

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

**Preaching God's Grace: An Interview with Tullian Tchividjian**

By Michael Duduit | Dean, Anderson University, Anderson, South Carolina.

<http://www.preaching.com/printerfriendly/11665498/>

Tullian Tchividjian is the senior pastor of Coral Ridge Presbyterian Church in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. He is the author of a new book published by Crossway titled *Jesus + Nothing = Everything*, as well as the grandson of Billy Graham and a popular preacher and conference speaker across the nation. He recently visited with *Preaching* Executive Editor Michael Duduit.

***Preaching:** Tell us about your own approach to preaching. If we were to visit Coral Ridge one Sunday morning, what would we expect to hear?*

**Tchividjian:** I typically go through books of the Bible. I typically do an Old Testament book in the fall and a New Testament book in the spring. In between those, I have a couple of other series I do. For instance, at the end of last spring after I finished preaching through the Book of James, I preached a series of sermons that I titled "Pictures of Grace" in which I went back to the gospels and isolated certain events in the life and ministry of Jesus that highlight the radicalism of God's unconditional grace. So it's not that I only preach through books of the Bible, but that's typical.

What I seek to do is rather simple; it's sort of an old-fashioned way of preaching along the gospel. Most of what I'm trying to do at the front is show Christians and non-Christians their dire need for Jesus. In a thousand ways, we're trying to do it on our own. Christian people are trying to make it on our own. We've concluded since Genesis 3 that we could do it better; even after we're saved, we drift into performance and self-sufficiency mode.

So, the first part of my sermons basically always are saying, "You're a lot worse than you think you are"; but I don't end there. I'm then able to come back and say, "but in the person of Jesus, it is finished." You're a lot worse off than you think you are, but God's grace is so much bigger, better and brighter than you could have hoped and imagined.

So it's what the Puritans used to do pretty regularly – preaching the law, showing Christians and non-Christians their sin and their need for a Savior, and then coming in with the gospel. I take Luke 24 as the way I read Scripture: Jesus is walking on the road to Emmaus with the two disciples and showing them the entire Old Testament spoke about Him. So the entire Bible tells one story and points to one figure: Christ. I make it a point to show Christ from every text in the Bible.

**There's a big difference between preaching the gospel and preaching moralism. Moralism is looking at a passage in the Bible and saying this is simply giving us**

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

**guidelines about how to live our lives, while preaching the gospel shows us how whatever is being talked about in that text is a picture of Jesus. I show how unable we are to meet God's requirements and how able Jesus is to meet God's requirements for us. When we exercise faith in Him everyday and when we are united to Him, then we experience the joy of our salvation.**

**My goal when I'm done preaching is to say in one way, shape or form: "It is finished." I often tell preachers that if that lasting impression people have when they leave a worship service is a checklist of things they have to do instead of a declaration of what Christ has done, the gospel hasn't been preached.**

*Preaching: If you knew this Sunday was going to be your last sermon, what do you think you'd preach?*

**Tchividjian:** That's like when Martin Luther was asked: If you knew Jesus was coming back tomorrow, what would you do today? He said, "I'd go plant a tree." I think his point was: "I hope to be carrying out faithfully my daily duties and enjoying what God has given me."

If I were to preach one final sermon, I would somehow, some way preach *Jesus + Nothing = Everything* in the hope that it would set people free and show them the fresh now power of the gospel. The passage I go back to—the one that really exploded in my heart and mind—is Colossians 1:9-14 and specifically the last part of verses 12, 13 and 14 where Paul said, "Where you have already been transferred, qualified, redeemed, forgiven, this has already happened to you. This alone will give you the power to say no to smaller things, to say no to lesser things. It will empower you to live your life freely for Jesus under the umbrella that reads, 'it is finished.'"

## INTRODUCTION

### LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

[The big idea of this short article is the big idea. The inclusion of the article does not mean every point made is valid. However, the big idea is valid.]

