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DESIRE UNDER THE EAVES

Clambering around the top of 150 one afternoon I stumbled upon a gold-mine. Tucked under the eaves is the former office of THE OPINION editors. Stacked away in three or four dusty boxes were all the editions of THE OPINION. Diving into the issues I found articles by Dr. Bush and Dr. Morgan (among many others) on topics like "the War" and "Black Studies programs". In short it appeared that students took both the issues and THE OPINION very seriously. What, I wondered, had happened? A vibrant journal and campus had been replaced by the silent Seventies.

Sadly missing the activism I wrote a note to, at the time, newly elected Nick Warner about reviving THE OPINION. Six months later I received appointment as editor. I accept the responsibility gladly, because I feel there are issues that demand our attention. I don't think THE OPINION should be a compendium of prayer requests and testimonies. Rather I view it as a forum for the expression of convictions about subjects on which viewpoints contrast (hopefully with clarity). Put another way one should not be able to read an OPINION without being incensed by something. It is in dialogue with those whose thoughts challenge us that we grow, I hope THE OPINION stimulates this kind of creative tension.

Each issue will (apart from book or movie reviews) revolve around one theme. This issue our focus is the response of the church to feminism. Apart from the problem of world hunger I think the challenge of feminism is the most pressing social issue confronting the church. It is a problem of great complexity, demanding diligent discussion.

All the questions and all the viewpoints certainly do not receive attention in this issue. I am embarrassed only at the absence of an article by a Fuller-wife. I feel as a community we pay far too little attention to the needs and frustrations of our wives. Other than that, I offer articles to stimulate discussion and inquiry. I should think it a tragedy if any student graduated from Fuller with no more than Basic Youth Conflicts understanding of women's liberation, marriage roles, etc.

In addition to Dr. Rogers bibliography, I would suggest Russ Chandler's (Religion Editor of L.A. Times) informative article surveying the broad range opinion on this issue stretching from Mary Daly to the Christian counter-feminist leaders. It appeared in the Dec. 29, 1974 issue and merits reading for an overview of the controversy and brief position statements by those involved.

Our next issue will deal with aspects of the "new look Fuller Seminary" (curriculum, quality of education, adjunct professors, etc.). Please contact me if you are interested in submitting an article or doing a book or movie review.

Enjoy!

Rex McDaniel

David and Elouise Fraser, both excellent scholars, (David is currently teaching a class in Sociology of Religion and Elouise has an article in the current Studia Biblica) have done extensive work together on the Biblical pattern for marriage and family. Though necessarily much abbreviated here are some of their observations on Eph. 5.

PAUL'S NEW PATTERN FOR MARRIAGE: EPHESIANS 5

Paul is often viewed as stubbornly prosaic in his thinking about the social customs of his day. While he may have been enormously creative in the religious dimension, he is seen as no more than a ratifier of the received traditions when it comes to the economy, the state, slavery, and marriage. By this view, if anyone needs to be transcended in the modern social scene, it is Paul himself.

This is an unnecessary and unfair caricature of Paul. His concept of the newness of the life Christ brings reaches even into his prescriptions for the household. When Paul's words for the family in Ephesians 5 are placed against the social background in
when he wrote, it becomes dramatically apparent that his words had transforming implications. Though he worked with the framework of his society's customs, it is clear he was pouring new wine into old wineskins.

The first way he did this for marriage was to set up conditions and attitudes which would change the usual relationship between husband and wife, leading gradually to the raising of women's status in society. Paul did this by curbing the harshness of his day's subjection of wives to husbands. By connecting submission (5:22) and love (5:25) to Christ, he transformed them both. If the submission of the wife (the normal, expected yielding of the wife to the husband, found in the majority of cultural groups in the Roman world) was given in Christ, there was no way this could be expressed apart from the wife coming to love her husband -- as Christ loved the church. There could be no feigning of submission as manipulation in order to get her own way. Submission would have to be a natural outflow of love. When Paul told husbands to love their wives as Christ loved the church, he was saying that they should act toward their wives as Christ acts toward the church. Thus husbands would become servants and helpers of their wives in moving them forward in growth and fulfillment (5:25-27). To love as Christ loved necessarily implies an adoption of the servant role (Phil. 2:4-8; I Cor. 13). Husbands will not look to their own interests or to their own (supposed) prerogatives as a thing to be grasped, but will give themselves for the development and fulfillment of their wives. That is the model Christ gives husbands -- a model which our society expects only wives to follow!

