Apologetics, 2ST530

Fall term, 2009, RTS/Orlando
Tuesdays, 10-12 AM
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Instructor: John M. Frame

Office hours: Mon., 8-11 AM, others by appointment. I'm in my office most mornings, and if my door is ajar I'll be happy to see you. Feel free to ask questions or make comments by email, jframe@rts.edu. I will probably give better answers to your questions by email, but I understand that sometimes it's better to talk face-to-face.

Teaching Assistant: Jonathan (Jonny) Dyer

His email, jonnywdyer@googlemail.com. Feel free to talk or write to him about any course matters. Give your papers to him, rather than Dr. Frame, by email, or in hardcopy. He will do the bulk of the grading in the course. In case of a dispute over a grade, please talk to him first. Then if you cannot resolve the matter, Dr. Frame will be happy to arbitrate.

Course Content
Apologetics is the study of how to give reasons for our Christian hope (1 Pet. 3:15). This course has three parts: (1) Christian theory of knowledge, (2) historic and contemporary views of apologetic method, (3) topics in apologetics. In the first part, we shall ask what Scripture says about human knowledge, particularly the process by which a non-Christian comes to know Christ. The second part will deal with the controversy over how to do apologetics, discussing representatives of different apologetic schools. The third part will discuss issues under debate between Christians and non-Christians: the existence of God, the truth of Scripture, the problem of evil, the currents of modern and postmodern thought.

Course Objectives

1. To understand and apply what Scripture says about the nature of human thought and knowledge, especially the knowledge of God.

2. To understand the methods used by Christian thinkers to persuade others of the truth of the Christian faith.

3. To learn how best to discuss matters of controversy between believers and nonbelievers.

4. To learn intellectual humility—to depend on God entirely for apologetic success.

Course Documents

These are all available at www.reformedperspectives.org. Click “Hall of Frame,” then this course.

Course Handbook (syllabus, what you are now reading)
DKG for Apologetics (Lecture Outline)
Apologetic Method (Lecture Outline)
Problems of Apologetics (Lecture Outline)
Topics in Apologetics (Study Guide)

Required Texts and Abbreviations

GD: Greg Bahnsen, The Great Debate, transcript online at http://www.bellevuechristian.org/faculty/dribera/htdocs/PDFs/Apol_Bahnse


SD: Supplementary Documents (Available at www.reformedperspectives.org. Click “Hall of Frame,” then this course.)
	William Edgar, “No News is Good News”

John Frame, “Certainty”
	--, “Christianity and Culture”
	--, and Paul Kurtz, “Do We Need God to be Moral?”
	--, “Greeks Bearing Gifts”
	--, “Infinite Series.”
	--, “Is Intelligent Design Science?”
	--, “Ontological Argument”
	--, “Self-Refuting Statements”
	--, “Transcendental Arguments”
	--, “Unregenerate Knowledge of God”
	--, “Van Til Reconsidered”
	--, “A Van Til Glossary”

**Recommended:**

*The Collected Works of John M. Frame* (P&R and Bits and Bytes, 2008), Vol. 1: three CDs or one DVD, including six books, many articles, and 70 hours of audio lectures on MP3s. This volume focuses on systematic theology, but it contains *Doctrine of the Knowledge of God*, an audio course on that book, and other materials relevant to epistemology and apologetics. Vol. 2 will deal specifically with apologetics, vol. 3 with ethics and worship. It costs a lot, but the cost per book (and other materials) is pretty low.

**Assignments**

1. Complete the reading assignments according to the schedule below.

2. In Part Three of the course, we will be using the “Topics in Apologetics” Study Guide. I will call on students by name, and they should be prepared to define key terms and answer study questions.

3. Write a paper. This assignment offers two alternatives. Please do either one or the other. The paper should be turned in before 11 AM on Wed., Dec. 6, the catalogue deadline. Put the paper in the bin marked with the
course name in the Administrative Assistants’ area. For late papers without excuse, I deduct 1/3 of a grade after 11 AM and for every 24 hours of lateness after that. 1/3 of a grade means, e.g., from B to B-.

