

# Christians and Culture: Christ our hope (Is There Something Missing in the Present Discussion of Culture?)

Samuel A. Dawson, Ph.D.  
Professor of Theology  
Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary

## ***Introduction:***

I will use John Frame's perspective on culture in his recent book *The Doctrine of the Christian Life* (2008, R & R Publishing, 853–908) as my starting point. After interacting with Frame's recent thoughts, I will share my reflections on an emphasis I believe is missing in the present discussion on culture.

## **I. FRAME'S ANALYSIS**

### **A. Defining Culture**

1. Generally Speaking – Frame defines culture as “anything that human beings work at to achieve” (854).
2. Narrowing the Focus – Creation is distinct from culture.
3. What God Says About Culture

- a. God commands Adam and Eve to make culture

**Gen 1:28** “*God blessed them; and God said to them, ‘Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth, and subdue it; and rule over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the sky and over every living thing that moves on the earth.’*” [NAS95]

- b. Frame and others call Genesis 1:28 the “cultural mandate” (855).

(1) Fill the earth –

(2) “Rule” the natural world

4. Expanding the Definition – Culture *is* what we do, but God intended for us to do culture for His glory.

Thus, Frame offers an additional definition: “... culture is both what human society is and what it ought to be, both real and ideal. Culture is what a society has made of God's creation together with its ideals of what it ought to make of it.” (857)

5. Connecting the definition to “religion”
  - a. In general, values and ideals have to do with “religion”
  - b. “Religion” governs culture.
  - c. Because of the Fall (Gen 3) people “make” religions that express hatred toward the true God, and therefore their cultures are corrupted.
  
6. Connecting the definition to common and special grace
  - a. As a result of the Fall, we might think that there is nothing good in human culture.
  - b. But Frame believes that some “good” still resides in cultures.
  - c. Common grace is the source of any relative good we may find in culture.
  - d. Furthermore, God’s special grace is at work in redeemed individuals in a culture, which also causes good in the culture.
  - e. To Frame, a believer is still responsible to carry out the “cultural mandate” (cf. Gen 1:28–30; 9:1–7) as it is reflected in the Great Commission (cf. Matt 28:19–20).

## **B. Analyzing Culture – Christ’s Relationship to Culture**

Frame uses H. Richard Niebuhr’s models to discuss the various views of culture... all the while evaluating these views from a biblical perspective.

Note: Many others also use Niebuhr’s models to discuss various views of culture (cf. D. A. Carson’s, *Christ and Culture Revisited*). Frame calls Niebuhr’s book: *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper, 1951)... “probably the most influential twentieth-century work on the subject.”

Niebuhr’s five models are: (1) Christ against culture; (2) the Christ of culture; (3) Christ above culture; (4) Christ and culture in paradox; (5) Christ the transformer of culture.

Frame notes that most people hold to a mixture of these models, but they are guideposts to evaluate thinking about culture.

1. Using Niebuhr’s model

- a. **CHRIST AGAINST CULTURE** – Christianity and culture are in opposition. Christians must reject culture and separate from it.
  - b. **CHRIST OF CULTURE** – Christ and the highest ideals and expressions of culture are in basic agreement. Christians should embrace the best of culture and acknowledge that, at least, those who have embraced the best ideals of culture are Christians, whether they called themselves Christians or not.
  - c. **CHRIST ABOVE CULTURE – SYNTHESISTS** – There is good in culture but it must be completed by Christ.
  - d. **CHRIST AND CULTURE IN PARADOX – “DUALISTS”** – Christ is sovereign over culture and the church. But He rules each differently. To some who accept this view, God has two sovereignties, . . . one over the nations of the earth (culture, etc.) and one over the church.
  - e. **CHRIST, THE TRANSFORMER OF CULTURE – TRANSFORMATIONALISTS** – Christians should seek to transform the bad elements of culture according to the standards of the Word of God.
2. Interacting with Certain Biblicists’ Perspectives – The Nature and Value of Present-Day Culture
- a. **FRANCIS SCHAEFFER** – traced the history of Western thought and culture: from rationalism to irrationalism (crossing “the line of despair”)
  - b. **OS GUINNESS** – argued that culture took a turn for the worse in the 1960’s. It even rejected “borrowed” Christian values and slid into pessimistic humanism, pronouncing the death of God as a cultural fact (*The Dust of Death*, 1973).
  - c. **DAVID WELLS** – chronicled how his hometown of Wenham, MA declined into a culture we call “modern” . . . a subjectivist or irrationalist culture based on human experience, not objective truth. This culture is an escape from reason and truth (*No Place for Truth*).

