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LETTER TO THE EDITOR
by Robert K. Bower

Upon reading Paul Larson's recent article, I was struck by the unfortunate statement that he is now "finally off the 'Pastoral Counseling Kick.'" "The game," he says, "is to get a secular justification for our role as pastors... (and) to surround ourselves with...neurotics to garnish and secure our identity." If he meant by this (and it appears to be the general tone of the paragraph) that Pastoral Counseling as a discipline within the theological curriculum simply provides some "luster" and "glamour" to the office of pastor through the use of a secular orientation, then he has, in my opinion, made two serious mistakes.

The first is that Pastoral Counseling needs some kind of support for its existence from the secular sphere (assuming for the moment the traditional dichotomy of the secular vs. the sacred). Thomas Oden in his Kerygma and Counseling has more than adequately shown that the mission of Jesus was in the three-fold form of teaching (didaskon), preaching (euangelion) and healing (therapeuon) (Matt. 4:23-24). And that it was not accidental that therapeia and kerygma are closely linked in Luke 9:1-2 when our Lord sent the twelve out to preach the kingdom of God and to heal. It is not a secular reason for the inclusion of Pastoral Counseling in the theological program of the seminary but rather a biblical one. It is definitely a part of the ministry of the Church (witness even the costly sponsorship of medical hospitals and missions by the church at home and in foreign lands to recognize the integral part which healing - both physical and mental - plays in the work of the ministry). This writer recognizes, however, that a pastor may not find counseling (therapy) as one of his gifts. In such an event, he may decide to (a) refer a number of cases to Christian (or Christian-oriented) professionals with advanced counseling and therapeutic skills (but not lose contact with the cases, in any event); or (b) delegate such responsibilities to another member of the church staff. For, counseling is vital to the mission of the Church.

A second mistake, it seems to me, is that Mr. Larson originally perceived counseling as a service with some promise of reward - emotional or otherwise. He has found, however, that counseling is hard work, time-consuming, and oftentimes completely frustrating. Yet those frustrating, "incurable neurotics" are persons with very real problems and one must not lose sight of this fact.

To convey the impression that it is a relief to get rid of some of those troubled with chronic neuroses and refer them to others is a kind of depersonalization which (in order to be fair to Mr. Larson) I do not believe he does nor desires to do. The very fact that he finishes his paragraph with an indication that he continues to do "crisis and preventive counseling" is evidence of this.

Pastoral Counseling, then, has biblical justification for its inclusion in the ministry of the Church, is not easy, is often frustrating but is a Christian service in rescuing people in despair, mending broken lives and restoring husbands and wives and children to each other within the redemptive, saving community which we know as the Church.
I am writing this article to combat what I believe to be a dangerous inadequacy in the approach used by Dr. Fuller in the second half of his Hermeneutics syllabus. I am not here concerned with the entire argument, but only with the presupposition on which the argument depends. Stated quite simply, that presupposition is this: Reason is a valid standard to test whether the Bible is true. I do not believe that Dr. Fuller has been able to justify that presupposition, either in his syllabus or in class. Consequently, I suggest that both his argument for the truth of some parts of the Bible, and his argument for the errors in other parts of the Bible, are likewise invalid.

I wish to clarify at the outset some related but distinct questions. In order to make the problem more clear, I will briefly state, without support, my position on these questions.

1. How do we know that God's word is true? This is the central question. Dr. Fuller contends that God's word is true because it is reasonable. I will contend that God's word is true because it is God's word.

2. Is the Bible true? Yes. We both say that it is. However, he and I mean different things when we say that the Bible is true. (see below)

3. What is truth? Dr. Fuller contends that God says false things when he talks about some subjects and true things when he talks about other subjects. Since the true things are more important, Dr. Fuller calls God's word "true." In other words, Dr. Fuller contends that God can tell white lies if they help God accomplish his purpose.

On the other hand, when I say the Bible is true, I mean "free from all error in the whole and in the part"; in other words, inerrant. I will insist that God does not tell white lies. If he did, and if we are to imitate God, we have some serious moral implications to face.

4. Is the Bible reasonable? Yes. This is not the question we are considering.

5. What is reason? In Dr. Fuller's syllabus, I understand reason to be the process by which we decide whether something conforms with what we perceive of reality. If something is reasonable, it conforms. The reason of men is not perfect until heaven. I will agree with this definition.

6. Is reason a useful tool? Yes. This is not the question. The question is whether reason is the ultimate standard of truth.

7. Can reason convince men that the Bible is true? Dr. Fuller says yes. I reply that in some cases the Holy Spirit can use reason, but this is only because men are inconsistent and often believe things without adequate proof. If a man is completely reasonable, he will reject every proof for the truth of the Bible which is based on reason. But this is not the exact problem I wish to deal with.

8. Can reason prove that the Bible is true or false? Dr. Fuller says yes. I say no. This is the problem.

1. Briefly, the danger is this: If men are allowed to make their own reason the ultimate standard of truth, the desires of sinful men will influence what is regarded as true. The Bible will no longer be considered inerrant, and men will choose from it only what they want to believe. Eventually, Biblical Christianity will be rejected. (I realize that Dr. Fuller has by no means rejected Biblical Christianity. However, I suggest that this is only a matter of personal preference.)
CAN REASON TEST THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE? (con't)

My argument has three propositions:
1. Reason cannot be a standard by which we test whether God's word is true.
2. The Bible is God's word.
3. Therefore, reason cannot be a standard by which we test whether the Bible is true.