(a) First alternative: Write a paper of approximately 3000 words presenting a fictional apologetic dialogue between a Christian and a non-Christian, or between a Christian having doubts or problems with his faith and another one who tries to help him resolve those. Chapter 9 of AGG provides you a model for the dialogue form, and you can find others, for example, in the books of Peter Kreeft listed in the bibliography. Your dialogue may deal with any subject that might arise in such a conversation, such as the existence of God, the problem of evil, the nature of truth, the authority of Scripture, etc. For this paper, you should do some research beyond the course assignments. The bibliography in this syllabus may help you.

(b) The second alternative: engage in an e-mail dialogue with a non-Christian (or with a Christian who is struggling with some of the difficulties of the faith). Send to Jonny all the exchanges, totaling around 3000 words. If the actual dialogue is shorter, you may supplement it with your own analysis of the dialogue: what you did well, not so well, how you might improve your answers if you had it to do again. If your email exchange turns out to be much longer than 3000 words, then please abbreviate. Summarize the parts you have chosen to leave out. “Clean up” the format of the email exchange, deleting the arrows (>>>>), putting the exchanges in chronological order, deleting irrelevant parts of the exchange.

4. Final Examination

The final will cover all the reading assignments and lectures in the course. It will be multiple choice, three hours. Time and place to be announced. Please do not study exams from past years. If you do it will be considered cheating.

Hints on Writing Dialogues

Your course paper is to be in the form of dialogue. In a dialogue, two parties are exchanging opposing views. In this assignment, I want the dialogues to be not merely an exchange of views, but an actual debate, in which each party tries (graciously, of course) to refute the other’s position.

If you write a fictional dialogue, you are to master both views well enough to be able to indicate how each party, thinking at his best, would reply to the
other's objections. Some examples of the dialogue form can be found in the writings of Plato, Hume's *Dialogues*, the Calvin Beisner’s *Answers For Atheists*, and many books by Peter Kreeft (see apologetics bibliography), the last chapter of AGG, and CVT, 339-352. Seek “clarity, cogency, and profundity.”

If you put together a real dialogue, from email exchanges, etc., it is still necessary for you to learn enough about the other person’s view to deal with his arguments.

A fictional dialogue should consist mostly of short speeches in which each party interacts with the other in detail. In general, they ought to be "ideal" rather than "realistic." "Realistic" dialogues, the kind we have in real life, involve a lot of misunderstanding, arguing at cross purposes, ambiguities, fallacies, etc. To save time and clarify the real issues, avoid those things as much as possible. You should seek to have each thinker make the best possible case for his position, even when, in the final analysis, you believe that position to be false.

In a real dialogue, such as an email exchange, you won’t have control over what your opponent says. But you should try nevertheless to deal with his points specifically, in detail.

I expect you to write concisely. I won’t hold you to a rigid limit, but the rule is this: if you write more than the recommended length, it must be eminently worth the extra space. If you write less, it must be concise, pithy, and profound enough to be equivalent to a longer paper.

**Grading**

Grading of the assignments in this course is on a pass-fail basis. For the whole course, your grade will be calculated as follows:

Passing work on assignments 2-4 above: A.
Passing work on two of these: B.
Passing work on one of them: C.
No passing work: F.

**Abbreviations for Comments on Papers**

A - awkward
Amb - ambiguous
Arg - more argument needed
C - compress
Circle (drawn around some text) - usually refers to
misspelling or other obvious mistake
D - define
E - expand, elaborate, explain
EA - emphasis argument
F - too figurative for context
G - grammatical error
Ill - illegible
Illus - illustrate, give example
Int - interesting
L1 - lateness penalty for one day (similarly L2, etc.)
M - misleading in context
O - overstated, overgeneralized
R - redundant
Ref- reference (of pronoun, etc.)
Rel- irrelevant
Rep - repetitious
Resp - not responsive (In a dialogue: one party raises a good question to which the other does not respond.)
S - summary needed
Scr - needs more scripture support
Simp - oversimplified
SM - straw man (a view nobody holds)
SS - problem in sentence structure
St - style inappropriate
T - transition needed
U - unclear
V - vague
W - questionable word-choice
Wk - weak writing (too many passives, King James English, etc.)
WO - word order
WV - whose view? yours? another author?