*Frame notes:* To Wells “Modern culture . . . is *psychologistic*, believing in psychotherapy as the best way to deal with human problems. It is preoccupied with *professionalism*: business management and marketing techniques as the model for achieving any kind of common enterprise. It is *consumerist*, believing that we must always be willing to provide for people what they want, or what they can be induced to buy. It is *pragmatist*, holding that results are the ultimate justification for any idea or decision.

Wells's main interest is not so much to analyze culture as to indict the church for its capitulation to culture" (882).

d. **KENNETH A. MYERS** –

A former producer/editor for NPR, host of Mars Hill tape ministry; author of the “brilliant and highly influential volume called *All God's Children and Blue Suede Shoes: Christians and Popular Culture*” (882). Myers also accuses the church for capitulating to the worst in modern culture.

Myers *distinguishes* between three kinds of culture:

- (1) *High*: Gourmet restaurants; Beethoven; Highly corrupted in our time but used to be rooted in absolutes about truth and virtue. Although corrupted, it is still more capable than folk or popular culture to transmit what God values.
- (2) *Folk*: Good home cooking; African-American spirituals – Less communicable from one group to another, but has “virtues of honesty, integrity, commitment to tradition, and perseverance in the face of opposition” (883).
- (3) *Popular*: Fast-food restaurant; Metallica – can provide “innocent pleasure”, but it is so corrupted by mass marketing and instant gratification that one should avoid addiction to it.

e. **RICHARD PRATT** – traces the history of culture under three chronologically successive worldviews: (1) Premodern; (2) Modern; (3) Postmodern

*Frame notes*: “Postmodernism tends to be very skeptical and very open at the same time: open to experience, yet skeptical of dogmatic accounts of experience; open to many interpretations of literature from many points of view, but dogmatically critical of ideas that are deemed oppressive, not politically correct. Many see postmodernism as the dominant ideology today on university campuses and among the elite opinion-making class of our society” (885).

f. **CORNELIUS VAN TIL**

Van Til, professor of Apologetics at Westminster Theological Seminary (1929-1975); died in 1987; one of Schaeffer's teachers; never wrote directly about culture – but did write about philosophy, worldviews, and ways of determining ethical values which are relevant to an evaluation of culture.

Van Til knew a great deal about the history of thought, but did not make a big deal of turning points in thought. This is the one area of difference between Van Til and the thinkers we have covered thus far.

“Van Til knew of only one turning point: the fall of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden. History since that time, in his view, has been replay after replay. Eve was rationalist and irrationalist, modernist, and postmodernist, oppressive establishment and countercultural rebel, an idolater of value and a destroyer of it, all at the same time” (886).

Van Til points out the inconsistency of Eve’s position. She is given a commandment from God *and* she is confronted by Satan who calls God a liar. Who would she believe? The obvious choice is to believe God. He is Eve’s Creator and as such He has the right to speak with absolute authority. Plus, God loved Eve. She should have believed God.

But somehow she no longer accepts/believes/trusts God’s Word. As such, she is left with two alternatives... and only two. As Van Til explains (in Frame’s words): “Eve was shut up to two remaining alternatives: either there is no final authority or she was the final authority. As a rationalist, she believed that she had the authority to decide what was true or false, right or wrong. But if she was the final authority, then there was no God, nobody who could speak a word more authoritative than hers. And if there was no God, there was no meaning, no rationality, no structure, no ground for any other words, including hers, to be authoritative. So Eve was both a rationalist and an irrationalist. She thought she was the supreme authority, but she also believed there was no supreme authority. These two beliefs were inconsistent, of course. Both are necessary to the unbelieving mind-set” (886–87).