In the end it is as though Paul spoke both words to each marriage partner, although the stress he gives is in terms of the average relationship in the Roman world. It is as if he said: Husbands, love your wives with Christ's love for the church (and thus serve them and become subject to them); Wives, be subject to your husbands (and thus come to love them). If these attitudes are placed in the context of the traditional expectations of the Roman world, their transforming implications are readily apparent.

The second way in which Paul was socially revolutionary within marriage was in his giving headship a new meaning for Christians. This new meaning is often missed because of the violation of a basic norm of interpretation: context determines the meaning to be given a word. What is meant by the husband being "head" of the wife must be determined within Ephesians 5 itself. There we discover no fewer than seven verses given in detail so that the Christian husband might not miss the new way in which he was to enact this old role. Paul begins with the traditional concept of the male head of the family, i.e. the determining and controlling others. The head is no longer the superior leader with all his sacred prerogatives, but rather a self-giving servant. Husbands are to model their headship after Christ who is head of the church, the one who gave himself for her. The model is not that of a general over an army private (as the word for submission, hupotasso, might suggest), or a parent over a child, or a master over a slave. Paul's model is Christ's self-sacrificing action on behalf of the church. If Christ's pattern is accepted as giving the meaning of headship, several unavoidable implications can be derived.

Leadership cannot be seen as the primary meaning of headship. When Christ's actions as head of the church are described in Ephesians 5, they are not listed as a description of how Christ makes decisions for the church, how he guides the church, or how he directs the church in a single harmony of service as its great leader. These actions may be true of Christ in his relationship to the church, but they are absent from Paul's comparison of Christ and the husband as head. Paul does not make the man lord in every way in which Christ is Lord merely by comparing the two. Instead, the reality of Christ's sacrificial love is portrayed and elaborated through seven verses (so that none might misunderstand the point of comparison). Headship is not defined in terms of one way of reaching decisions or of only one partner having the right to give leadership.

Who makes the final decision or who is most accountable to God is not the primary
idea in headship. A careful look at the passage reveals the lack of any suggestion, either by way of statement or through the model of Christ's actions, that headship is being portrayed in terms of one partner being made more responsible than the other. There is nothing to imply that husbands will have to give a special accounting before God for the decisions and actions of the wife (or of the family as a whole) — any more than Jesus is pictured as answering for the actions of the church. In describing Christ as head, Paul does not say: Jesus as head of the church makes the final decisions, so you husbands are to make the final decisions. We do not find here the development of an organizational chart for the family, indicating who makes decisions and who takes orders. Nor do we find a pattern of how decisions are to be made.

Finally, Paul revolutionizes the family structure of his day by reaching back before the fall to the fellowship of equals in the garden of Eden. He makes the oneness of Genesis 2:24 (Eph. 5:31-33) the controlling norm of marriage. What the fall lost, expressed in Genesis 3:16 as her loss of equality in a subordination to her husband, John 3:16 intends to restore. The curse is rescinded by grace and she is no longer to be treated as a man's chattel, a sexual object, exploited as inferior, an uneducated (or educated) drudge to do the dirty work of the home, a servant to be dominated in an authoritarian manner. She is placed on the same level as her husband that she might be joint-heir with him of the responsibilities and grace of life. She is to be one flesh with him, a participant in a mysterious unity that goes beyond the physical act of sexual union. It is a oneness that comes about only when both fulfill the word under which the whole passage on the household stands: "Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ." (Eph. 5:21) Paul makes marriage a dynamic process of mutual adaptation of two persons to each other as they progress toward creation's goal of oneness. The husband and the wife are to be one in love and in mutual subjection to each other. It would be difficult to find any norm for marriage as permanently threatening to all traditional marriage structures as that!

Our language conditions our perception of any phenomena, Gail Toycen notes the implications of this fact for language about God.