Grading System For Papers

A: Good grasp of basic issues, plus something really extraordinary, worthy of publication in either a technical or popular publication. That special excellence may be of various kinds: formulation, illustration, comprehensiveness, subtlety/nuance, creativity, argument, insight, correlations with other issues, historical perspective, philosophical sophistication, research beyond the requirements of the assignment. One of these will be enough!
A-: An A paper, except that it requires some minor improvement before an editor would finally accept it for publication.

B+: Good grasp of basic issues but without the special excellences noted above. A few minor glitches.

B: The average grade for graduate study. Good grasp of basic issues, but can be significantly improved.

B-: Shows an understanding of the issues, but marred by significant errors, unclarities (conceptual or linguistic), unpersuasive arguments, and/or shallow thinking.

C+: Raises suspicions that to some extent the student is merely manipulating terms and concepts without adequately understanding them, even though to a large extent these terms and concepts are used appropriately. Does show serious study and preparation.

C: Uses ideas with some accuracy, but without mastery or insight; thus the paper is often confused.

C-: Problems are such that the student evidently does not understand adequately the issues he/she is writing about, but the work may nevertheless be described as barely competent.

D: I don't give D's on papers.

F: Failure to complete the assignment satisfactorily. Such performance would disqualify a candidate for ministry if it were part of a presbytery exam.

Most of my students get B's. I try to keep A's and C's to a relatively small number. F's are extremely rare, but I have given a few.

**Course Outline and Reading Assignment Schedule**

**Part One: Biblical Theory of Knowledge**

Sept. 1: No assignment. Have available the Lecture Outline “DKG for Apologetics”

Sept. 8: DKG, 1-75
SD: Frame, “Certainty”
---, “Unregenerate Knowledge of God”
Sept. 15: DKG, 101-164

**Part Two: The Controversy Over Apologetic Method**

Have available the Lecture Outline, “Apologetic Method”

Sept. 29: FV, 145-206, 265-312, 345-349, 364-373 (Feinberg, Clark)

Oct. 6: FV, 207-263, 350-363 (Frame)

Oct. 13: Reading week, no class.

Oct. 20: AGG, 1-88
SD: Frame, “A Van Til Glossary”
--, “Van Til Reconsidered”

**Part Three: Topics in Apologetics**

**A. Apologetics as Proof**

Oct. 27: AGG, 89-118 (The Existence of God)
Have available the Lecture Outline, “Problems of Apologetics.” Be prepared to define key terms and answer questions from Lesson 1 of the “Topics in Apologetics” Study Guide.
GD (all)
RG, 127-158.
RS, Chapter 1
SD: Frame, “Ontological Argument”
--, “Infinite Series”
--, “Do We Need God to Be Moral?”
--, “Self-Refuting Statements”
--, “Transcendental Argument”

Nov. 3: AGG, 119-147 (Proving the Gospel)
RG, 159-242.

**B. Apologetics as Defense**

Nov. 10: AGG, 149-190 (The Problem of Evil)
RG, 22-34, 51-83
Study Guide, Lesson 3.
C. Apologetics as Offense

Nov. 17: AGG, 191-217 (Philosophy and Religion)
Problems of Apologetics Lecture Outline, 10-14.
SD: Frame, “Greeks Bearing Gifts”
Jonny Dyer will preside, with Dr. Frame out of town.

Nov. 24: RS, Chapter 19 (Science)
RG, 84-123.
Study Guide, Lesson 5.

Dec. 1: SD: Frame, Christianity and Culture
Edgar, “No News is Good News”
RG, ix-xxiii, 3-21, 35-50

Course Bibliographies

Religious Knowledge

See also books listed in the Apologetics section below.