Frame summarizes Van Til’s view of the history of philosophy: “Van Til analyzed the history of philosophy to show that all non-Christian thinkers, from ancient Greece to the present, were both rationalists and irrationalists at the same time. Van Til did not agree with Schaeffer that the ancient Greeks had an adequate view of truth. The Greeks believed with Eve that truth could be known through the autonomous human intellect, and that was no better than subjectivism or irrationalism. Nor did he take the position of Wells and others that the ills of culture come from modernism, the Industrial Revolution, the sixties’ counterculture, or postmodernism. Eve was both a traditionalist and a modernist, a modernist and a postmodernist. History is not a movement from rationalism to irrationalism, but a dialogue, a dance, between them. When rationalism gets out of hand, irrationalism jumps in, and vice versa” (887).

Thus, the problem is not found by tracing thought through history. The problem is sin. Culture is bad today, but probably not much worse or much better than Sodom, Gomorrah, Tyre, Sidon, Babylon, Rome, Capernaum, Chorazin, Bethsaida.

Thus, Frame makes the following conclusions based on Van Til's thought:

- (1) Popular culture is bad today, but so is high culture.
- (2) High culture has not been corrupted by popular culture. In fact, the reverse may be true.
- (3) Folk culture has always had its problems along with its humble virtues; "bawdy tales, class warfare, ignorant populism, and disrespect for the holy" (887).

*Frame concludes:* "It is always wrong to try to single out one element of culture as pure, even relatively pure, and blame all of society's ills on some other element. That is almost always self-serving: we like what we like, and we want to blame the evils of life on the culture we dislike. But perhaps we need to have a more biblical view of sin. Sin is not limited to one segment of society or one segment of culture. It pervades everything. And whatever good there is comes from God's common and special grace" (887).

### **C. Interacting with Culture – Christians and the Church**

How should Christians and the church interact with the culture God has placed us into?

*Frame writes:* "The general biblical formula is that we are to be 'in' the world (John 17:11, 15; Titus 2:12), but not 'of' the world (John 15:19; 17:14, 16)" (888).

But how do we apply this principle (being "*in*" the world, but not "*of*" the world), taking into consideration Frame's position of making a distinction between world and culture? Frame explores three specific areas where Christians interact with the world and gives his thoughts on how Christians are to be "*in*" the world and not "*of*" the world in these areas: (1) Interacting with the cultural elite; (2) Interacting with movies; (3) Interacting with music. I will "flesh out" the first of these, and leave you to peruse the other two in his book.

Interacting with the Cultural Elite:

1. Background

- a. Medieval, Renaissance, Reformation, Post-Reformation to around 1750 (death of J. S. Bach) – Christianity was the dominant force in Western culture (“education, scholarship, the arts, literature, science, law, treatment of the poor, etc.” [889]).
- b. 1750–1920 — Christianity had significant influence but not dominant. During this time pastor, priest, rector, were the most educated... and people came to them for advice on all sorts of things.
- c. 1920 (from an American perspective) to now – Serious decline of Christian influence. Frame writes: “The Scopes trial, in which the Christian critique of evolution became a laughingstock, was the symbolic, if not actual, point of decline” (889).

(1) From this point on American evangelicalism became anti-intellectual. “Many Christians thought that the contemporary academic world was what Paul called in Colossians 2:8 ‘*philosophy and vain deceit*’, a spiritual snare to be avoided. This view was shallow and harmful to the church’s witness. But one can still admire the fundamentalists for putting loyalty to Christ ahead of cultural fashions, intellectual and otherwise” (889).

(2) 1925–1945 was a wasteland of evangelical participation in academics, arts, sciences (culture, *per se*). Mark Noll calls this time period: “*the scandal of the evangelical mind*” (because there was no evangelical mind).

*Frame writes:* “The development of Reformed theology at Princeton Seminary (Westminster after 1928) was one exception to this general rule” (889). Yet, Frame caveats this positive development: “In [the Reformed theology] movement there was, if anything, an overemphasis on intellectual rigor” (889).

(3) Post-WWII an evangelical renaissance occurred with younger leaders like Carl F. H. Henry and Billy Graham... along with Harold J. Ockenga, Charles E. Fuller and financier J. Howard Pew. They tried to create an evangelicalism that would have “sound scholarship and be apologetically powerful and socially relevant.” Their products were: Fuller Seminary, *Christianity Today*, and the Billy Graham evangelistic crusades. This was a

*“new evangelical”* movement.