What follows I say more by way of explanation than by way of defense. Although I believe that the validity of these propositions is subject to more sophisticated philosophic proof, I think that once they are understood their validity is practically self-evident.

PROPOSITION ONE: Reason cannot be a standard by which we test whether God's word is true.

1. To understand this proposition we can use the following explanation: If God says something which we perceive to be false, either:
   (a) God is wrong and we rightly perceive the error; thus the ultimate standard of truth is our perception of what is reasonable; thus God has been made subordinate to our perception of what is reasonable; thus the creator is subordinate to the creature;
   or, (b) God is right and our perception of what is reasonable is wrong; thus our perception of what is reasonable is subordinate to God's word as the ultimate standard of truth.

I suggest that (b) is the only valid position.

2. Note that in this proposition God's word is not the same as the Bible. By "God's word" I mean anything spoken by the God of the Bible.

3. I am not in this proposition assuming that the Bible is true. I am assuming something about "what is," about the nature of reality. I am assuming that the God of the Bible exists. If someone wants to deny this proposition, he simply has to deny that the God of the Bible exists. But that is the subjective side of the question: whether everyone will be convinced by this argument. That is not what we are talking about. We are talking about whether the argument itself is valid.

I want to be very clear here. This proposition assumes a metaphysic. It assumes that the God of the Bible exists. If such a God does not exist, this proposition fails. But if such a God exists, whether men believe it or not, this proposition is valid.

4. The use of words in a fallen world does not make it possible for God to say something which is not true.
   a. Words themselves do not always convey error. God spoke words before creation (Gen. 1:3) and before the Fall (Gen. 2:16). Words are spoken in heaven, where there is no sin, both by man (Rev. 4:11) and by God (Rev. 1:17).
   b. Words are used by men as a part of our fallen human existence. This does not mean that all words convey error. I would suggest the analogy of the Incarnation. Christ was in every way like us, yet without sin. Just as human flesh did not cause Christ to be sinful, so human words do not cause God's word to have error.
c. God's omniscience makes it impossible for him to think untrue thoughts.

d. God's holiness makes it impossible for him to speak falsely.

PROPOSITION TWO: The Bible is God's word.

1. By the Bible I mean all 66 books of the canon, as they were originally written down. Variant readings resulting from transmission should be recognized and dealt with according to lower criticism. Nevertheless, the text we have now is "sufficiently trustworthy not to lead us astray"... (J. I. Packer?)

2. This is a metaphysical statement. Moreover, it is one which is only known to be true by immediate perception. What proves that the Bible is God's word? Only its divine character, which is self-evident. That is, the sense of divinity is everywhere upon it. This proof is valid, but it does not depend on deductive reasoning. An analogy might help explain this type of knowledge. Suppose I have a yellow lemon. I say, "This lemon is yellow." What proves that the lemon is yellow? Only its self-evident yellowness. It is immediately perceived. That is, yellowness is everywhere upon it.

There are also analogies from the Bible. Abraham's hearing God's command to sacrifice Isaac and Paul's hearing Christ's voice on the Damascus road are good examples. In neither case would deductive reason prove that the voice actually was that of God. Rather, the sense of divinity in the words was self-evident and immediately perceived.

3. Although this sense of divinity in the Bible is the only valid, objective proof that the Bible is God's word, not all men will be convinced by this proof, because man is sinful. This is the subjective side of the argument. Here, I would reply that the internal testimony of the Spirit works in men to convince them that there is a sense of divinity in the Bible which proves it to be God's word.

4. Conflicting claims do not invalidate this proposition. For instance, suppose a Moslem said to me, "I am not convinced that the Bible is God's word. I think the Koran is God's word. I recognize a sense of divinity everywhere upon it." I might try to convince him by praying for him, reasoning with him, or telling him the Gospel. But reason would give me no compelling proof.

This situation would be somewhat analogous to trying to convince a world of color-blind people that my lemon is yellow, especially if all of their lives were based on its not being yellow. Unless their eyes are opened to see accurately, they will not believe.

5. There is, however, something that would falsify this proposition. If in reality there is no sense of divinity in the Bible, the proposition is false. Suppose there were a sinless man, who thus had no moral impediment to recognizing the divine character of the Bible. He could make an objective decision. If he said, "There is no sense of divinity in the Bible," then this proposition would fail. To believe then would be making an irrational leap of "faith." I do not think that this would be valid for a Christian.
PROPPOSITION THREE: Reason cannot be a standard by which we test whether the Bible is true.

1. We conclude that the Bible is true not because it is reasonable but because it is God's word.

2. We also contend that reason cannot show the Bible to be in error. It is absurd to talk about something which is both true and contradicts the Bible. Thus, if it appears to us that there is an error in the Bible, there are only two possible explanations:
   a. We have not correctly understood what the Bible says.
   b. We have not correctly understood reality.

   These are the only two possible positions when we confront a supposed problem in the Bible. For the Bible itself to be in error is not possible.

3. This entire argument depends on the reliability of reason. But that in no way invalidates it. Reason can show that reason cannot test the truth of the Bible. So when I believe that the Bible is true, I am not acting against reason. But neither can reason be the basis by which I determine that the Bible is true.