### **“The Bible Is Not a Self-Help Book” or “Please Stop...”**

Posted: August 15, 2012 in [Current Events](#)

<http://reluctantxtian.wordpress.com/2012/08/15/the-bible-is-not-a-self-help-book-or-please-stop/>



Rob Goodman recently wrote an excellent article critiquing Rick Warren, “Smiley” Osteen, and the like for their “self-help” theology. The main instigation for the article was Rick Warren’s new “Daniel diet” based off of the Daniel story from the Older Testament.

Yeah, that guy who fell into the lion’s den.

Warren supposedly mined the depths of scripture to come up with this plan loosely taken from the section of Daniel where the book’s title character refuses to eat the king’s food in their place of captivity (thereby avoiding the appearance of consenting to the godless ways of his captors).

It’s a good story. And it may actually hold some diet advice...for lions.

But, as Goodman points out, it’s a story about identity and resistance and trust. Not about dieting.

So why is Warren using it as a diet guide?

Warren plays into what I think is one of the most dangerous trends in Christianity that has still, inexplicably, continued since the Enlightenment.

The Enlightenment did wonderful things for humanity in many ways. It also has some negative consequences, one of the chief ones being that we now only see something as “truth” if it correlates to “fact.”

I’ll go out on a rhetorical limb here and say that the statement, “ ‘Truth’ and ‘fact’ are always synonymous,” is simply...not true.

But, in Warren’s view the two must be the same, which means that the Bible must be “fact” and the home of all fact, or else the authority of the Bible is laid to waste. Basically, it’s a story of the Christian who rails against the Enlightenment because of what it has

**INTRODUCTION – OBSERVATION – INTERPRETATION – APPLICATION**

## INTRODUCTION

### LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

done to the authority of the religious community thereby perpetuating Enlightenment thinking by buying the primary premise.

Yeah, it's that age-old story, that old chestnut, where, as Paul rightly says, someone (in this case Warren) "does not do what (they) want, and only does what (they) do not want to do."

And so for Warren, the Bible is not only the authority on how the world was created (Genesis 1-2), why there are different languages (Genesis 11), what you should think about social issues (scan Leviticus and the Epistles and pick one), and how you should vote (wait...that's not in there), it also must be the authority on everything else including dieting.\*

Because if the Bible is reliable, it must be infallible and inerrant and the home and locus of all that is necessary for knowledge as a primary document.

And you spent your money on those Encyclopedia Britannica books...

I'll cut right to the chase: the Bible wasn't written to give you a diet plan, to save your marriage, or to help you make money. In fact, if you go to certain places of scripture you might find that you're given permission to eat anything (Acts 10), or that you can hate your family (Luke 14), or that God intends for you to be penniless and poor (Matthew 19).

Like that advice? It's probably not good for the purposes that I intended to use it for. But it has about as much merit as the basis for Warren's diet plan.

That little move, where you take a section of Scripture and use it to proof-text a point or position is actually just taking it out of context. It's a popular move, to be sure. I mean, what adds weight to a cause more than the very voice of God?!

But it's not honest. And, dare I say, it might be breaking the second Commandment (from the Protestant Decalogue). "You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain," has little to do with cursing (although, from a [previous post](#) you'd think that that's all it means).

It actually means that you shouldn't take God's name "uselessly." You shouldn't associate God with things that God has no association with. And so, if you believe that the Bible was more dictation than experiential writing, or if you think the infallibility and inerrancy of the text come from the very will of the Divine, I'd tremble in my boots before I use the Bible as back-up to most

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

anything, let alone a diet plan.

I tremble doing it myself, and I don't think the Bible is inerrant and infallible!

I tremble because, well, scripture is important to me. It is sacred. And as something sacred I hate seeing it belittled to the point of Jenny Craig and Seattle Sutton.

I do think that what we eat and how we care for our bodies is important, and Godly work, and I believe it can say something about our core convictions.

There are times when I can get insight into an issue from the Bible. Many a sermon is based on this. But that's taking the Bible into my context. Warren, and those who routinely do this, mistakenly assumes the Biblical context *is* this context.

Suffice to say, I don't think the Bible has a diet plan for me. And I don't think it has a plan to get me rich. And I don't think it has a plan to get me buff (Sampson comes to mind here...and I can't grow much hair on my head). And I certainly don't think that Solomon is a good example of a successful marriage.