- (4) The “new evangelical” movement was influenced by the Westminster model, even though its hotbed was Fuller. Westminster grads like Edward J. Carnell and Paul K. Jewett joined Fuller’s faculty. Gordon Clark of Wheaton was also influential with students like Henry, Graham, Edmund Clowney. Clark’s intellectualism helped develop the “new evangelical” self-image.
- (5) The “new evangelicals” were somewhat ashamed of their fundamentalist heritage. They “repudiated the idea of an antithesis between Christianity and secular learning and determined to take a positive role in the affairs of society” (890).

Note: Frame notes that Van Til was skeptical of this kind of attitude... feeling it was naïve. Frame writes: “Cornelius Van Til tried to inject a different note. We should be positive about intellect and science per se, but we should also be aware of the effects of sin upon the life of the mind. Van Til even spoke of antithesis between Christianity and secular learning. He did not mean to say that everything in secular philosophy and science was false, but that it was deeply flawed by an anti-Christian epistemology and could never be taken for granted. Van Til was no obscurantist. He had earned a Ph.D. in philosophy at Princeton and had a knowledge of history, philosophy, and culture that few could equal. But the main body of evangelicalism saw his emphasis to be too much a reversion to the fundamentalist anti-intellectualism” (890).

- (6) The “new evangelical’s” commitment to “mainstream scholarship” derailed in the 1960’s on the question of inerrancy. Some rejected “inerrancy”; others did not.
- (7) To Frame, the two strains of “new evangelicals” (inerrantists, errantists) “have drawn closer together again” (890), because “noninerrantists and limited inerrantists have taken fairly conservative stands on matters of biblical criticism, while inerrantists have become hermeneutically more sophisticated. Yet the two branches often diverge, especially on questions of feminism and homosexuality” (890).
- d. 1970 to present – “...there has been a constant effort to get evangelicals involved in mainstream academics, the arts, and in debates of the public forum” (890).

How successful has this “constant effort” been?

- (1) Evangelicalism is a more important voice in social and political discussions.
  - (2) Christian philosophers like Alvin Plantinga, Richard Swinburne and Paul Helm have invaded an academic domain once given over totally to the secularists.
  - (3) “Faith-based” mercy initiatives have been started to relieve suffering in the world.
  - (4) Christian schools and homeschooling have become an important part of education in America.
  - (5) “Intelligent design” writers such as Phillip Johnson, Michael Behe and William Dembski have critiqued evolution effectively.
  - (6) *World Magazine* (Christian editorial position) has become the fourth-largest selling magazine.
  - (7) Christian music (CCM) and book publishing have become major businesses attracting secular investment.
  - (8) Billy Graham has befriended every U. S. President since Dwight Eisenhower.
  - (9) Many talk of the Republican Party being taken over by the Christian Right.
- e. Yet many critics (evangelical and non-evangelical) of evangelicalism still view it as an “anti-intellectual cultural backwater” movement.

Response:

## II. MY REFLECTIONS ON CULTURE

- A. **Culture Defined:** There are so many definitions of culture that it becomes somewhat dissatisfactory to raise my voice in the noise. So I will simply use *Oxford’s Dictionary* as my starting point: “the customs, civilization, and achievements of a particular time or people.” Culture, therefore, is what man does with the resources God gives him.

- B.** God created man in His image to individually and collectively build a culture that would bring God glory.

Man would be able to do this by filling the whole earth with his progeny and using the resources God gave him (cf. Gen 1:28–30).

- C.** There are, at least, six areas in which man, individually and collectively, was to build a culture to glorify God:
1. ***Spiritual*** – The spiritual aspect of man’s pure fellowship with God was to be the proper foundation on which to build a culture that brought God glory.
  2. ***Ethical*** – Man was to obey God’s commands both in relationship to God and to His creation. For example, Adam and Eve were not allowed to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil.
  3. ***Social*** – Obviously if man is to fill the earth and use the resources God gave him to glorify God, then this task must be done collectively, as well as individually. Mankind, collectively (socially) was to glorify God by interacting with Him and with each other in ways He intended.
  4. ***Political*** – Collective man needed a governing structure. This is true of all personal beings – angelic; and the Persons of the Godhead (cf. 1 Cor 11:3). For example, in terms of man, from the very beginning the husband was to be the head of the wife.
  5. ***Physical*** – There is a physical aspect to the culture which God intended for man to build in order to glorify Himself. Man was to cultivate the Garden, and use the natural resources God had given him to benefit God’s image-bearers (agriculture, horticulture, etc.).
  6. ***Religious*** – Man was to worship God, externally, in a way that pleased God... working, serving, resting, praising, etc. This aspect is not explicitly presented in Gen 1–3, but it is there.

