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TRIBUTE TO DR. STRACHAN
by E. Paul Balisky

It was nearly a year ago that you came to us. You lived so quietly and unassumingly among us. You sat with us and ate with us in the refectory. You joined us as we huddled around the little TV set in Slessor Lounge to watch the World Series. Many of us went golfing with you.

You hardly seemed like a professor. You were more like the Apostle Paul and we...well, we were like the scared crewmen on the stormy sea. Many of us had given up hope for the missionary enterprise. Evangelism was not an option. All our hopes and ambitions would soon be smashed on the rocks. Many of us despaired of life itself. The wind had torn the sails. We had already thrown the rigging overboard. And we were so tired and hungry. Then you stepped out on the deck. Somehow all of us, from the captain to the sailors, felt you should take charge. When you said:

I now bid you to take heart; for there will be no loss of life among you, only the ship.... So take heart, men, for I have faith in God....

we could hardly believe you. "Why, you don't know the theological climate in this part of the world," some of the sailors muttered. "There is no hope; we are all going under." But because you spoke with such love and hope, reinforced by your life, we believed you.

You had us over to your home. You asked us who we were and why we were in seminary. You loved us and gave yourself to us.

You showed us how to love all men, and to love them where they are. Remember that Pasadena banker you used to go golfing with last spring? You told us that behind his facade of prestige and power this man was really lonely. Apparently he had no idea of what Christ's love meant.

And then there was the living testimony of your ministry in Latin America, but you talked very little about this. Instead of blowing your horn about the merits of the Evangelism-in-Depth program, you were continually tossing out new ideas for evangelism.

Yes, the old ship of bad theology, doubt, and faulty attitudes about missions went down. But not a life was lost. You showed us that "with God nothing is impossible." Doubt had been replaced by faith; static, rigid thinking by creative, imaginative thinking; promotion by prayer; individualism by teamwork; lazy Christianity by discipleship; and-man-centered evangelism by a Christ-centered evangelism that could reach the total society.

You gave us new hope. How shall we thank you?

* * * *

PAUL BALISKY, a senior at FTS, is chairman of the Fuller Missions Fellowship. He received an AB in Literature at Wheaton College in 1962.
EDITORIAL

Now That Our Education is Over,
We've Come to The Seminary

Past issues of the Opinion have manifested the student's sense of responsibility in meeting the academic and administrative issues of the Seminary. Few opinions have gone unvoiced. No doubt, such evidence of student concern over the type of education being offered will continue to seek expression. There is, however, another aspect which deserves the close attention of all who are involved in the academic process at Fuller. This "aspect" elicits the general question of what goes to make up an education, but it centers on the student and his responsibility to his own education.

Education is one of the most dynamic, demanding enterprises in a man's life. It is in education that one is confronted with ideas and methods; it is here that the mind is stretched and one comes to full maturity. Through a process of taking in new concepts and weighing them by past experience, the student is able to assimilate them, making them his own and applying them to all areas of his life.

The challenge of education is awesome, for vital education calls upon the student to give himself wholly to the discipline of learning. Yet such discipline is easily counterfeited. There is a form of 'learning' which, while fulfilling the basic requirements of a given curriculum, leaves the student impervious to personal change and growth.

It seems as if this second, demeaning form of learning is receiving altogether too great a following. For some of us, academic rigors were left behind at college. We have replaced them with attention to other demands on our time. All sorts of pressures—from work, from church responsibilities, and from families—have been allowed to eat away at time appropriately designated for study.

This multiplicity of responsibilities is, to some degree, quite proper. It is when things get out of hand that the question of student ethics needs to be raised. But even behind this there are two opinions currently held which are quite appalling.

First, there is an effort on the part of some to make their first responsibilities be to the church group, the Young Life club, or the Inter-Varsity chapter. Studies become subordinated to this service aspect of the student's life. This attitude is a constant danger in a professionally oriented school. It must be seen for what it is: a compromise at best.