Calvin, John, Institutes, I, i-ii.
Clouser, Roy, Knowing With the Heart (Downers Grove: IVP, 1999). Clouser is doctrinally Reformed, Dooyeweerdian in background. Always stimulating.
Frame, Doctrine of the Knowledge of God (P&R, 1987).
A very important philosophical work.
Plantinga, Alvin, and Wolterstorff, Nicholas., ed., Faith and Rationality (Notre Dame, Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1983) Plantinga is greatly respected even in
secular philosophical circles. His work is original, much discussed, and not easily classified. Requires some philosophical background. See Frame’s review of this volume in an appendix to DKG. Plantinga is of Christian Reformed background and taught at Calvin College for some years. Now teaches at Notre Dame.


Wolterstorff, Nicholas, Reason Within the Bounds of Revelation (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976). Also, see under Plantinga. Wolterstorff also taught at Calvin for many years. He recently moved on to Yale.

**Apologetics (General works)**


Carnell, Edward J., An Introduction to Christian Apologetics (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948). See the chapter on Carnell in Frame’s CVT.

Clark, Gordon H., A Christian View of Men and Things (Eerdmans, 1952). Clark was Reformed in theology, and a kind of presuppositionalist, but opposed to some of Van Til’s ideas. This is an excellent work, showing that many human disciplines (history, politics, ethics, etc.) require Christianity.

--., Religion, Reason, and Revelation (P&R).

Clark, Kelly James, Return to Reason (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990). Follows Plantinga (see below).

Cowan, Steven, ed., Five Views On Apologetics (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000). Includes six contributions by Frame in support of presuppositionalism. Other authors: William Lane Craig (classical), Gary Habermas (evidential), Paul Feinberg (cumulative case), Kelly Clark (Plantingan Reformed Epistemology).

--, Reasonable Faith (Wheaton: Crossway, 1994).


--, Reasons of the Heart (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996). Edgar is a presuppositionalist, very knowledgeable about culture, adept at speaking to real people.

--, Apologetics to the Glory of God (P&R, 1994).

Geehan, E. R., ed., Jerusalem and Athens (Presbyterian and Reformed, 1971). A Festschrift: essays in honor of Van Til. Some are critical of him and advocate the “traditional method,” among them the essays by Pinnock and Montgomery, which sum up well the standard criticisms. See also Van Til’s “My Credo,” which contains a four-page outline summary of his system.

--, Christian Apologetics (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976).
--, Philosophy of Religion (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974).