- D.** However man rejected God, which marred the image of God man bears, and also marred the culture which man builds.

But man still bears God’s image and thus sometimes, sporadically does relative good [but always with an evil heart]. So the culture man builds has some relatively good things in it. However, they are built on the foundation of man’s pride. We can look at this culture from the vantage point of the six areas we discussed earlier:

1. ***Spiritual*** – The culture sinful man builds has no true spiritual foundation.

2. **Ethical** – The more man listens to his conscience, the more civil his culture... and probably the more prideful.
3. **Social** – Man seeks peace *and* war selfishly.
4. **Political** – The best government developed by man is a government that limits man's powers.
5. **Physical** – Man uses the environment and abuses the environment. He creates cures for diseases, but also helps spread diseases.
6. **Religious/Ecclesiastical** – Man needs to worship, but his worship is corrupt (cf. Rom 1:21–23).

**Bottom Line:** Van Til is right. Man is rational and irrational at the same time. I would say man rationally suppresses the truth of God, which makes him irrational (cf. Rom 1:18–32).

- E. Thus the culture man has built in the secular world wherever man has built it, is irredeemable.
- F. God is not in the business of redeeming culture anyway. He redeems men and women for His glory.
- G. To these men and women, He has promised a Kingdom on earth over which Christ will reign. And they will serve Him gladly, in the functions in which He places them.
- H. When Christ finally fulfills this promise, He will establish a culture on earth, which brings glory to Him. This will bring His plan full circle. A people called out for His Name will collectively build a culture on this earth that brings glory and honor to Jesus Christ.

Niebuhr's categories are insufficient. It is not just *Christ against culture*, *Christ of culture*, *Christ above culture*, *Christ and culture in paradox*, or *Christ transforming culture*. Rather, it is *Christ supernaturally and personally establishing a God-honoring culture on earth through redeemed people, whom He has transformed*.

- I. The Old Testament prophets speak of this time when Christ will establish a God-honoring culture through people He has redeemed and brought into His Kingdom. McClain uses the six-aspects (we borrowed from him) to describe this Millennial culture:

1. ***Spiritual*** –

- a. Spiritual salvation will come from God (Isa 12:1–3; 60:18; 61:10; 52:7–10).
- b. Spiritual salvation will be effected by the grace of God (Ps 45:2; Zech 12:10; Ezek 16:60–63).
- c. Spiritual salvation will be seen in its fullness (Zech 12:10–13; Jer 31:19; Isa 55:4–7; Mic 7:19; Jer 23:6; Ezek 36:24–38; Joel 2:27–28; Zeph 3:11–13; Jer 30:11–12, 17–18; 32:40).
- d. Spiritual salvation’s blessings will be centered in the King (Isa 32:1–2).
- e. Spiritual salvation’s extensiveness will bring joy to the world (Isa 31:12; 51:11; 61:2–3).
- f. Spiritual salvation’s blessings will be set in the realm of sense experience (Ezek 36).

2. ***Ethical*** –

- a. Moral values will be readjusted (Isa 5:18–23; 2:3).
- b. Moral values will be based on an objective standard (Ps 119:115; Mal 4:4; Isa 2:3).
- c. Moral values will be appraised accurately on the basis of the objective standard found in the King’s laws (Mal 2:17; 3:18; Isa 32:5).
- d. Moral value of truth will be exalted to its proper place (Zech 8:3).
- e. Retribution for wrongdoing will extend only to individuals (Jer 31:29–30).
- f. The effects of obedience/disobedience will be demonstrably evident (Ps 72:4, 7; Zeph 1:12).

3. ***Social*** –

- a. Military conflict will cease (Ps 46:9; Hos 2:18; Mic 4:3).
- b. Social justice will prevail (Isa 65:21–22; Amos 9:11, 14; Ps 72:1–4, 12–13).
- c. Man will reclaim what he has ruined (Isa 61:1–4).