**OUR MOTHER WHO ART . . .**

The language of the Christian church is currently undergoing a refreshingly honest appraisal of its use of masculine terminology. It seems appropriate to begin any discussion of this subject by noting the important relationship between one's language and one's religious symbols.

Symbols are usually thought of as pointing beyond themselves to something else. In other words, they point to realtities that the human mind cannot explicity define in empirical terms but can implicitly comprehend in ontological terms. A distinction is made between symbol and sign, with language falling in the category of sign. "Signs, unlike symbols, do not participate in any way in the reality and power of that to which they point", however, "there are words in every language which are more than this, and in the moment in which they get connotations which go beyond something to which they point as signs, then they can become symbols...". It is my contention that use of almost exclusively masculine terminology for God has locked our symbols, here including language, for God into maleness. Now one might sit back and sophisticatedly say that God is neither male or female. Granted this is good theology, but is it the way in which we deal with God in our daily thought? One has only to attempt saying "Our Mother who art in heaven" to realize the force of maleness in our thinking of God. As linguist Benjamin Lee Whorf has observed:

"The limits of my language are the limits of my thought." Theolog-
cal language was fixed in the era of the early patriarchy and has never shaken itself loose, in spite of our changing conceptions of reality. Images, solidified in language, have a way of surviving in the imagination so that a person can function on two different and often contradictory levels. One can speak of the abstract conceptualization of God as spirit and still imagine 'him' as male.2

There seem to be two pressing issues at hand here that the Christian community must address. The first is the statement that God is not male or female as we know male and female to be. He/She is not limited to the existence from which we see reality. At the same time as a Christian I believe in a personal caring God whom I can know. Knowing a personal, yet transcendent God, I must continually guard against attempting to contain God within a set state of male or female. Should I insist upon referring to God only as He, I run the risk of committing idolatry.

Having stated that God is neither male or female what am I left with in knowing how to talk of God? God is not male or female but She/He does have masculine and feminine attributes. Attributes include anything that is said about God: that God is love, that God is perfect, that God is all powerful, that God is omnipresent. Throughout the Bible God is talked of in language and metaphor that we would readily recognize as displaying traditional feminine attributes. God's love for human kind is described as like that of a mother's for her child. "They spurned the Rock who had made them, forgetting it was God who had given them birth." (Deuteronomy 32:18)

"I will comfort you there as a little one is comforted by its mother." (Isaiah 66:13) "Can a woman forget her suckling child, that she should have no compassion on the son of her womb? Yes, she may forget, yet will I not forget you." (Isaiah 49:15) "Oh, Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you. How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings." (Luke 13:34)

There it is. The feminine is in the Bible along with the masculine. The problem in the past has been that we were so accustomed to understanding it all in terms of a patriarchal society, i.e., one that makes maleness supreme, that we have denied full recognition of the feminine. "Unlike us, God can be both a Father and a Mother to his people; he is not subject to the either/or of male and female being as we are."3 Knowing this, let's get on with the work of making the language and symbols of the Christian church in line with a Father God/Mother God. This means that we must begin to use both masculine and feminine pronouns for God. We must make conscious efforts to incorporate in our everyday language and thought the understanding that God is neither male or female. Once this is done we will begin to grow in greater and more holistic understanding of God and ourselves. It is all there in the Bible. Our task begins with recognition. From there we must work to make feminine attributes as much of our conscious thinking of God as masculine attributes.


A wife who is intent on developing her spirituality and potential in a unique way can be threatening, I think Dudley Miller's open and honest look at his struggle helps free up those of us making a similar journey.

SCENES FROM A MARRIAGE

During a coffee break at Bill Gothard's "Basic Youth Conflicts" (with which I assume we are all familiar) I decided to apply my sexually inherited gift of spiritual leadership. So I said to Kath, then my fiancee, "When we go to Pasadena, rather than both of us attending Fuller as we planned, why don't you enroll in a photography school. You are very good at photography and maybe you will open a shop." Three years later Kath finished her M.A. dissertation on the female orgasm, while I finished the dishes. Things had really changed.