Second, and even more serious, there is the attempt to make a distinction between the person-oriented student and the intellectual. These two aspects are integral parts of the fully functioning person. To constantly hold up the dichotomy of person-orientation and intellectualism is to deny the necessity of their integration within the person. The result of such a stand is one's failure to fully be a student.

Are we not still in academia? Do not our responsibilities lie strongly in the present situation where we have made so great an investment in time and finances? Granted, the seminarian needs to be many things, but we cannot afford to lay aside our main role as students without giving up something of immeasurable value. There is a need for a deeper dedication to our academic responsibilities on the Fuller campus.

by B. O. B.
WHAT IS THEOLOGY? --An Orthodox View
by Savas Agourides

The subject "What is theology and what is its mission" has always been timely, though today especially it is drawing the attention of the three great branches of Christianity. The Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism are searching for a new theology to meet contemporary needs, while Orthodoxy is also beginning a period of re-evaluation.

What is theology? First, theology must not be confused with faith or with theological science. Surely, faith cannot be certain or clear unless the believer has a certain degree of understanding of the beliefs involved in this faith; however, this is not theology, because theology presupposes a conscious, systematic effort. Neither should theology be identified with theological science, which can be indifferent to the contents of faith. It is impossible for theology to exist without theological science which provides clarification through the application of scholarly methods. This many-sided analysis of religious matters by theological science constitutes a necessary point of contact with the problems and needs of each age. Nevertheless, theological science cannot be identified with theology because theology is not only formal but substantial, having divine revelation as its origin and guide. The combination of faith and theological science constitutes real theology.

It would be a mistake to consider theology as a concession made by faith to thinkers, or as a necessary luxury of faith for the purpose of discharging its missionary duties among the intelligentsia. Theology is not a more or less useful accessory of faith; it is a necessary expression of its own. But the interpretation and understanding of faith is useful and indispensable only when it becomes essential for the individual himself for his own use and for the use of his fellow men. The interpretation and understanding of the content of faith are closely bound to the act of faith.

What exactly do we mean when we speak of the interpretation and understanding of the content of faith? The interpretation is a spiritual function, a mental process moving from the general to the particular, from the old to the new, by means of which man's intellectual position is changed. It is impossible for us to comprehend the new without reference to the old; it is impossible to classify our observations in any form without reference of the part to the whole. Many times this process may have a revolutionary character. While new impressions are understood through reference, they may be constituted in such a manner that they come to dominate the consciousness. Thus, as these impressions become involved in the whole of experience, they become basic to the man's being. Thus the content of faith (i.e., salvation through Christ) can be understood only insofar as he understands other related concepts such as the necessity of salvation, sin, etc.

The Holy Scriptures do not suggest that the interpretation and understanding of the content of faith are natural acts, sufficient to explain that which happens to man when he is confronted by the Word of God. Though the Gospel of John is most clear at this point, the whole New Testament certainly implies that the interpretation and understanding of the contents of faith are the result not of man's intellectual endeavor through the process of reference, but of the Holy Spirit.

1. "Theology" incorporates both that which is a posteriori, faith and its results, and that which is a priori, "theological science." The distinction between "theology" and "theological science" can be seen in the a priori efforts on the part of recent theologians to demythologize Scripture. --B. B.

***
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Thus, while it is naturally impossible to understand salvation through Christ without reference to that experience which already exists, we must take into account perception which is really an act of the Holy Spirit, who guides the Church. Without the Spirit of the ecclesiastical community, it is not possible for man to recognize the content of faith. According to the fourth Evangelist, the disciples of Christ were not able at first to understand either the meaning of the preaching or those things which were done by Jesus. They understood only after Jesus "was glorified," i.e., after the Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Pentecost. Because the Holy Spirit is essential to the founding and substance of the Church, the explanation and comprehension of that which is the content of faith cannot exist outside of the Church.