POSTSCRIPT: A COMPLAINT: As Fuller students we are given two alternatives in Hermeneutics: Dr. Fuller's system which is in many ways helpful but destructive to Biblical authority and philosophically inadequate, and Dr. Smart's book, which is much worse. The most valid response for a student is to reject both positions. But that means we have no positive training in Hermeneutics and confusion results. It would only be fair to include in the course a text which maintains Biblical inerrancy.

RESOLVED

by John Piper

I have often thought about how business went on as usual in Palestine while God was walking about her towns. I suppose most people of that time lived quite oblivious to the division of the history of creation. But then Jesus really seemed so normal. You would have had to hear him speak or see him do something quite out of the ordinary even to begin to realize there was something rather different about him. And I can’t help thinking of the thousands of people who were God’s contemporaries and never knew it.

That's the way it is. Mystery always has a way of getting lost in ordinary life. If God could rub shoulders with a man and be ignored, I suppose we shouldn’t be surprised that most folks don’t mind sleeping through a sunrise.

We humans have an audacious propensity for jumping to conclusions. This is very sad in a world of mystery. When we receive some tidbit of an insight
RESOLVED (con't)

into a mystery our first reaction is to conclude that the mystery no longer exists at all. And this conclusion restricts what we were longing for to what we have acquired. The problem is, of course, that our hearts never really stop longing and so such a restriction makes our inevitable longing absurd. This is a very sad and unhealthy situation.

Therefore, not wanting to be sad, unhealthy or wrong, for that matter, I resolve:

Never to be satisfied with the rubbing shoulders or the receiving of tidbits,
Never to be satisfied with anything less than true statements,
Never to be satisfied with true statements,
Never to be satisfied with uncertainty,
Never to be satisfied with certainty,
Never to be satisfied with seeking,
Never to be satisfied with anything less than satisfaction;

In short, I affirm Mystery.

THE GOSPEL, SOCIETY AND THE GOD SQUAD

by Ted Dorman

"They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world...As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them into the world." (Jesus, speaking of His disciples - John 17:16, 18).

Ever since the time a small group of men and women first went forth to proclaim the good news of salvation to a lost world, Christians have wrestled with the problem of what their relationship with this world should be. Jesus had shown them a new life style, and their uniqueness as children of God was to be an important part of their witness to Him. They were, in a word, to be "not of this world." At the same time, Jesus specifically declared that He was sending them into the world which they were "not of." The question, therefore, was and is, "What does it mean to be in the world but not of it?"

I will not attempt to answer this question in full; that would not only be too time-consuming but also somewhat presumptuous. Rather, I would like to share a recent personal experience which helped me focus on some aspects of this problem, then reflect on what went on and how it relates to the aforementioned question of the Christian's position vis-a-vis the world.

A couple weeks ago Steve Beattie and I went down to the Hollywood Blvd. area to pass out copies of "The Alternative" (Christian paper) and witness to people on the street. We had not gone too far when a busload of singing, stomping young people passed by, shouting to us from the windows. The bus stopped a couple blocks further down the street and emptied to the tune of strumming guitars and exuberant songs. As we arrived on the scene a young man, about 19, poked his head out the bus door and called to us.

"Hey, what ya got there?"
"Papers. Want one?"
"O.K."
He never smiled, just looked at the paper quizically. Steve asked him twice if he and the others were Christians; he didn't respond, but simply nodded and asked us a few questions. Then he inquired:

"Do you guys go to church?"

"Yes, I do," Steve replied, somewhat puzzled.

"Do you think I should go to church if I'm a Christian?"

Steve and I looked at each other for a moment, shrugged, and answered in the affirmative.

Our inquisitor pulled out a small Bible and handed it to Steve.

"Prove it!"

By now we were a bit flustered, and a few of the other bus riders had come over and were nodding with approval as their companion insisted that a Christian not only did not have to go to church, but should not go to church. Our appeal to Hebrews 10:25 proved fruitless as they admonished us "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers." We had to admit that when one goes to church (i.e., the organized church) he inevitably rubs shoulders with unbelievers. This made them all the more adamant in pressing home their point.

From here we began to receive a heavy dose of separatist theology. The group we encountered was part of a large community of about 400 Christians who live together in a large building in downtown L.A. Taking their cue from Acts 2:43-47 they have everything in common, including clothes, food and money. Further, they have all quit their jobs ("Labor not for the meat that perishes") and get money from friends who contribute to their community or support them as individuals "which is actually a blessing for those who support them--after all, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive'".

This community which likens itself to the first century Church calls itself "The Children of God." They are better known around the Strip as the God Squad. Their life consists of Bible study during the days and street witnessing at night, plus any other tasks or details needed to keep the community going. They believe that society is rapidly heading for oblivion and that Christ is returning very soon, so that Christians should drop out of society, quit work, live communally and preach continually. Ergo, we as Christians should drop out of work, seminary--in short, society--and live with the Children of God's community. Imagine (we were told) what a witness it would be to the world if all the Christians dropped out of society and began to live together communally. We had to agree that the impact would be tremendous. Exactly what the effects might be is another matter.