The Bible doesn't do that.

I do think it contains stories of people who have had experiences with God powerful enough to talk about them. I think it contains glimpses of my faith heritage. And I think it contains the best, most beautifully engaging story I've ever read in the person of Jesus. I think it's instructive for devotion and faith.

Really, the only thing close to a diet plan I hear from the scriptures is from the book of John in chapter 6 where the Gospel writer has Jesus talking about him being the "true bread from heaven" that the world lives on.

But, as a Christian who takes Scripture seriously, I'm entreating the Christian world to stop with this nonsense of looking to the Bible like one might look to an encyclopedia.

The Bible wasn't written to be your self-help book.

But, it does have beautiful stories, letters, poetry, and history that just may change your life. So please, do help yourself to it.

\*If, perhaps, Warren does not believe that the Bible holds dieting advice, but is just using it as a basis to help sell the product, that would be the definition of the word "despicable."

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

## Reading The Bible Narcissistically

Posted on [June 10, 2013](#)

<http://www.pastortullian.com/2013/06/10/reading-the-bible-narcissistically/>



We often read the Bible as if it were fundamentally about us: our improvement, our life, our triumph, our victory, our faith, our holiness, our godliness. We treat it like a book of timeless principles that will give us our best life now if we simply apply those principles. We treat it, in other words, like it's a heaven-sent self-help manual. But by looking at the Bible as if it were fundamentally about us, we totally miss the

Point-like the two on the road to Emmaus. As Luke 24 shows, it's possible to read the Bible, study the Bible, memorize large portions of the Bible—even listen to “expository” preachers who are committed to preaching “verse by verse, line by line, precept by precept”—while missing the whole point of the Bible. It's entirely possible, in other words, to read the stories and miss the Story. In fact, unless we go to the Bible to see Jesus and his work for us, even our devout Bible reading can become fuel for our own narcissistic self-improvement plans, the place we go for the help we need to “conquer today's challenges and take control of our lives.”

Contrary to popular assumptions, the Bible is not a record of the blessed good, but rather the blessed bad. That's not a typo. The Bible is a record of the blessed bad. The Bible is not a witness to the best people making it up to God; it's a witness to God making it down to the worst people. Far from being a book full of moral heroes to emulate, what we discover is that the so-called heroes in the Bible are not really heroes at all. They fall and fail, they make huge mistakes, they get afraid, their selfish, deceptive, egotistical, and unreliable. The Bible is one long story of God meeting our rebellion with his rescue; our sin with his salvation; our failure with his favor; our guilt with his grace; our badness with his goodness.

So, if we read the Bible asking first, “What would Jesus do?” instead of asking “What has Jesus done” we'll miss the good news that alone can set us free.

As I've said before, the overwhelming focus of the Bible is not the work of the redeemed but the work of the Redeemer. Which means that the Bible is not first a recipe book for Christian living, but a revelation book of Jesus who is the answer to our unchristian living.

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

[The Key offering of this article are the four summary statements concerning an Evangelical Hermeneutic at the end of the article under point 7.]

## **Hermeneutics and Christ**

Graeme Goldsworthy

Formerly lecturer in Old Testament and Biblical Theology at Moore Theological College, Sydney. He is now retired, but continues as a visiting lecturer in Hermeneutics  
<http://beginningwithmoses.org/bt-articles/204/hermeneutics-and-christ>

---

HERMENEUTICS has been one of the big topics of the last 25 years. A seemingly endless series of books has been produced and academic papers written.

However, 'hermeneutics' is not only the preserve of academia. The Christian who says "I'm just a simple Bible-believer" can be just as adept at imposing an interpretation on the text as the most sophisticated theologian. Nor is 'hermeneutics' an entirely modern question. Christians have always struggled with how to read and apply the Bible, and have adopted various ways of doing so.

In fact, the history of how Christians have read and applied the Bible is most instructive, especially if we take note of what was really happening in the various historical developments. What we find repeatedly is that when people were asking 'What do we think about the Scriptures?' they were really asking 'What do we think about Christ?'. This is because what we think about the incarnate Word of God, Jesus Christ, will run parallel with what we think about the inscripturated Word of God, the Bible.