This doctrine does not have its origin simply in the need for combating heresies, but also in the certainty that without the influence of the Holy Spirit who resides in the Church, no real understanding of the Gospel is possible. Since like is only understood by like, the uniqueness of the gospel makes understanding impossible if finite intellectual processes alone are relied upon. Yet these processes are necessary for the interpretation and comprehension of the content of faith.

The terms with which the first Christian community expressed the significance of Jesus (Messiah, Prophet, Lord, Son of Man, etc.) or the meaning of the new state of things ushered in by Christ (the Way, the Kingdom of God, Eternal Life, etc.) show the significance of interpreting and understanding the content of faith. However, the inadequacy of the natural process of intellection is exposed: how can Christ be introduced to men? Certain branches of the new Protestant theology brush this aside and interpret the theology of Jesus and the early Christian community's observations about the Kingdom of God through reference to comparable Jewish or Greek views, without adequately taking into consideration the ecclesiastical tradition which emphasizes the act of the Holy Spirit in providing reference for the correct interpretation and understanding of the gospel.

We are led directly to the meaning of theology when we clarify that which happens to one when he confronts Christ or his Word. What an individual does to interpret and understand the content of faith, theology also does, though in a more systematic manner—a manner which is defined in terms of each era's methods of analysis and classification. Therefore, in its work of systematic interpretation and understanding of the content of salvation, theology draws upon theological science, by means of which the possessions of faith (psychological, historical, sociological, etc.) are analyzed, interpreted, and understood through natural intellectual processes. At the same time, of course, theology is guided by the Spirit of Truth, which provides the Church with the legitimate interpretation of faith.

Because of the fall of man and the influence of evil upon him, he is not able to know when he has found faith, nor is he able without assistance to interpret that faith or properly to understand its content. Therefore, the intervention of the Holy Spirit and accordingly of the Church is necessary. An example is in order here: the words "Jesus Christ" constituted the confession of faith of the early Church and distinguished it from Jewish belief. Through these words, the Church declared that Jesus and no one else is the expected Messiah.

But what did the term "Messiah" mean to the Church? Was the term used to represent the Jewish expectation of the Messiah? Or did it denote something new for the Church, deriving from a new consciousness of the leadership of Jesus Christ and from the life of the early Church through the Holy Spirit? If such was the case, why then was the Jewish term "Messiah" used? Analysis of the holy texts and the fact of Jesus' rejection by his contemporaries lead to the view that the early Church did not use the term "Messiah" to express the Jewish expectation of the Messiah. We are then entitled to ask why Jesus and his disciples used this term "Messiah" in the proclamation of his mission.

This term apparently was used for two reasons, the first being that Jesus' earliest disciples were Jews. As Jews, they were not able to perceive the proper dimension of the mission or the central place of the person of Jesus in the new scheme of God except by relating him to the figure of the Messiah prophesied in
How important or closely related is a person's view of Biblical inspiration to his Christian outreach? Aspects of the doctrine of inspiration have been a live issue at Fuller. This year in Iran, I have had the opportunity of seeing the results of translating this doctrine from the academic to the practical. What I have to say is not a scholarly polemic; these are some ideas I have formulated while grappling with the problem out here.

We might restate the doctrine of inspiration by saying, "Is the Bible Truth, or does the Bible contain truth?" Last year a professor replied to a question regarding the seminary's stand on inspiration by saying that we are asking these less important questions about a doctrine while the world is asking if God is dead. At the time I thought this was a good answer, but now I am asking if the true answer to the latter question (Is God dead?) is not really dependent upon the answer given to the former question (Is the Bible Truth, or does it contain truth?).

The issue is almost always a shade of grey instead of black and white. For example both of the Bible teachers where I am teaching say that the Bible is God's Word, but when we examine their approach to the Scriptures, we find that they do not believe that the Bible is Truth. One of the teachers with whom I work said that his view of Scripture was higher than mine because after he "took the Bible apart" i.e. showed the "errors" and problems, he had faith that the truth in it would still speak to the students. He said that my lower view chose to rationalize the errors so I could rely upon the Bible as a whole instead of the Holy Spirit. The other Bible teacher said that we should "hang our dirty laundry on the line" (i.e. Biblical 'errors'), and that to do less was dishonest.