Since the God Squad built their whole case for separatism from quoting the Bible (and did they ever know the Bible--no doubt because they read from the Book rather than about it), I decided to look at the Pauline Epistles to see if the great apostle had ever encountered a similar situation. I found that he had in Thessalonica. The believers there were so anxious for Christ's return that some had quit their jobs and sold their possessions in order to await His parousia. Some even thought the "day of the Lord" had come (cf. II Thess. 2). Paul admonished them in both I and II Thessalonians to continue to work "with your hands" (I Thess. 4:10) and thereby present a good witness to the non-Christians of the city. This phrase "with your hands" indicates that Paul was talking about occupational labor, not merely religious work in the community of believers. Paul here seems to say that believers should in general follow the Jewish custom where a priest always worked at a job other than his religious functions. This vocation, which was his means of financial support, consisted of manual labor of some sort. Paul himself was a tentmaker (Acts 18:3) and told the Thessalonians "if you don't work, you don't eat" (II Thess. 3:10). This last remark, when considered in light of the aforementioned Scripture references
THE GOSPEL, SOCIETY AND THE GOD SQUAD (con't)

and the historical circumstances surrounding the writing of the epistle, therefore strongly suggests that Paul did not favor the idea of Christians "dropping out" of society.

From a practical standpoint, other arguments could be levelled against the separatist theology of the God Squad. But we need not mention them here. These people have built their case on Scripture; therefore a Scriptural refutation is sufficient. In concluding it may be noted that while Scripture rejects the notion that Christians must "drop out" in order to be "not of the world," it also declares that there are many parts, but one Body, Christ. These various parts of the Body may be called to function in extremely diverse ways, but one part should not despise the other (I Cor. 12). We at Fuller have our place in the Body, as does the God Squad. We may reject their extreme separatist theology, but we must acknowledge that they are doing the Lord's work in their way. They study and memorize the Bible to an extent that would put most Seminary students to shame, and people are being saved through their ministry. I had the opportunity to see a young Mexican who just happened to be walking by come to the Lord through their proclamation—I interpreted while one of the sisters invited him to stay and live with them. That was exciting.

To be "in the world but not of it" is often a difficult distinction to make. Sometimes it is hard to draw the line where our identification with the world should end and where we must take our stand as being uniquely children of God in the midst of a godless world. We have seen that we are not commanded to "drop out" entirely. But let us also acknowledge that those Christians who live apart from the world more radically than we do are still our brothers, and as such have a place in the Body just as much as ourselves. If we feel they err in regarding us as "sub-Christians," let us not fall into the same trap and regard them—or any brother—as spiritually inferior.

ABOUT THAT EXAM SCHEDULE
by Jim Murphy

I would like to suggest to the student body and administration of Fuller Seminary a change in examination procedures which would work to the advantage of all concerned. Present examination schedules are firmly set in concrete, allowing no changes to be made except in the case of extreme emergency and upon payment of a $2.00 penalty fee for having an emergency. The apparent reasons for this are three-fold. 1) All the students who take a particular course must take the exam in that course in the same place at the same time. This is deeply rooted in the doctrine of the total depravity of man, which teaches that all men will cheat if given the opportunity and sufficient justification to do so. More about this later. 2) It is an inconvenience to the professor to have to make up a special exam for an individual student, or to have to make it up any more than one day before his exam is to be given, or to hold separate testing periods for individuals. 3) Many professors prefer to read one question in all the exams before going on to the next question, so as to better compare the answers. This requires that all the tests be in before any of them can be graded.
The disadvantages of this system for the student are obvious. Many students find that they have their heaviest exams earliest in the exam week, which gives them the least time to study for the hardest tests. Also, although we are encouraged by the administration to involve ourselves in a local ministry of some sort while we are in seminary, full recognition is not given to the fact that these commitments to people and programs do not go on recess during exam week. This means that we are forced to make a decision between studying for exams and ministering to people, a manifestly difficult decision to make.

The solution I am suggesting would ease the pain for the students without increasing the burden on the faculty, and would reflect a better understanding of priorities. The following examination procedure has been instituted in a number of schools around the country and has met with enthusiastic support from faculty and students alike.

1. Extend the examination period to a full five day week.
2. Establish three testing periods each day of exam week, e.g., 9-11 a.m., 1-3 p.m., and 7-9 p.m.
3. Place all exams on file in the library at the beginning of exam week.
4. Designate various rooms in the school campus as testing areas.
5. Allow students to take any of their exams at any time slot on any day they choose.
6. Require all exams to be completed by 9 p.m. the last day of exam week.

This system would have the advantages of 1) allowing the student to schedule his exams and studying around outside prior commitments, 2) allowing the student to schedule his hardest exams at the most opportune time for him, and 3) freeing the professors from the necessity of being at school during exam week.

It hardly seems too much to ask of the faculty to have their exams prepared by the beginning of exam week. I feel certain that much more is asked of the students to prepare for the exams than of the professors to make them up. I would also suggest that the professors cannot be in such a rush to get their particular exam graded that they cannot wait until the end of exam week. After all, it is presently well into the next quarter before we receive this quarter’s grades. This surely gives the faculty enough leeway to wait until after Christmas to begin grading exams if they choose. And if a professor has no scruples against grading some tests while others are being taken, he would start grading them as soon as the first ones come in, thereby spreading the grading task out even more.

