology which do not touch a major Christian doctrine.

We have a splendid liberty here at Fuller in eschatology with the exception of this one point. I have merely become convicted that it is my duty to reassess the question while the founder is still alive. You properly point out that our days are in the hands of the Lord and that we cannot presume upon His providence.

I appreciate your observation that the Seminary may open itself to carelessness on certain theological questions and thus destroy the precision of the school's testimony over the years. Remember that this is a problem which every school faces. We shall do our best here to cover this matter. As to your reference to Daniel Fuller mentioning that the Bible is the record of God's message to man, bear in mind that the words are formal and that they are capable of being used in various ways. I do not defend the choice of language which Dan Fuller has used, but I do know from years of conversation with him that he does not intend what neo-orthodoxy intends. We gave Dan a very thorough interrogation here before he was hired.

You mention a blast against my apologetics which was to come out. I was only passing on an observation which Jewett had given me. He said that he had gotten wind that it was in the offing. I know nothing beyond that. I presumed that the blast was going to have its origin at Westminster Seminary. I shall ask Jewett about it when he comes.

We are considering Jewett for the Chair of Theology here at the Seminary. He will take my place. There are several complicating factors in the picture, but I do hope the faculty here will show maturity and give Paul a vote. I shall let you know of the outcome.

Congratulations to the Southern Presbyterians for their stalwart stand.

Yours cordially,



Edward John Carnell

EJC:K