At first these arguments may seem plausible; but even if some aspects of the critical approach are valid, the approach that says the BIBLE CONTAINS TRUTH instead of saying the BIBLE IS TRUTH takes away our only real witness. Now when any human has the right to say what part of the Bible is true, the source of authority is changed. Authority is changed to subjective ideas.

For me the results of this situation are painfully obvious. When talking to students about Christ or studying the Bible with them to show the doctrines of sin and grace, they ask, "How do you know these verses are true since our Bible teacher says they are a mistake?" I could go into detail with these students and give them other explanations for these "so-called errors." But to these students who already are seeking to discredit Christianity (often unconsciously) these "errors" in the Bible are all that is needed to keep them from further searching. The sad fact is that while most of them are willing to accept the Bible as God's Word and The Truth, those who discredit it in their eyes cause them to doubt.

As a pragmatist, I place some store in the results of one's doctrine of Scripture. The critical approach to Bible study is being used here. And according to what the Bible teachers in this school report, there has not been a conversion in this school for years. Hearts are seeking, but this strategic witness to future leaders in the Middle East is lost. Perhaps we cannot say that this is a direct result of the view of inspiration held by the teachers, but my bias is that until a person takes the "leap of faith" (or whatever it is called when one commits himself to Christ as Lord and Saviour) and is able to approach the Bible as someone seeking to apply the authoritative Truth, he cannot be effective in God's work. Therefore, I think a person's view of inspiration is not only important and related to his outreach. I think his outreach is determined by his view of inspiration.

***
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A WINTER PRAYER
A Psalm of Descents
(Cantandi a manu in recluso sui).

O Lord, Creator of the World,
and of the universe,
and of mankind:
WE PRAISE THEE.

O Sustainer of life, and Source of peace:
    O Ground of all our being:
WE ADORE THEE.

O Provider of Man's prosperity,
in soul, in mind, in heart:
    O Benefactor with warming hearths,
WE THANK THEE.

For a fellowship, divine and free,
    providing men with common ties:
    For a chance to meet and sing
    within our blести community:
WE BLESS THEE.

For David's Rest, the absence of--
    oppression:
    Because you keep us from--
all harm:
WE WORSHIP THEE.

And, O Great Sovereign King,
    O Source of our delight,
Because you've not asked US to serve,
in total consecration:
WE ARE BEHOLDEN TO YOU. AMEN.

by Bruce Braman

BRUCE BRAMAN is a junior at FTS. He received a Bachelor of Philosophy degree from Monteith College of Wayne State University in 1964.
the Old Testament and expected by the Jews. The gospels unanimously agree that only after the Resurrection and Pentecost did the disciples perceive precisely who Jesus was, and only then could they correctly define his relation to the Old Testament (cf. John xii, 16).

The second reason for the use of the term "Messiah" was clearly associated with the sacred mission of the Church among the Jews. How else was it possible for the first heralds of the gospel to present the sovereign authority of Jesus (as the foundation of the new age, as a judge in the world, as the Savior) but with the help of the image of the Messiah? This image had helped call the attention of the disciples themselves to Jesus and his preaching, and it enabled their fellow citizens to approach Jesus. In this case, we clearly see that the early Church proclaimed and interpreted the person of Jesus to the people in terms and figures acceptable to the time.