The greatest threat to the success of this system is that it presupposes an honor system. While that may sound impossible in light of the Fall, I would mention the following considerations. We presently have what amounts to an occasional honor system, for many of the professors do not proctor their exams. Furthermore, if a man is going to cheat under the present system, he can do it alone. But if he is going to take advantage of the new possibilities for cheating under the proposed system, he will have to convince someone else to compromise himself also. In the context of a theological seminary, I believe that that is a difficult thing to do. If a man is going to cheat, he is going to find a way to do it regardless of the system he has to beat.

Finally, I cannot believe that the timing of an examination is nearly as crucial as our present rigid system makes it out to be. What difference does it make whether a man takes the test on Monday or Wednesday compared with the question of whether he knows the material or not? Five years from now it will be ridiculous to ask about the date and time of an exam, but it may not be so inane to ask what happened in the lives of the people you could have been ministering to had it not been for the rigidity of the exam schedule.
In response to the query as to "How I Work", I am a bit at a loss to know just how to begin. As a direct response to the question taken literally, the answer would of necessity be pervaded with ambiguity. Sometimes I work rapidly; sometimes I am more notable in my ability to execute avoidance behavior with reference to work tasks, sometimes intensely, with a measure of craftiness and sometimes with a rather unrefreshing level of naivete.

However, perhaps the question could be phrased as to areas of my clinical activity, or perhaps the dimensions of my working life. In general my work week consists of the time between 8 o'clock Monday morning and 6 o'clock Friday evening. My wife and I have agreed that is the time at my discretion, with the understanding that I shall make every effort to be home for dinner frequently and engage in tutorial activities in the area of New Math. In spite of the fact of the large number of my children, this is not such an ominous task, inasmuch as three of them are in the seventh grade and therefore I can rather efficiently review math and science with them. The weekend from Friday 6 o'clock until Monday at 8 o'clock is under the absolute discretion of my wife and so, since it is devoted quite largely to domestic tasks, familial involvement and recreation, and ecclesiastical events, I preclude it from the general area of discussion in this article.

So I shall divide my work task in terms of my primary academic commitment, my involvement in private practice, the charitable contribution of my time to church and community as a clinician, and my advocational pursuits (which, I'm afraid, receive an undue proportion of enthusiasm and energy).

My primary major course sequence during the three quarters of the school year is History of Psychology, Phenomenology and Existential Psychology, and the Psychotherapy of adults. In addition, a psychology professor has the responsibility for a minor course during each term and my special interests are contained in an annual seminar on marriage and the family, and a workshop in hypnosis. In addition, I generally am involved in an annual integration seminar or a stint of teaching in the evening school lay program under the auspices of the Department of Pastoral Counseling. My clinical involvements in the School of Psychology during this present term are comprised of supervisory responsibilities for three interns, the chairmanship of two doctoral dissertation committees, and two weekly sessions given to the Pasadena Community Counseling Center. My major committee responsibility is as a member of the faculty senate and the admissions committee of the School of Psychology. There are various and sundry other responsibilities, but these represent my chief academic functions.

My limited private practice is rather a general practice in the area of clinical psychology, although I tend to specialize in marital therapy. I also serve as psychological consultant to two mission boards, in which I screen candidates for mission service, de-brief furloughing missionaries, and serve as personnel management consultant. Contingent upon this particular involvement is a significant opportunity for clinical counseling with missionary personnel.

In the third category of contribution to church and community, I serve as the psychological consultant for the Glendale Outreach Project. This is a four-community (Glendale, Montrose, La. rescenta, La Canada) funded project to serve the communities particularly through the adolescent segment, with
the intention of both prevention and correction in deliquent behavior. We are especially concerned with the problem of drug abuse. I also have an informal consulting relationship with the staff of my church, La Canada Presbyterian. The fourth area of my involvement, the avocational, has its primary focus in my role as president of the Aquilan Flying Club which consists of a score of business and professional men with a keen interest in flying as a hobby and a means of professional transportation. We operate three airplanes and I utilize private air transportation whenever possible to conferences, consults, and professional organizational meetings.

This pretty much presents the four foci of my work week, in a descending order of time involvement. I ought also perhaps to mention that once or twice a week is interspersed a handball contest and inasmuch as today the honor of the School of Psychology is at stake at the hands of the Dean of the School of Theology, I must sign off.

THANATOPSIS ON WAKING
by John Piper

Morning
The thought of death is in my mind—
Purgation of lethargy,
Purest purgation of lethargy.
Like the first water from the pipes—
Splashed in a yawn
Splashed in a senseless yawn.

The thought of death
Pushing up daisies in my soul—
A most efficient compost
(Even nature shows us death
Should serve the living).

The thought of death—
Peace beckons the warrior to the fray,
Yes, a happy destination
Always makes the journey worthy.

Morning
The thought of death passes through my mind
Consumed, not like persimmons
But like a Son-lit peach.
SYNTTEGRATION: A LOOK AT THE INTEGRATION SEMINAR
by Stephen W. Frueh

The Integration Seminar has been the recipient of a good deal of hostility - some of it legitimate. Is there a viable alternative to this Seminar? Is it possible for the Schools of Theology and Psychology to integrate philosophically or is a peaceful co-existence the most we can hope for? To experience an integration seminar is in some ways regressive. It's kind of eerie. At the level of studies where one expects a spirit of exploration and discovery he finds a return to epistemological debate. Hoping for excitement he stumbles into qualification and definition. It is most likely theology and psychology at their blandest. It is impossible to homogenize these two. Whatever else the integration seminar was designed to do, it wasn't designed to bore and castrate the souls of true lovers of theology and psychology. To attempt integration in the present manner is to resolve to take the most bloodless psychology and theology and aim for formal ideational agreement. Bloodless is theology divorced from the pulse of the man Jesus, psychology separated from human need. The people at Fuller deserve, and should demand better. It is possible even desirable that these two schools maintain, in some structured way, honest and open communication. Communication presupposes that the autonomy of the two schools be taken seriously; that each recognize the worth of the other; that both are willing to translate their anxieties and fears into non-threatening and meaningful messages; and that both recognize human beings not so much as target populations for enhancing their own worth in the eyes of the community but as integrated wholes in need of healing.