--, The Resurrection of Theism (Moody, 1957). An earlier work of Hackett, sharply critical of
presuppositionalism.
Hanna, Mark, Crucial Questions in Apologetics (Baker, 1981). Tries to establish a position called “veridicalism,” between “presuppositionism” and “verificationism.” His concept of presuppositionism is a straw man; his veridicalism is very close to Van Til, once you get past the rhetoric.
Kreeft, Peter, The Best Things in Life (Downers Grove, IVP, 1984). --, Between Heaven and Hell (Downers Grove, IVP, 1982).
--, Socrates Meets Jesus (Downers Grove, IVP, 1987). Kreeft converted to Roman Catholicism from Reformed background. He is fond of C. S. Lewis and follows Lewis’s basic apologetic. Excellent writer.
--, and Tacelli, Ronald, Handbook of Christian Apologetics (Downers Grove: IVP, 1994). A comprehensive overview of the field. For example, it contains twenty arguments for God’s existence.
Lewis, C. S., Mere Christianity (Macmillan)
--, Miracles. Lewis is one of the best apologetic writers of all time. We can learn much from his style. His content is uneven.
Marston, George, The Voice of Authority (Vallecito: Ross House, 1978). This is the simplest of all the simplifications of Van Til.
Mayers, Ronald B., Both/And: A Balanced Apologetic (Chicago: Moody Press, 1984). Like Hanna, tries to find a middle ground that allows both presuppositions and evidences. I think Van Til already found it. But there are good things in the volume.
McDowell, Josh, Evidence That Demands a Verdict (San Bernardino: Here’s Life, 1979). McDowell has published a great many books of evidences. He doesn’t worry too much about apologetic method, just sets out the facts. Lots of quotations from others. The author is not a profound thinker, but these books are handy summaries of relevant data. He does sometimes amuse, as when talking about the “swoooootoooo theory.”
McGrath, Alister, Intellectuals Don’t Need God and Other Modern Myths (Zondervan, 1993). McGrath has a great reputation as an evangelical Oxford scholar. His appendix on Van Til, however, is incompetent.
Miethe, T., and Flew, Antony, Did Jesus Rise From the Dead?
Interesting dialogue between a traditional apologist
and a strongly anti-Christian philosopher.
His appendix on Van Til is not well-informed.
--, Faith Founded on Fact.
--, Where is History Going? Traditional. See also
his essay in Jerusalem and Athens (under Geehan, above).
Morris, Thomas, Making Sense of It All (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992). Applies the ideas of Pascal to
the modern situation.
Murray, Michael J., ed., Reason For the Hope Within (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
Nash, Ronald, Faith and Reason (Zondervan, 1988). Nash
is influenced by Clark, but more eclectic. Writes
clearly.
--, Worldviews in Conflict (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992).
Notaro, Thom, Van Til and the Use of Evidence (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980). Shows that Van Til
did have a positive view of the use of evidence in
apoletics.
Pinnock, Clark, Reason Enough (Downers Grove: IVP, 1980).
Plantinga, Alvin, God and Other Minds (Ithaca: Cornell
Pratt, Richard, Every Thought Captive (Phillipsburg:
Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979). A Van Tillian
apologetic directed toward young people.
Ramm, Bernard, Varieties of Christian Apologetics,
a historical survey.
Van Tillian, but veers toward Clark at points. Good
critiques of a number of recent apologists.
Robbins, John, Cornelius Van Til: The Man and the Myth
(Jefferson, MD: The Trinity Foundation, 1986).
I mention this only to warn you about it. Robbins
is a fanatical follower of Gordon Clark who has
very little understanding of Van Til. This book,
as a critique of Van Til, is simply incompetent.
Rushdoony, Rousas, By What Standard? (Phila.: Presbyterian
and Reformed, 1959). A good summary of Van Til's
positions.

Sire, James, Why Should Anyone Believe Anything at All? (Downers Grove: IVP, 1994). Good comparison of Christianity with alternative worldviews.

Van Til, Cornelius, Christian Apologetics (Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1975). This was the basic syllabus for Van Til’s first-year apologetics course. In many ways it remains the best introduction to his thought.
--, The Defense of the Faith (P&R, 1955; second abridged edition, 1963). This is his first published exposition of his system.
--, Introduction to Systematic Theology (P&R, 1974). This, together with the above three, is of major importance to understanding Van Til’s approach.
--, Why I Believe in God (OPC, undated). Pamphlet. Van Til’s only writing with a non-Christian reader in mind. Quite fascinating.
--, The Works of Cornelius Van Til on CD-ROM. Available from P&R. Most all his writings, a complete bibliography, fifty one hours of audio sermons, lectures, discussions. A very helpful tool.

The Existence of God

See also the general apologetic works above.

Mavrodes, George, Belief in God (NY: Random House, 1970). A very important philosophical work.


**The New Atheism**


**Evidence For Christianity, Especially the Resurrection**

See also General Works on Apologetics, above.


Lapide, Pinchas, The Resurrection of Jesus: a Jewish Perspective (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1983). Lapide is a Jewish rabbi, who concluded that Jesus was actually raised from the dead. Lapide, however, accepted Jesus only as a prophet, not as the Messiah or the Son of God.


Miethe, Terry, ed., Did Jesus Rise From the Dead? (San Francisco: Harper, 1987). A dialogue between evangelical Gary Habermas and well-known atheist philosopher Anthony Flew. Habermas wins the debate, in my
opinion.
Osborne, Grant, The Resurrection Narratives: A Redactional Study (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984). Careful and detailed analyses of the texts, supporting their integrity and reliability.

The Problem of Evil
See also works listed under General Apologetics, above.