### **1. Apostolic hermeneutics**

The apostolic answer to the hermeneutical question is the correct one: Jesus Christ is the God-man, saviour and Lord, to whom the apostles and all the Scriptures testify. This means that the objective historical Jesus is in fact the content of the gospel message and the gospel is the power of God for salvation (Rom 1:16). The apostle's answer comes from taking seriously the fact that Jesus claims to be the truth. There is a sense in which the apostles understood the Old Testament as providing the substructure of the gospel - and so the Old Testament helps us understand the New Testament. But the main thrust of the New Testament is on the person of Jesus as the one who makes clear what the Old Testament is all about. So the apostle's hermeneutical position is that the gospel is the power of God for interpreting the Bible.

### **2. Early Christian hermeneutics**

The early church was characterised by two streams, one from Alexandria and one from Antioch.

**INTRODUCTION**  
**LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Christians at Alexandria followed Hellenistic Jews in adopting Greek ideas. Gnostic influences, which discounted the material world as inherently evil, led to a spirituality which moved God away from his historical acts. The historical events were seen as just allegorical stories and that inevitably led to the gospel being eclipsed as an historical event.

Antioch, on the other hand, emphasised the historical meaning of the Bible and so preserved the gospel as an historical event in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Out of this grew the historical method of typology which saw the Old Testament events as foreshadowing the gospel without dissolving the Old Testament's natural, historical meaning. The Antioch strand's weakness was its tendency towards the subtle heresy of Nestorius, which split Jesus' divine nature from his human nature and declared him to be not only of two natures, but also to be two persons.

A third development in the early church was interpreting the Bible in the light of ecclesiastical authority and dogma. This is a subtle problem because we all do it and, to some degree it's right that we do. We all interpret the Bible from inside our own adopted tradition and climb on the shoulders of the believers who have gone before us. The problem is when an ecclesiastical creed or confession of faith becomes the external authority by which Scripture is tested and understood. This became a bigger problem in medieval hermeneutics.

### **3. The struggle for an orthodox hermeneutic**

The two big theological questions over which Christians struggled in the first four centuries were about the nature of God and about the person of Christ. How could God become man? And how could a man be both God and man?

By moving away from the apostolic hermeneutic of an historical Jesus, the biblical perspective on the relationship between the divine and the human, and between the eternal and the historical, was lost - both in relation to the Bible and Jesus. Without this perspective, people came up with all sorts of heresies about the nature of God and Christ, fusing or separating Jesus' divine and human natures. Ebionism (Jesus is only human), Docetism (Jesus is only divine), Apollinarianism (Jesus is divine but not fully human), and Nestorianism (Jesus is two persons, two natures), were all trying to solve the mystery by dissolving one reality to make room for another. The same happened in heresies about God. The unity of God was preserved by reducing the Son and the Spirit to beings who were less than fully God.

Eventually, in 451 AD, the Council of Chalcedon set things straight by formulating a way of speaking about Christ which didn't try to solve the mystery of how God could become



**INTRODUCTION**  
**LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

man, but instead preserved it by setting the bounds of true statements. The Council decided that to keep an orthodox view you should believe that: a. Jesus is true God; b. Jesus is true man; c. the two natures are united in one person, but not fused; d. the two natures remain distinct, but are not separated. This structure of unity and distinction characterised the relationships in the Trinity. It also kept the true relationship between the divine and the human, and between the eternal and the historical, both in relation to the Bible (the hermeneutical question) and Jesus (the Christological question).

#### **4. Medieval hermeneutics**

Hermeneutics was very complex in the medieval period (500 AD-1500 AD). The influences of Antioch and Alexandria were both struggling for ascendancy and, although the search for the natural and historical significance of the Bible was never abandoned, Alexandria won over Antioch.

This led to a complex method of interpretation being developed which didn't ignore the natural meaning, but said that the text could be read in a four-fold way - the literal sense, the moral sense, the allegorical sense and the anagogical sense (which derived heavenly meanings from the earthly text). Allegorical meaning was at the heart of this approach. Allegory comes out of fusing the historical and the eternal, and the divine and the human. They are not kept distinct, and so the basic historical meaning of the text is lost.