I propose shifting the model from integration to syntegration. Syntegration is a harmonizing of apparent opposites. It is recognition that psychology and theology start at different places and will always, to some extent, go in different directions.

Whereas integration implies the unity and wholeness of diverse parts, syntegration would concentrate on the synchronizing and blending of two independent and mature disciplines. Whereas integration seeks ideational precision and formal agreement, syntegration looks for a clear and open inter-change between mature partners.

Syntegration denies the role of "in loco parentis" to either discipline. It takes the adulthood of each seriously.

Whereas integration urges to the false goal of unifying two entities (e.g. oil and water), syntegration implies an honest and decent confession of the material content and boundaries of each.

We have to ask the question: can psychology and theology work together i.e. can theologians and psychologists relate to one another in a mutually instructive and supportive context? In so far as our Seminars are midwives to this process they will be stimulating and helpful. We would do more if we didn't worry so much about looking good to one another. Perhaps it is time to graduate integration into syntegration.

LEARNING TO WEEP
by Stan Adamson

If a human being lives from infancy totally separated from human society, totally independent of any human influence, is he then still human? When he falls unwittingly into the hands of society, what is its responsibility to him?
LEARNING TO WEEP (con't)

Can he be "civilized"? What is his standing before God? Such questions are raised by L'Enfant Sauvage (The Wild Child), a new film by Francois Truffaut, playing locally at the Los Feliz Theatre in Hollywood.

This film recounts the true story of the so-called "Wild Boy of Averon," discovered in a forest in France in 1789. The ten or twelve year old boy, naked and grimy, apparently unable to speak, a wild shock of hair billowing about his head, was captured by a small band of villagers and eventually transported to Paris where he was placed under the care of a Dr. Itard, headmaster of a school for the deaf and dumb, who had read of the wild boy and was curious to study such a creature. This was the France of the Enlightenment and of Roussean, and the conflict between the two emerges in the situation. Dr. Itard's life was characterized by order and discipline, yet he saw in the wild boy an innocent, primaeval nature which captivated him. Could he transform this feral man into a man of the Enlightenment? How had he survived in the forest so many years? Why was he abandoned there? He was a freak to the society which rejected his humanity because it did not seek to understand him.

The power of this film is in its slowly developing the viewer's appreciation of the kind of patience and time required to communicate. When one must operate on a non-verbal level, awareness of the simple necessity of love in establishing a link between men is heightened tremendously, and it overshadows our confidence in technique and order. Teaching Victor (as the boy came to be called) to walk erect, to dress himself, to become sensitive to temperature so that he would feel the necessity of clothes, to hear a full range of noises - even teaching the boy written language and the nature of speech - was never as hard for Itard, despite his comparison, reward-punishment system, as teaching the boy a sense of justice. This was Itard's great aim, and only love, expressed through patience and concern, could achieve it. When Victor first wept, and later rebelled at a deliberate trick, Itard rejoiced at the first glimmer of a sense of the "moral order" in the Wild Boy.

There are haunting images in the film. Victor, whose two great joys were a cup of cool water and a view of the forest, loved the rain, and we see him out in it, looking upward to the clouds and leaping about on all fours. One night Itard went to his upstairs window and was surprised to see Victor out in the courtyard below, in the cold evening, rocking on his haunches from one side to the other and staring up at the moon.

Itard, with all his sophistication, appears at moments to long for the apparent simplicity in the boy's life. At one point he questioned the humaneness of having removed the boy from the only kind of existence he really knew.

What would you have done with Victor? Would your first question have been, as one of the curious gawkers put it, "Will he be baptized?" Would you have thrown up your hands in dismay at the formidable task of making the boy a functioning member of society? See this film before it leaves town. It will be an experience unforgettable in its quiet power.

DR. FULLER'S FALLACY?
by Jerry Daley

"You read the Bible just like you read any other book." Often heard repeating this sentence or a paraphrase of it is Dr. Fuller in his course on hermeneutics. Perhaps he enjoys giving his students such a shock. At any rate I did...
not disappoint him, for my face registered the expected dismay. However, I was even more shocked by his misunderstanding of the scripture used to argue his case.

In this article I purpose to show why Dr. Fuller cannot support his shocking statement (and its implications) with the scripture he has used in his syllabus on Hermeneutics on page VII-1.

His proposition is, 'The activity of reading does not stop with the work of understanding what a book says. It must be completed by the work of criticism, the work of judging.' What he means is that after we understand what the Bible says then we must proceed to ask the question, is it true, just as with any other book.

A restatement of this proposition is found in the second paragraph, "A passage of Scripture makes it plain that moral fault attaches to those who do not take the trouble to determine why they believe something in the Bible to be true." The restatement is the practical interpretation of his proposition and is the statement I will deal with specifically.