Throughout these changes the issue of spiritual leadership and submission was a continual source of irritation. I remember one exchange in which Kath threw a can of tuna fish in the sink so hard it bounced and nearly hit the ceiling! Seconds later I was out the door which I firmly slammed.

But all this happened well into our story, perhaps we best go back to the beginning. At Bill Gothard's seminar, Kath's answer was simply, "No, I think I will go to Fuller." At the moment it seemed like outright spiritual rebellion, but later I was to learn she was claiming a privilege which was rightfully hers. Suppressing my indignation, I agreed, God would vindicate me, after all He had placed me as head of the woman, first in the chain of command.

At the close of summer '72, married ten days, we enrolled in concentrated Greek. Because the feminist movement was just blooming, many students found it difficult to be conscious that Kath was also a student. You may not believe this but sometimes we had to explain three times in the course of one conversation that Kath was also a full-time, tuition-paid, Greek-studying student!

For me her presence was only too apparent; she was getting better grades. Despite my claim of happiness for her success, I secretly wished she wasn't a student. As her acute capabilities became obvious, so did my secret, for I began to whimper. I felt threatened.

This inconsistent pattern followed me everywhere. Claiming to be beyond male chauvinism, I would wash dishes. Asserting to be spiritually free in Christ, I would vacuum the rugs. But deep inside it went against every fiber of my body. There I was, a spiritual leader, head in the chain of command...making a bed! I was an exile! God would come and free me. He would show who owns the spiritual leadership in the domain of our marriage. He would demonstrate who was the head and who was to be submissive!

Waiting upon God, nothing happened. Therefore I took matters into my own hands. With great subtlety, I began small spiritual expositions. Maybe she would see I knew what I was spiritually talking about. Then she would have more respect. So gathering my gnostic abilities along with prayer and fasting, I performed these innocent teachings. For some reason Kath just didn't catch on. Perhaps her rebellion had driven her too deeply towards darkness for her to see the light. But Kath received an entirely different message. She heard me saying: "Spiritual matters are my ground. You are not welcome." The tuna fish discussion occurred about this time.

As you can imagine, our marriage was winding up and the tension forced action. Kath transferred from the M.Div. to the M.A. program. "Seems like they understand me better," she said. I contemplated leaving the ministry. We both sought counselling. All spiritual dialogue ceased, except short prayers at dinner.

Whereas I thought these changes would cause stagnation, channels of growth I never expected began to blossom. We found working together on the house duties created more free time. But free time meant certain intimacy and I wasn't good at that. I would much rather study and be exhausted than learn intimacy. Kath was very patient. Likewise our situation brought on an identity crisis for me. Aggressive leadership had always been my pride, in fact this ability was my identity. It would be the treasure of my family, for by it I would bring home the bread on which they depended. My purpose and identity was neatly planned. But now that Kath was planning a professional career all her own, bringing home bread as well (and maybe more!), who was I?
Then something marvelous happened. Since we were both attending the same 8 o'clock class, we began to alternate attendance. What a delight sleeping in on my mornings off! Finally the light dawned. Kath's professional career was not meant as a threat, but a great relief. The labor of "bread winning" could now be "bread sharing". Whereas Kath's liberated stance seemed against me, it was now for me. The power which I thought was working to enslave me I could now see as working to free me. This power I realize is God's hand. He did not 'come' to me, for He has never away. Always present, He is freeing us, and fulfilling us both.

The matter of spiritual leadership and submission became clear. God demonstrated my spiritual bankruptcy; He had shown there is only One who is the spiritual leader. And a Godly woman's "submitted" place is not doing a role like dishes and child rearing anymore than a Godly man's place is out winning bread. The only "place" of Godly people is in Jesus Christ. Only He is Lord, and the rest of us in Him are His church, His bride. There is no chain of command except the Lord then the church, and this is no chain of command, but a marriage of love.

Nick Warner offers this review of a controversial dissertation on authority structures within marriage.

DOES THE BIBLE REALLY SAY THAT?