Related to this was the idea of the rule of faith - the accumulation of biblical doctrine - which developed into the idea that only the clergy could interpret the Bible correctly. This was really fusing the Christ of history with the body of Christ, the church, so that there was no distinction between Jesus' authority and the on-going authority of the church through its clergy. It eventually led to the doctrine of papal infallibility.

The other great hermeneutical problem is best seen in the work of Thomas Aquinas. A theological trend that had begun in the second century with Irenaeus, led to the separation of the natural and supernatural on the one hand and the fusion of the historical and the divine on the other. Catholicism, as it developed from this through to the late medieval period, came to fuse the 'Christ who is without' (the Jesus of history) with the 'Christ who is within' (that is, by the presence of his Spirit). The gospel event was redefined more and more in terms of what God does in us rather than as what God has done for us in the historic Jesus. Justification and sanctification were reversed so that a changed life became the basis of acceptance with God. Grace was redefined. It ceased to be God's attitude which makes for the justification of the ungodly, and became the spiritual influence which flows (mainly through sacraments) into the soul making it good and, eventually, acceptable to God.

**INTRODUCTION**  
**LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**5. The hermeneutics of the Reformation**

Luther, and then Calvin along with the other Reformers, abandoned allegorical interpretation and went back to looking for the natural historical meaning of the Old Testament. As they did so they also recovered the historical gospel, restored justification as the basis of sanctification, and moved grace from the heart of the believer back into the heart of God.

The Reformation's hermeneutical principles came out of what the Bible said, and so the gospel returned to being the key to proper interpretation. The unity and distinction of the Old and New Testaments were clearly recognised. Exegesis became a matter of understanding the divine word as it comes to us in human dress. The Christological question "What do you think of Christ?" once more dominated in the interpretation of the Bible. If Jesus was the divine-human word incarnate, the Bible was seen as the divine-human word inscripturate. So, once again, there is unity and distinction. Even though the Bible and Jesus are distinct, they are also the same - they're both manifestations of the one Word of God.

**6. Enlightenment hermeneutics**

The Enlightenment of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries began more as a tendency to the Ebionite heresy in down-playing God's influence on humanity. Eventually it rejected God altogether. Instead of the divine and human being both united and distinct in both writing the Bible and reading the text, they were separated. So, even if the Holy Spirit existed, he had no part in writing the texts and the inspiration of Scripture became a meaningless concept. Nor could the Bible-reading believer count on the Spirit to help them understand what they were reading.

The Enlightenment led to various developments in the business of interpreting the Bible. Once the theory of interpretation was divorced from divine revelation in the Bible, working out what the Bible said came to be thought of as a matter of human scientific advances. Different philosophical perspectives, which had always dogged the question of hermeneutics, took over from biblical views of reality and knowledge (metaphysics and epistemology). Theological hermeneutics gave way to philosophical hermeneutics. Revelation by God was replaced by natural processes and independent human thought declared God to be irrelevant.

Even though the structure of unity and distinction was held in theory, in practice it was constantly attacked by a tendency to turn distinction into separation. In biblical criticism, the Enlightenment led firstly to a concentration on the history of religious thought and the history of the biblical texts. These are both legitimate dimensions of the Bible to study, but concentrating on them separated them from the Bible's theological and literary

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

dimensions. When the new hermeneutic turned to consider the nature of the Bible texts, their theology was down-played and the author's intention ignored.

**7. An evangelical approach**

As evangelicals we believe in the Bible as God's word to us, but what does this mean?

**a.** Unlike the Alexandrian strand, we recognise the Bible as both divine and human. The great diversity of texts in the Bible find unity in their common role of testifying to Christ. We reject all tendencies to a docetic or Gnostic Bible which ignores the human context of the divine word.

**b.** Like the apostles, we recognise that the Old Testament finds its fullest significance in the person and work of Jesus of Nazareth. The relationship of the two Testaments is unity and distinction.