Dr. Fuller gets a lot of mileage out of his interpretation of Acts 17:11, and this is the problem that I am challenging. He says, "The writer of Acts declares that those in Berea were 'more noble than those in Thessalonica, for they received the word with all eagerness, examining the scriptures daily to see if these things were so.' The Thessalonians had accepted the apostles' teachings uncritically, and in so doing were less noble than the Bereans." To this interpretation he further adds the gross overstatement of assigning 'moral fault' to those who do not ask his questions of, "is it true?", and "why?" Moral fault suggests sin to me, whereas the only pronouncement was the positive one of being 'more noble' which rested upon the Bereans.

There are two reasons why his interpretation of Acts 17:11 cannot be true: (1) Luke is not comparing the Berean Jews with the believing Jews of Thessalonica but with the unbelieving Jews of that city. (2) The Berean Jews were not questioning the revelation of the Old Testament but were comparing the claim to new revelation against the older revelation to see if the Old Testament really did predict that the Christ would suffer and rise form the dead (Acts 17:3).

1a. "Now these Jews were more noble than those in Thessalonica..." Acts 17:11a.

The real question is, 'Which Jews at Thessalonica are being compared to the Bereans?' In Acts 17:4a we are specifically told that "some" of the Jews in the synagogue at Thessalonica were persuaded, but the "some" is contrasted to a great multitude of worshipping Greeks. It seems clear that in verses 5 and 6 the majority of the Jews are being described as jealous, rioting, and accusing. Paul and Silas had to flee for their lives from this Jewish multitude, and for this reason they arrive at Berea. This same unruly, Jewish mob pursues the apostles to Berea to touch off another riot there when they hear how the word of God was proclaimed to the Bereans. Once again Paul has to flee for his life from the unreceptive Jews of Thessalonica. It is only natural then, to speak of the Jews at Berea as being more noble than the rioting rabble, "for they received the word with all eagerness..."

b. Another reason Luke is not comparing the Bereans to the believing Jews at Thessalonica is found in 1 Thess. 1:6-8 and 2:13. Far from belittling this "uncritical" acceptance, Paul, Silas, and Timothy "thank God constantly" for the way they received the word (1 Thess. 2:13).

The Thessalonicans are commended in 1 Thess. 1:6, because they "became imitators of us and of the Lord". They did this by receiving or welcoming the word in much affliction. Having "welcomed the word in much affliction" refers to the persecution suffered, but he also thanks God constantly, "that when you received the word of God which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God..." (1 Thess. 2:13).
DR. FULLER'S FALLACY? (con't)

The result of receiving the word in such an uncritical manner was their becoming imitators of Paul, Silas, Timothy, and the Lord. The result of this imitation is stated in verse 7 where Paul gives the highest praise accorded to any New Testament church. He calls them the "tupos" (exact type or example) to all the believers. The reason for this is that the same word which they received so enthusiastically, they sounded forth to all of Greece in a remarkably short time.

2. Regardless of which Jews are being compared, the Bereans do not offer us a pattern for questioning the truth of scripture, for this is not what they were doing. Their nobility was based upon receiving "the word with all eagerness" as opposed to jealousy. This eagerness was characterized by "examining the scriptures daily to see if these things were so". What they were doing was examining the Old Testament scriptures to see if "it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead..." (Acts 17:3). They were bound to question any new claim of revelation by comparing it to the older revelation that was accepted by the Jewish community. In this we have an example to let every new claim of revelation, such as Joseph Smith brought, be compared to the known scriptures of the Old and New Testament. Nowhere does it suggest that the Bereans questioned the Old Testament. In fact even Dr. Fuller has not gone so far as to say that the Bereans did this. And yet Dr. Fuller draws the conclusion that, based upon their example, people incur moral fault if they do not question the truth claim of the Old and New Testaments.

For the above reasons I charge not only that Dr. Fuller cannot make Acts 17:11 support his proposition, but when 1 Thess. 1:6—8 and 2:13 are considered the proposition falls apart. The believing Thessalonian Jews are commended in 1 Thess. 1:6,7 in a way that exalts them above the Bereans. So while the Bereans are more noble than the rioting Jews at Thessalonica, the believing Jews at Thessalonica are imitators of the Lord and the "tupos" to all the believers in Greece. The apostles constantly thank God for their "uncritical" acceptance of God's word.

MY RESPONSE TO WAYNE GRUDEM
by Daniel P. Fuller

Mr. Grudem objects to my system of hermeneutics because he believes it involves God in telling white lies. According to the dictionary, such a lie is "a lie without evil intent." For example, if my wife comes home from a shopping expedition and says to me, "How do you like my new dress?" and although I believe it is a monstrosity I tell her it is beautiful to avoid the infelicitious consequences that would follow, then I have told her a lie to avoid the evil of disturbing domestic tranquility. Such a lie is a white lie and falls short of being a bald one only because it has the redeeming feature of trying to keep someone happy. But like a bald lie, a white lie necessarily involves asserting a statement whose intended meaning is contrary to fact. What my wife wants to learn in asking her question is my feeling about whether or not her dress is beautiful. If I say it's beautiful when I think it's awful, then I am giving her false information about a fact of which she wants to be apprized.