Adams, Jay, The Grand Demonstration: A Biblical Study of the So-called Problem of Evil (Santa Barbara: EastGate, 1991). I offered some criticisms of this in AGG, which Adams answered in an Appendix. Actually, I think this is one of the better books on the subject.
Gerstner, John, The Problem of Pleasure (P&R, 1983). Building on the Reformed doctrine of the Fall, Gerstner argues that the real problem is this: Why should God allow fallen sinners to have any pleasure at all?
Hick, John, Evil and the God of Love. Advocates Irenaean “soul-making” theodicy.
Philosophy: see course in History of Philosophy and Christian Thought

Islam (Thanks to Bill Davis, Steve Hays, and others)


Ghaffari, Ebrahim, Strategies for Sharing the Gospel with Muslim University Students in the U.S., Iranian Christians International, Inc., P.O. Box 25607, Colorado Springs, CO 80936.


Margoliouth, D.S. Mohammed and the Rise of Islam (C.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1931). This is my favor treatment of the subject. Margoliouth was a Messianic Jew—the son of a rabbi. He was a great linguist and philologist who taught Islamic studies at Oxford and really knew his way around the primary sources. He exposes Muhammad for the charlatan he was. Scholarly, but written with dry wit. Available in other editions.


Morey, Robert, The Islamic Invasion (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 1992). Somewhat uneven, but the theology is Reformed, and his critique packs a punch. Lots of useful material here.


Watt, W. Montgomery. The Faith and Practice of Al-Ghazali. This is a memoir of Islam’s greatest thinker. Al-Ghazali suffered a crisis of faith as a young man. Gives the reader a window into the mind of Muslim. Easy to read.

Wickwire, Daniel E., A Theological Source Book for Missionaries, Elizabeth, La Rovere, Goleta, California, Self-Published, 1985, pages 252.

www.answeringislam.org

Science

Behe, Michael L., Darwin’s Black Box (1996). One of the latest rounds in the creation/evolution battle. Respected by secularists and Christians, Behe argues that organisms are too complex to have been evolved by chance.
Since the parts of organisms are highly interdependent, they could not be formed by tiny changes in individual parts. No part will work unless the whole organism is present.


--., Science and the Bible (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1971). 3.95. 121. h.


--., Defeating Darwinism (1997).
--., Reason in the Balance (Downers Grove: IVP, 1995).

Klotz, John W., Genes, Genesis and Evolution (St. Louis: Concordia, 1955). 575. H. Useful older work by a Lutheran.


Lester, Lane P., and Bohlin, Raymond G., The Natural Limits to Biological Change (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984). 207. P.

Maatman, Russell W., The Bible, Natural Science, and Evolution (Grand Rapids: Reformed Fellowship, 1970). 3.50. 165. P.


--., and Whitcomb, John C., The Genesis Flood (Phila.: P&R, 1961). Morris is the founder of the Institute for Creation Research. His books, and those of others from the institute, are vigorously criticized by many scientists, some Christians among them. There are other Christian approaches to these issues. But the work of ICR cannot be neglected.


--., Quarks, Chaos, and Christianity


Ross, Hugh, Beyond the Cosmos (NavPress, 1999).
--., Creation and Time (NavPress, 1994).
--, The Fingerprint of God (Whitaker House, 2000).
--, The Genesis Question. Ross is an old earth creationist with a high view of Scripture and an impressive knowledge of science. He claims that every day there is a new discovery confirming the teaching of Scripture. Has some interesting ideas about multidimensionality. See his periodical, Facts for Faith, web site www.reasons.org.

Verbrugge, Magnus, Alive (Vallecito: Ross House, 1984). 159. P. Dooyeweerd’s son-in-law, a urologist, attacks the notion that life could have come from nonlife.
--, Man’s Origin, Man’s Destiny (Wheaton: Harold Shaw, 1968). 5.95. 320. H.
--, Rocks, Relics, and Biblical Reliability (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977). 141. P.