**c.** Unlike the medievalists, we avoid fusing the historic Christ with the Church as the body of Christ. So we recognise that the Church, far from being the Lord of Scripture, is created by the word and must submit to its authority.

**d.** While welcoming many of the insights of the Enlightenment, we reject its separation of the divine and human. We see Jesus' incarnation to be the theological reason for all proper critical study of the text and its background. Much modern literary and historical criticism assumes God has nothing to do with the text, but evangelicals refuse to separate the historical and literary dimensions of the Bible from its theological dimension. All critical procedures must be tested by the authority of Christ in his gospel.

This is only the beginning of the story, but at least we can recognize that we can't think about hermeneutics without thinking about Christ.

---

This article first appeared in The Briefing #209, pp. 11-13, and is used here with permission. No part of this article may be copied or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of Matthias Media.

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

[This article is from a Roman Catholic perspective. The points made are valid. If could exchange Evangelical for Catholic without harming the intent of the article.]

## Understanding the Bible

By Mary Elizabeth Sperry,  
Associate Director for Utilization of the New American Bible.  
<http://www.usccb.org/bible/understanding-the-bible/>

The Bible is all around us. People hear Scripture readings in church. We have Good Samaritan (Luke 10) laws, welcome home the Prodigal Son (Luke 15), and look for the Promised Land (Exodus 3, Hebrews 11). Some biblical passages have become popular maxims, such as "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you (Matthew 7:12)," "Thou shalt not steal (Exodus 20:15), and "love thy neighbor" (Matthew 22:39).

Today's Catholic is called to take an intelligent, spiritual approach to the bible. Listed here are 10 points for fruitful Scripture reading.

1. **Bible reading is for Catholics.** The Church encourages Catholics to make reading the Bible part of their daily prayer lives. Reading these inspired words, people grow deeper in their relationship with God and come to understand their place in the community God has called them to in himself.
2. **Prayer is the beginning and the end.** Reading the Bible is not like reading a novel or a history book. It should begin with a prayer asking the Holy Spirit to open our hearts and minds to the Word of God. Scripture reading should end with a prayer that this Word will bear fruit in our lives, helping us to become holier and more faithful people.
3. **Get the whole story! When selecting a Bible, look for a Catholic edition.** A Catholic edition will include the Church's complete list of sacred books along with introductions and notes for understanding the text. A Catholic edition will have an *imprimatur* notice on the back of the title page. An *imprimatur* indicates that the book is free of errors in Catholic doctrine.
4. **The Bible isn't a book. It's a library.** The Bible is a collection of [66] books written over the course of many centuries. The books include royal history, prophecy, poetry, challenging letters to struggling new faith communities, and believers' accounts of the preaching and passion of Jesus. Knowing the genre of

INTRODUCTION  
LESSON TWO – SOME INITIAL CONSIDERATIONS

the book you are reading will help you understand the literary tools the author is using and the meaning the author is trying to convey.

5. **Know what the Bible is – and what it isn't.** The Bible is the story of God's relationship with the people he has called to himself. It is not intended to be read as history text, a science book, or a political manifesto. In the Bible, God teaches us the truths that we need for the sake of our salvation.
6. **The sum is greater than the parts.** Read the Bible in context. What happens before and after – even in other books – helps us to understand the true meaning of the text.
7. **The Old relates to the New.** The Old Testament and the New Testament shed light on each other. While we read the Old Testament in light of the death and resurrection of Jesus, it has its own value as well. Together, these testaments help us to understand God's plan for human beings.
8. **You do not read alone.** By reading and reflecting on Sacred Scripture, Catholics join those faithful men and women who have taken God's Word to heart and put it into practice in their lives. We read the Bible within the tradition of the Church to benefit from the holiness and wisdom of all the faithful.
9. **What is God saying to me?** The Bible is not addressed only to long-dead people in a faraway land. It is addressed to each of us in our own unique situations. When we read, we need to understand what the text says and how the faithful have understood its meaning in the past. In light of this understanding, we then ask: What is God saying to me?
10. **Reading isn't enough.** If Scripture remains just words on a page, our work is not done. We need to meditate on the message and put it into action in our lives. Only then can the word be "living and effective."(Hebrews 4:12).