In my system of hermeneutics nothing analogous to a white lie ever occurs in any of the Bible's statements—all of which are verbally inspired by God. Indeed, Jesus did say the mustard seed is the "smaller of all seeds" (Matt. 13:32) "upon the earth" (Mark 4:31)—and therefore the smallest of seeds, although...
we know there are smaller ones. But Jesus, in making this statement, was not intending to impart botanical information. Neither were his hearers, in thronging him and coming great distances to hear him, intending to learn more about botany. They heard Jesus gladly because he fulfilled their desire to learn the Word of God. Since Jesus’ hearers got the facts that they wanted, they were not being treated as my wife would be in the aforementioned illustration. They were not the victims of a white lie because they were correctly apprised regarding the facts that Jesus was intending to impart and which they were waiting to hear. Therefore it is a misnomer to regard my construction of such things as the mustard seed as white lies. In denying that the Bible ever tells even white lies, I am also affirming, as does Mr. Grudem, that the Bible is free from any kind of error (factual or otherwise) in the whole and in the part.

In building his own hermeneutic, Mr. Grudem affirms that reason ought not to be relied upon to test the truth of the Bible's claim to be the Word of God. Mr. Grudem argues that just as knowledge of the yellowness of a lemon is self evident and not derived through one or more steps in which reason plays a role, knowledge of the Bible’s being the Word of God is also self evident. But I affirm that even when I know that a certain lemon is yellow my reason is functioning. Because a particular lemon is yellow and not some other color, a distinct signal travels along my optic nerve to my brain when I look at it. Reason reminds me that at other times when I have received this sort of impulse through my optic nerve I, and others with whom I converse, have been accustomed to signify it by the word "yellow". Reason helps me believe that a lemon is indeed yellow because none of the impulses are coming to my brain that would be expected if I were looking at a small orange that was painted yellow, or looking at it through yellow glasses.

The Bible has qualities or marks of divinity, just as a lemon has the quality of yellowness. It is reason which enables me to see that the Bible, unlike other books, has qualities which in the language conventions of my society are denoted by the word "divinity." Reason enables me to see that I am not predicking this word to the Bible to avoid offending those around me who might ostracize me were I not to agree with them that the Bible is the Word of God, but, rather, that I am affirming it because I am cognizant of its divine qualities. To be sure, the sinful heart, which hates the light and will not come to it lest its evil deeds be exposed for what they are and reproved--this sinful heart refuses to let reason cordially predicate divinity to the Bible. The only way that sinful men can acknowledge that the Bible is God's Word is for the Holy Spirit to overcome their hatred of the light, so that in loving what the Bible says about them, they delight in acknowledging that only the Bible has the qualities of divinity. When this happens, reason is freed to perform its crucial role in the knowing process which is carefully to discern the nerve impulses coming into the brain and then assign the proper words to them.

I agree with Mr. Grudem that sin certainly upsets the knowing process, but I affirm that the remedy consists not in shelving reason but in depending on the power of God to change the heart so that it wants to be reasonable even in acknowledging what the Bible has to say about our sinfulness. It is precisely because the Holy Spirit's work is not to set aside reason but to free it so that it can function properly that I affirm in my hermeneutic that reason should test the truth of the Bible. To shelve reason, as Mr. Grudem does, is to remove an essential for knowing, and so make it impossible for anyone to have knowledge that the Bible is the Word of God.
MY REPLY TO JERRY DALEY
by Daniel Fuller

Mr. Daley is correct in understanding that I construe Acts 17:11 to mean that the Bereans were noble (righteous) to the extent that they used their critical faculties in deciding whether the apostle’s message was true. Mr. Daley has helped me understand that it was Luke’s intention to contrast the Jewish Bereans (who became believers) with the rioting Thessalonian Jews who did not believe. Acts 17:4ff, makes it clear that the converts at Thessalonica were Gentiles and not Jewish. Furthermore, I Thess. 2:14-16 implies this. But while Mr. Daley wants to stress that the nobility of the Berean Jews consisted in not rioting, yet I believe he must concede that Acts 17:11 expressly states that it consisted positively in their eager use of their critical faculties to decide whether to credit the message of Paul and Silas. (He affirms this in the third paragraph from the end of his essay, although in two other places he defines the nobility only negatively.)

I am in error when I say in my syllabus that "the Thessalonians had accepted the apostles' teachings uncritically, and in so doing were less noble than the Bereans" (VII-1.5). I am grateful to Mr. Daley for showing me that there is no reason to regard the Thessalonians as having been any less critical than the Bereans, since Luke is contrasting believing Jews in Berea with unbelieving Jews in Thessalonica. To honor Paul’s intention in writing I Thessalonians I must not construe him to mean that the Thessalonians were not an example of true faith, when he says explicitly that they were (I Thess. 1:6).

As I have been reading I Thessalonians I note that according to 1:5, the apostolic message was accompanied by such marks of divinity as power, a manifestation of the Holy Spirit and the godly lives of Paul and Silas. Paul himself recounts the godly living of himself and Silas in 2:1-12, and then in verse thirteen declares that the Thessalonian believers received the apostolic message not as the word of men "but as what it really is, the Word of God." Since Paul explicitly alludes to the evidences which enabled the Gentile Christians to use their critical faculties in believing, it would seem to me that the example which the Thessalonians are for all Christians will have to mean that genuine faith must rest on the evidences and the use of critical faculties.