As we prepared for marriage we assumed that it was an absolute gospel truth that a Christian wife was to be "submitted" to her husband. The assumption was supported when the pastor at our wedding delivered a sermon asserting that the hierarchical model of marriage was the only one for a Christian couple to live by. In marriage, however, we both began to count many symptoms of dysfunction in our relationship. My wife became little more than a portion of her full self, living most of her life in a state of bitterness and resignation. And I began to resent having to be responsible for her personality.

For a long time we did not question the hierarchical model of marital authority. We blindly and totally assumed its truth; as stated in Larry Christenson's book, the "Christian family" is one in which the husband is head over his wife and she is submitted.

Dave Jansen does not think so. In his work as a marriage and family counsellor, Jansen began to find fundamental conflicts between the reality of marital conflicts and the patterns of authority taught by teachers claiming to have the only "truth" from the New Testament. Asked to review Christenson's The Christian Family, Jansen was forced to carefully examine the biblical view of authority in marriage. The results are both interesting reading and of enormous importance to every Christian couple.

A reading of the New Testament, particularly the letters of Paul, will lead many to conclude that the divine order in marriage is unquestionably hierarchical, Paul says it absolutely and that should end the issue, Jansen provides most convincing evidence to the contrary from Scripture and does so with incisive exegetical skill and sensitivity to the whole of Scripture. Let us review some of Jansen's arguments.

First, Jansen cites Genesis 1 and 2 wherein there is no hint of subordination of either male or female in the creation narratives, indeed God created man and woman to live in partnership. Granted, that picture changes after the Fall and in later Jewish history a hierarchical system developed. Even so, Jansen clearly shows that the understanding of the marital relationship was progressively moving toward a more equalitarian model between the time of Moses and the time of Paul. The concept of marriage was not static in Hebrew history.
Second, Jesus never taught that women were to be subordinate to men, rather he taught the principle of "the original marriage ordinance being restored". In Christ women could again know equality as it was to have been before the Fall.

Third, there is no question that Paul taught female subordination, particularly in the Letter to the Ephesians... But what is too easily overlooked is that he also taught mutual submission. Ephesians 5:21 is a watershed passage, "Be subject to one another out of reverence for Christ". Paul's order for female submission follows that verse; mutual submission is the underlying goal of Paul's teaching but the working out of that teaching was restricted by tradition, culture, and eschatological expectation.

Fourth, Jansen demonstrates the influence of Paul's rabbinical background and the effect of his time on the apostle. He was a new man in Christ but he was still a Jew, a pharisee, and a man of his time. Furthermore, his first priority was the vigorous proclamation of the gospel in light of his belief in an imminent return of Christ. Jansen argues from Scripture that Paul's eschatological expectation "prevented him from developing a system of Christian values with regard to many vital issues". Even so, without commanding a re-ordering of the issues of slavery and marital hierarchy, Paul put into motion a process that would eventually reveal that those issues are not scriptural absolutes.

Fifth, Jansen contends that there is no absolute argument for the subordination of the wife and the headship of the husband being the divinely ordained order. Rather, there is change expected in the form of marriage with the progress of revelation and with changing cultural conditions. "The form is not the absolute. The absolute might well be that the relationship in which love, grace, forgiveness, peace, and harmony can develop."

David Jansen's thesis constantly returns to the theme of growth. He conclusively examines the development of marital relationships in the Old Testament and rabbinical writings and compares the hierarchical and egalitarian models of authority in marriage. He forcefully argues that one of the foremost attributes of the New Testament church was newness, a new community (the church) with a new head (Christ), a new faith, new hope and a new love. "This new faith was bound to change things wherever it went. Institutions would be changed. New forms would take place -- new forms of marriage and the family being among them."

It is ironic that the same church which so often gave the initial impulse for change is also responsible for so much of the fearful reluctance to change. Perhaps it is the economy of God to use the demands of the world around the church to force the church to meet the needs of the people of the world.

Jansen's insights into the movement of Scripture toward a more egalitarian model of authority in marriage are important. He cites Jesus' style of relating to women and Paul's assertion (Gal. 3:28) that in Christ there is no male and female. Indeed, Paul provided a great impulse toward spiritual equality, social equality, and sexual equality for women. As for marital equality, it was not Paul's intent to alter the cultural norms of his day so much as to proclaim the imminence of the parousia.