Culture, the Arts

Begbie, Jeremy, Voicing Creation’s Praise (interesting thoughts on Christianity and music).
Calvin, John, Institutes of the Christian Religion, various editions. 3.6-10.
Carter, Stephen L., The Culture of Disbelief (Basic Books, 1992?).
Cochrane, Charles N., Christianity and Classical Culture.
Dooeyeweerd, Herman, Roots of Western Culture (Toronto: Wedge, 1979). 228.p.
Drew, Donald, Images of Man (Downers Grove: IVP, 1974).
Hegeman, David Bruce, *Plowing in Hope: Toward a Biblical Theology of Culture* (Moscow, ID: Canon Press, 1999).
   --, *Where in the World is the Church?*
   --, *Spirit Wars* (Escondido: Main Entry, 1997).
--*, *The Weight of Glory and Other Addresses* (NY: Macmillan, 1980).
Interesting, but overgeneralizes to a preposterous extent.
Romanowski, William D., *Dancing in the Dark: Youth, Popular Culture, and the Christian Media*
--*, *Eyes Wide Open: Looking for God in Popular Culture* (2001)
--*, *Pop Culture Wars: Religion and the Role of Entertainment in American Life.*
--*, *Risky Business: Rock in Film.*


   --, Theology of Culture.


   --, *No Place For Truth* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).


**Postmodernism**


Dockery, David S., ed., *The Challenge of Postmodernism*

Grenz, Stanley J., A Primer on Postmodernism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996). Probably the best general introduction to the subject, but I would be more critical of the postmodern movement.


Lundin, Roger, The Culture of Interpretation (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

Lyotard, Jean-Francois, The Postmodern Condition (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1984).


Middleton, J. Richard, and Walsh, Brian J., Truth is Stranger than it Used to Be (Downers Grove: IVP, 1995). Christians who are more friendly than most toward some postmodern ideas.


Taylor, Mark, Deconstructing Theology (NY: Crossroad, 1982).

Tilley, John, Postmodern Theologies (NY: Orbis, 1994).

Web Sites

   Craig Branch’s ministry, with Steve Cowan and others.

   Covenant Media Foundation. They supply writings of the late Greg Bahnsen and others, and you can read a lot of Bahnsen’s articles on this site. Bahnsen was a strong Van Tillian and an impressive apologist.

3. http://iidb.org/cgi-bin/ultimatebb.cgi
   These are the “internet infidels.” They have a discussion forum, and you can find non-Christians here who might be willing to dialogue with you for your paper assignment.

Rich Pratt's web site, with a world vision for Christian education. Posts articles on many different subjects. Discussion forum. See also www.reformedperspectives.org, which posts the magazine articles and hosts the “Hall of Frame.” The Hall contains excellent student papers from Frame courses and also the supplementary papers for this and other Frame courses. Another sub-site of Thirdmill is www.reformedanswers.org, which posts answers to a lot of theological and apologetic questions. J. Frame and Ra McLaughlin are among the responders.


Lots of information about Van Til, articles about him from people like Bahnsen, Frame, Pratt, Hays, Welty, and others, along with Van Til himself. Includes Eric Bristley’s comprehensive bibliography of Van Til’s writings.


Robert Bowman’s web site. He has some sympathy for presuppositionalism, but has a fairly broad reach methodologically. Lots of good stuff.


David Hall founded this site, the “Center for the Advancement of Paleo-Orthodoxy.” These folks are conservative Presbyterians. Part of their site is “the Van Til Institute for Apologetics.”


This is the Christian Apologetics and Research Ministry, started by my former student Matt Slick. Some good material here.


The Center for Reformed Theology and Apologetics, founded by Jon Barlow. Oriented toward Presuppositionalism.


This is the web site of Hugh Ross, the Christian astronomer who has written and lectured broadly on scientific matters. I think he’s one of the
most impressive figures writing today on Christianity/Science issues. An old-earth creationist, anti-evolution.


John Byl here analyzes a number of scientific, mathematical, and logical arguments dealing with Christian theism. A bit abstruse to those not into these disciplines, but he is a very sharp and edifying thinker.


James White’s Apologetics Blog.


Peter Jones’ CWIPP: Christian Witness to a Pagan Planet. The author of Spirit Wars argues that modern western culture is awash in pagan thinking similar to ancient Gnosticism. He has done a lot of good research on Gnosticism, modern culture, and the Scriptures.