- d. The disadvantaged will be properly cared for (Isa 42:1–4).
- e. The institution of the home and the value of young and old will be properly recognized (Jer 33:10–11, 15; Zech 8:4–5).

4. *Political* –

- a. There will be an international authority (Isa 2:2–4).
- b. There will be a world capital in Jerusalem (Isa 2:3; Ezek 38:12; Zech 14:4, 10).
- c. Political wrongs will be righted (Isa 2:4).
- d. The barrier of language will be removed (Zeph 3:9).

5. *Physical* –

- a. Climate will be controlled for the benefit of the Kingdom (Isa 30:23–26).
- b. Geological changes will benefit the kingdom (Isa 24:19–23; Ezek 38:19–20; Zech 14:4, 8).
- c. Areas unfit for cultivation will become productive in the Kingdom (Joel 2:23; Ezek 34:26b; Isa 30:25; 35:6–7; 41:18).
- d. Productivity and fertility will increase in the Kingdom (Isa 35:1–2; Ezek 34:29; Ps 72:16; Amos 9:13).
- e. Animals will harm neither man, nor each other during the Kingdom (Hos 2:18; Ezek 34:25; Isa 11:6–8).
- f. Physical disease and deformity will be mitigated in the Kingdom (Isa 5:5–6; 33:24a; Isa 65:22).
- g. “Accidents” will be a thing of the past in the Kingdom (Ps 91:10–12).

6. *Religious* –

- a. The King will also be a priest (Zech 6:12–13; Ps 110:4).
- b. Israel will be the religious leaders (Isa 61:6; Zeph 3:20).
- c. Jerusalem will be the religious center (Isa 1:21, 26; 60:14, 18; 62:3, 7, Jer 31:6; Zech 8:23).

- d. Religious freedom will not be tolerated (Zech 14:17–19).
- e. There will be a future temple in Jerusalem (Hag 1:4; 2:3, 6–9; Ezra 3:12; Ezek 43:1–3, 7 and Ezek 40–48).
- f. Animal sacrifices will be memorial in nature (Heb 10:1–3).
- g. There will be a world center of worship (Zech 14:16; 66:23).

**J.** This is the culture we long for and look forward to, when Jesus comes back.

**Titus 2:13** *“looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus.”*

**K.** Our mission today is not to transform culture... but to make and mature disciples who are becoming more and more like Christ in the local church... so that they may carry out their God-given responsibilities now (in the church) **and** in the future Millennial Kingdom to glorify Christ. In His Kingdom, Christ will give His redeemed certain duties to help build a culture for His glory.

**L.** How do we carry out this mandate in the culture in which God has called us to minister?

**M.** Some call this task contextualization... I call it application of a grammatical-historical interpretation of Scripture to the culture we are endeavoring to reach. Some basic thoughts:

1. **Question:** We should ask ourselves how do we apply God’s Word to *our* culture?

2. **Answer:**

- a. 1st, we seek to understand God’s Word in the time-frame and in the culture in which it was written.
- b. 2nd, we apply what we have learned to our time and culture, so as not to change the original meaning, or the present-day application God intends for our culture.
- c. While working hard at the first two steps we must rely on the Spirit to give us wisdom and boldness in proclaiming the gospel.

**Eph 6:18–20** ¶<sup>18</sup> *With all prayer and petition pray at all times in the Spirit, and with this in view, be on the alert with all perseverance and petition for all the saints,* <sup>19</sup>*and pray on my behalf, that utterance may be given to me in the opening of my mouth, to make known with boldness the mystery of the gospel,* <sup>20</sup>*for which I am an ambassador in chains; that in proclaiming it I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.”*

## 3. Some test cases:

- a. *“You shall not steal”* (Ex 20:15)
- b. *“Make a parapet for your roof”* (Deut 22:8)
- c. *“Greet all the brethren with a holy kiss”* (1 Thess 5:26)
- d. *“<sup>12</sup>But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet. <sup>13</sup>For it was Adam who was first created, and then Eve”* (1 Tim 2:12–13)
- e. *“He must deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me”* (Matt 17:24; cf. Mk 8:34; Lk 9:23)
- f. *“Here I raise my Ebenezer”* (*“Come Thou Fount of Every Blessing”* – cf. 1 Sam 7:12)