The New Testament, in the ministry of Christ and the teaching of Paul, cuts to the root of the issue of female equality. Woman was created equal with the church in every age to work toward that equality. We cannot and must not expect to live by the cultural norms of New Testament times. David Jansen clearly shows that to do so is out of sorts with the flow of the New Testament.

Speaking as a marriage and family counsellor, Jansen provides significant insights into the realities of daily marital conflicts and draws them forth to provide a backdrop for the need to have a right equality in marriage. In his thesis he discusses much more than what can be mentioned here, such as the question of the analogy of marriage to Christ and the Church. Finally he commends to Christians the model of marriage that he calls the "cooperative" model and I rejoice to find that this is the model toward which my wife and I have been moving in our marriage.

David Jansen is considering publishing the thesis in book form. Some parts of it will need editing for the general public and other parts will have to be expanded. But the importance of what he has to say...
requires that it get a wider reading. It will benefit all who read it and may well save the marriage and faith of many who do so.

FOR FURTHER STUDY...

Dr. Rogers has been personally interacting with the issues of feminism and the church as a member of an U.P.U.S.A. commission studying sexism in the language of the church. He compiled a stimulating bibliography for anyone who wish to probe further on the issue.

The accompanying list are a sampling of recent works dealing with women in the church and society. All are based on substantial research and scholarship. Evangelicals would do well to begin with Jewett and Hardesty-Scanzoni. These evangelical writers share a sensitivity and understanding of the issues with those of other traditions but deal with the issues in an evangelical theological perspective. The shortest and still one of the best books is Stendahl's which lays a hermeneutical foundation. Two large recent collections edited by Ruether and Hageman give an excellent sampling of the breadth and depth of work by feminist theological scholars. Mary Daly's Beyond God the Father should be read in contrast to her earlier, The Church and the Second Sex. Beyond God the Father expresses the anger and frustration to which one woman has been pushed by a church which would not listen to her serious and legitimate concerns.

General


The Church


Harkness, Georgia, Women in Church and Society. 1972

Swider, Arlene, Woman in a Man's Church. Paulist Press, 1972.

Theological


Hardesty, Nancy and Scanzoni, Letha, All We're Meant To Be: A Biblical Approach to Women's Liberation. Word, 1974. (Reviewed in Wittenburg Door Dec. 74-Jan. 75 page 27)

Jewett, P.K., Man as Male and Female. Bemumans, 1975. (in press)


Seldom does a fellow student here at Fuller introduce a new book. The event being rare, this brisk and enjoyable review by Marguerite Schuster was in order.

EVERYTHING YOU NEED TO GROW A MESSIANIC SYNAGOGUE
A new book by Phil Goble

With the growing stress of economic inflation, there has been growing encouragement to grow things. Vegetables? Chickens? Ah, yes, but amidst rhetoric designed to promote such ventures, have you ever thought of growing a Messianic synagogue? No? Well, don't worry—or should I rather say, "Worry!"—you are not alone. If there is anywhere that evangelicals, even missionary-minded evangelicals, are myopic, surely the area of reaching the Jew is one of the most obvious. The Jewish people in our midst are all too often awkwardly and almost deliberately overlooked as the average pastor divides his gaze between his own congregation and some slightly exotic "foreign field," the latter (as well as the former!) often viewed through either rose-colored or mud-colored binoculars.

This oversight of our Jewish neighbors is particularly reprehensible among those who claim to take their Bibles with ultimate seriousness, for one would have to do quite a cut-and-paste job on the New Testament to avoid the conclusion that we Gentiles are indeed eating off of Israel's table. We need to remember that not only did Rabbi Paul assert that the gospel was to the Jew first, but also Jesus himself specifically sent his disciples to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel," lest we infer that this preferential treatment was mandated only for the first century and nullified by Israel's rejection of Jesus, we would do well to take another look at Romans 9-11. If by now at least a few faint rumbles of guilt have been aroused, the time has arrived to speak specifically of Phil Goble's new book, Everything You Need To Grow A Messianic Synagogue.