The gospels illustrate various degrees of understanding of Jesus' mission where they relate an incident which took place at Caesaria in Philippi (Matthew xvi, 13ff). The crowds received Jesus as a forerunner of the Messiah (Elijah, Jeremiah, etc.) because they expected a glorious Messiah in accord with their ethnic expectations. On the other hand, the disciples were not thereby prevented from seeing the Messiah in Jesus' person. Because of this, the Lord characterized the confession of Peter—"You are the Christ, the Son of God"—not as a human point of view or as an individual interpretation, but as a revelation from his Father in heaven. Thus Jesus was recognized as the one who was the founder of the new age and the leader of life in this new age, and this recognition took place through the image of the Messiah and the Jewish expectation of the Son of God. Salvation was interpreted through reference to the experience of men. Yet the fact that the disciples did not adapt Jesus to their Jewish expectations tells us that the reference of the disciples was not the work of men but of their heavenly Father. Many readers are astonished at the passage under discussion, since they notice that a few lines below Jesus denies Peter as a tool of Satan because that disciple will not abandon a more typically Jewish interpretation of Jesus' mission (Matthew xvi, 23).

Therefore we see that the disciples had not yet grasped the full explanation of the meaning of Christ. Fuller understanding was possible for the disciples only after the Resurrection and the descent of the Holy Spirit. Then the term "Messiah" ceased to mean for them what it had formerly meant. Thus we see that the apostles' new insight into Christ's true mission was characterized by Jesus as revelation from the Father, while denial of the expectation of the essential mission of Jesus (Matthew xvi, 23) constituted an opinion not divine but human and even demonic.

From the preceding we can conclude the following: (1) The reference of the content of faith to our former experience is inevitable and necessary. It is not possible for us to accept something unless we are able to interpret it by means of what we know. (2) Some connection must exist between the object of reference (i.e., the nature and mission of Christ) and the meanings and images which refer to it. There must be some point of contact. The image of Messiah, as it is expressed in many ways in the Old Testament and Judaism, affords such a point of contact.

(3) Under the influence of the Spirit, the added reference of the new to the old consists in the progressive recognition that the essential content of faith lacks any one sanctioned form.

Therefore (1) theology is inevitable and necessary. (2) Theology always selects terms, images, and schemata from various sources, and it bases them on an understanding and comprehension of the content of faith. And (3) the main function of theology, as it is influenced by the Holy Spirit and the Church, is to recognize the inadequacy of every form and every image to express the meaning of Christ. The forms and schemata are always considered necessary and are therefore maintained: that which changes is the assurance of their inadequacy to express the richness of the content of faith.

2. Here Peter is speaking as the representative of all the apostles.
It must be affirmed that Christianity is a religion which is principally historical. God reveals himself through an historic person, Christ, and by an historic institution, the Church. Analysis of the basic facts in the gospel proposes three elements: the deed, the remembrance of the deed, and its interpretation. These three elements are inseparable. Thus it is clear that theology as a systematic interpretation and understanding of the content of faith occupies an organic place in the mystery of revelation and in the transmission of the gospel. Theology therefore ought not attempt to provide its own explanations of the world and life through its own general theoretical and philosophical presuppositions alone. It has its origin and end in the gospel.

The terms and presuppositions of an era determine how something can be understood and discussed. Different times and conditions will necessitate different terms and presuppositions, and those who proclaim the gospel must recognize this. Above we saw that Jesus' disciples, immersed in the Jewish environment, understood their Lord through the basic term "Messiah." However, the greater Greek world of the time found "Messiah" to be a meaningless term; they simply thought in other terms and accepted other presuppositions. When the preachers and theologians of the early Church approached this larger Greek community, they made use of these other presuppositions, by which they understood and interpreted the act of salvation. Jesus was proclaimed as the Lord, the Savior, the Word of God, the Life and Light of the World. These images had their origin in the Old Testament, and they were invested with various meanings by the contemporaries of the first missionaries. Thus they proclaimed the gospel to their contemporaries through images which they could understand.