Faith Defenders, Bob Morey’s ministry. He has written on cults and various theological-apologetic issues, has lately focused on Islam and has drawn death threats.


Contains materials from contemporary Christian philosophers, among others.


Leadership University. Contains articles on a number of subjects including a very substantial number of apologetics articles, mostly by people working in the “traditional” mode.


Useful articles in a number of fields including apologetics. The apologetics material includes some presuppositional resources. Many audio lectures at http://www.rctr.org/ap5.htm by well-known apologists and Christian philosophers.


The “Sola Scriptura” site. Articles on apologetics and other subjects.
17. [http://www.trinityfoundation.org/reviews/last.asp](http://www.trinityfoundation.org/reviews/last.asp)

John Robbins runs the Trinity Foundation site. He is a fanatical disciple of Gordon H. Clark, and the site spends much of its space trashing people that deserve much better treatment. I have no confidence in Robbins as a writer, but this site contains a lot of information about Gordon H. Clark who was, in my judgment, one of the best apologists of the twentieth century.


Many articles by Steve Hays, Ryan McReynolds, and others.


Ravi Zacharias’ ministry.

---

**Course Objectives Related to MDiv Student Learning Outcomes**

Course: 2ST530, Apologetics  
Professor: John M. Frame  
Campus: Orlando, FL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDiv Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Rubric</th>
<th>Mini-Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulation (oral &amp; written)</strong></td>
<td>Broadly understands and articulates knowledge, both oral and written, of essential biblical, theological, historical, and cultural/global information, including details, concepts, and frameworks.</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scripture</strong></td>
<td>Significant knowledge of the original meaning of Scripture. Also, the concepts for and skill to research further into the original meaning of Scripture and to apply Scripture to a variety of modern circumstances. (Includes appropriate use of original languages and hermeneutics; and integrates theological, historical, and</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cultural/global perspectives.)</td>
<td>their lack of scripturality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reformed Theology</strong></td>
<td>Significant knowledge of Reformed theology and practice, with emphasis on the Westminster Standards.</td>
<td>Moderate The method of apologetics is distinctively Reformed. We make occasional reference to the Westminster Standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanctification</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates a love for the Triune God that aids the student’s sanctification.</td>
<td>Strong One major point is that like other activities of life, our knowing is subject to God’s laws, is fallen, and needs regeneration. So to grow epistemologically is to grow in grace. And apologetics is to be carried out “with gentleness and respect” (1 Pet. 3:16).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desire for Worldview</strong></td>
<td>Burning desire to conform all of life to the Word of God.</td>
<td>Strong Worldview is a central emphasis in the course, as a comprehensive understanding of God and the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winsomely Reformed</strong></td>
<td>Embraces a winsomely Reformed ethos. (Includes an appropriate ecumenical spirit with other Christians, especially Evangelicals; a concern to present the Gospel in a God-honoring manner to non-Christians; and a truth-in-love attitude in disagreements.)</td>
<td>Strong I try to present presuppositionalism as incorporating other methods of apologetics, rather than as antithetical to them. And I emphasize graciousness in dealing with inquirers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preach</strong></td>
<td>Ability to preach and teach the meaning of Scripture to both heart and mind with clarity and enthusiasm.</td>
<td>Moderate Apologetics is involved in teaching and preaching, and the reverse is also true. So this course should contribute to effective preaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worship</strong></td>
<td>Knowledgeable of historic and modern Christian-worship forms; and ability to construct and skill to lead a worship service.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shepherd</strong></td>
<td>Ability to shepherd the local congregation: aiding in spiritual maturity; promoting use of gifts and callings; and encouraging a concern for non-Christians, both in America and worldwide.</td>
<td>Strong Students should be able to teach apologetics in their congregations, encouraging them to share their faith with non-Christians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Church/World</strong></td>
<td>Ability to interact within a denominational context, within the broader worldwide church, and with significant public issues.</td>
<td>Minimal Not much here on denominational context or worldwide church, but the course does enter into significant public issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>