The Rev. Mr. Goble (recent Fuller graduate) is not interested in arousing guilt. He concerns himself with providing tools, a much more constructive—and much more difficult—enterprise. Let it first be affirmed that Mr. Goble knows whereof he speaks, that his tools are sharp: for several years, he has been a minister at Beth Emmanuel in Encino, California, one of the fastest growing Messianic synagogues in the world. Second, his approach is straightforwardly centered not upon diluting but upon maintaining the cultural Jewishness of the people to whom he ministers. Why? Both because of the practical discipling value of such a stance, which does not require of a people that they commit "ethnic suicide" in order to become Christians, and also because of the intrinsic value of the traditional Old Testament heritage. Nonetheless, Mr. Goble indulges in no candy coating of the message of Christ or the cost of discipleship. His focus is fairly and squarely on the issue of the resurrection of the dead as fulfilled in Christ Jesus (Yeshua Ha Mashlach!) and upon the indwelling Holy Spirit as the enabler of new life, a Trinitarian approach with a rare balance of emphasis. The vital role given to the Holy Spirit would appear especially crucial in a "how to do it" book, lest technique overtake one's reliance upon God.

The "technique" as such is based upon what is called an "interlocking document method" whereby a potential convert invited to attend a home Bible study may progressively be introduced to the foundation and demands of Messianic Judaism. He is led, in four gradual steps, from the stage of inquiry to full Messianic synagogue membership. The "propaganda" is tactful but firm and honest, with excellent Scriptural backing and an emphasis on commitment. Since, furthermore, the title of the book promises everything you (not just your potential convert) need to know, there are model communion and Friday evening services included, as well as appendices on everything from leading home Bible studies to techniques of bus and telephone ministry. Little but the unique response of each individual approached is abandoned to the frustrated imagination of the reader!

Granted, of course, that the most usable of books will still leave room for quibbles. If one may commend the fresh, incisive language, he may question occasional looseness of Biblical translation, and especially the Gentile reader with negligible training in Hebrew may find himself awkwardly thumbing through a dusty lexicon to pin down the sense of some transliterated but not translated Hebrew words. If one may commend the
essential theology, he may yet discern the impact of a tradition other than his own; some Presbyterian and Reformed churchmen, for instance, might demure at Mr. Goble's central and unequivocal espousal of adult baptism by immersion. Further, one might raise questions about the sense in which Holy Communion may be a continuation of the Passover: should a "fulfillment" retain or supersede the form of its harbinger? That we may be forced to pose such questions is surely a good thing in itself, for it may shake us from a mere sleepy, dogmatic affirmation of ossified "answers".

Is the book worthy of our attention? You have not missed my intention if you hear a resounding "Yes!" If one is primarily in the market even for help in his devotional life, the section on prayer—obviously not written from an armchair—is valuable; and if one's pocketbook needs a challenge, he might try the section on tithing ("The only reason a person might believe he couldn't live on $9 out of $10 is because he doesn't have a dollar's worth of faith that God can help him," p. 87). If one's sensitivity, creativity, and evangelical energy in any context have been at a low ebb, here is an intriguing, imagination-tickling encourage-

ment to get serious both about the Bible and about the culture of those to whom one is speaking. More directly to the point and very timely, though, is Mr. Goble's piercing challenge to our comfortable Gentile presuppositions and presumptions. His book may point up to us how we have indeed cut ourselves off from our roots; his language may jolt us into a realization of how blithely we have "Christianized" the gospel. If we are jolted, good, for must we not affirm that "a Christian can only know who he is himself when he understands who he is in relation to the Jews at whose table he is eating"? (pp. 55-56)

Perhaps you have a growing curiosity, perhaps even a growing urge to investigate "growing" a Messianic synagogue. If so—or even if not!—remember that "If the casting away of them (the Jews) be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? . . . So have these also now not believed, that through your mercy they also may obtain mercy" (Rom. 11:15,31). Paul was writing to us. So is Phil Goble.

(Everything You Need To Grow A Messianic Synagogue is available through William Carey Library, 305 Pasadena Ave., South Pasadena, California 91030.)