It may be objected that this interpretative function of theology is a precarious enterprise. The gospel can become falsified under the influence of assertions, situation, and ideas of this world. Misinterpretations of this kind have occasioned all the heresies from the beginning to this day. Only with the help of the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, is the correct reference and interpretation of the content of faith possible. Without this guidance, orthodox theology is impossible. And when we speak of the Holy Spirit, we think of the life of mysteries and of love (agape) inside the Church. Outside of this life, the theologian will be wandering in his attempt to interpret and understand the gospel. This life of mysteries and love, the life of the Holy Spirit, is evidenced in the transformation of man's mind and heart in a spiritual maturity through which man sees everything with the "mind of Christ."

* *

the opinion

With this issue, a new staff assumes responsibilities for the opinion. Bruce Braman, new man in the hot seat, replaces Phil Hoffman as Editor-in-chief. James Griffin is taking over for the exhausted Jerry Warren as Managing editor. Monte Swanson remains as the Literary editor, the man with the blue pencil. The advisee of Dick Avery is being exchanged for that of the new Consultant, Dill Walker. The utter freshness of the opinion is due, in part, to the presence of the Typist, Carol Kopp.

Contributions in the form of articles, book reviews, poems, letters to the editor, etc. are very warmly welcomed. the opinion is the organ for student thought at FTS; make use of it.
IN MEMORIAM

My Faith is strong.
I'm living in Hope.
Shut up to Love. --K.S.

Life was here—once,
When I felt the warmth of His hover
When cares and burdens were swallowed---
In the soothing cool of His bosom.

Oh Soul...
Where were you when I pained Him?
Heart Cry...
When His Holy face I smote?

Such Peace... (Yet peace there was)
In the center of His bleeding heart.
And there was I
And I loved Him.

And life is gone—now,
But its ripples still bathe
The unseen shores of history's tomorrow
And the panting cries of eternity's tragedies.

Oh life,
Where did you go?
So short
So liquid
So veiled in tears.

And I loved you
Because He was there
And I clung to your breast
For my hands could ne'er weary
of that race
which was my life.

And I gave that pittance, O God
With my life I thee did give
And to thy soul do I now return.

But I lived...My God!!
I lived!
And my faith was strong
And my heart was bound in chains of hope
Forever shut up to the refuge of love.

--W. H. Walker

* * * * *
WILLIAM WALKER is a Junior at FTS. He received his BA in History at Wheaton College in 1963.
PLAY REVIEW

On Friday, February 26, the Tri-Theta Players put members of the Fuller family and friends in their debt by a splendid performance of Maxwell Anderson's Joan of Lorraine at the First Congregational Church of Pasadena. Reminiscent of the good old days when students gave recitals and experimented with simple forms of contemporary religious drama, it was the most ambitious effort ever carried off at the seminary.

Joan of Lorraine is a play within a play, but the structural diversity of a rehearsal for the play and the play itself, counterpoise each other in a true synthesis. The basic religious questions of good and evil, principle and expediency, faith and verification, which focus in the life of Joan as she struggles with court corruption and vested ecclesiastical privilege, are foiled in the running debate between Mary Grey, who played Joan, and her director, Jimmy Masters, as to how the role of Joan is to be interpreted. The audience is made to sympathize with Joan (and Miss Grey) who concludes on the eve of her execution, that had she her life to live over again, she would do it the same way. The Scripture according to Mark Twain, printed at the bottom of the program: "Don't give up your illusions. You may continue to exist, but you will cease to live" appear to express the sentiment of Jimmy Masters, the director.

Although we were assured that tabacco was unknown to Joan's France we never did get an explanation of how she came to keep her little lambie of Lorraine in a Budweiser beer carton. Equally unexpected was the manner in which Dr. Roddy, professor of homiletics, seated himself on a sofa by leaping over the back. Personally, the most exquisite humor was reached when Sheila Price told the English occupying France where to go, in an impeccable English accent. I suppose a critic should comment on the quality of acting, but everyone did so well, that I have not the intestinal fortitude to award the encomiums.

Single men at Fuller, however, should note that Miss Price played three diverse roles and did very well in each.

by Paul K. Jewett

* * * * *
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