
A table of contents for *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php

TSF BULLETIN
THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

NOVEMBER–DECEMBER 1984

Vol. 8, No. 2 $3.50

Love and Negotiate: Creative Conflict In Marriage, by John Scanzoni. Using a strong biblical base, Scanzoni presents a sound alternative to the hierarchial view of marriage: an excellent resource.

Twelve Oppportunities to Help

1. Volunteer to serve on the board of your local shelter for abused women and gain the experience and knowledge that will enable you to make a significant contribution to the healing of violent families.
2. Volunteer to train as an advocate/counselor for the shelter or crisis line in your community.
3. Sign up for a trianing seminar to learn ways to effectively counsel victims and abusers.
4. Contribute to the local shelter money or material goods (clothing, furniture, supplies, etc.) through the women's fellowship in your church.
5. Speak up when someone tells a wifebeating joke. Wifebeating is not funny and you need to stand up and be counted.
6. Arrange an adult education series in your church on family violence.
7. Provide brochures in the church's narthex about community services dealing with family violence.
8. Speak up in the community in support of local services for victims and abusers.
9. Keep informed about all legislative issues at the state and national levels. Let your representives know of your concerns about family violence issues. Be especially aware of how budget cuts are affecting services in your area.

And for clergy . . .

10. Do the theological and scriptural homework necessary to better understand and respond to family violence.
11. Preach a sermon about family violence.
12. *After* you have taken a training seminar, volunteer to be on call at your local shelter when it needs a clergyperson.

Evangelical Feminism: Reflections on the State of the "Union"

Harvie M. Conn

What is a feminist? I agree with Alan Alda. It is "someone who believes that women are people."

My purpose in this essay is to review the opinions on feminism now current within the evangelical community. What do I mean by "evangelical"? To quote Robert K. Johnston, I speak of a group of over forty-five million North Americans and millions more worldwide. Two of their commitments are important for us in providing a functional definition for this paper. They affirm (1) the need for personal relationship with God through faith in the atoning death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and (2) the sole and binding authority of the Bible as God's revelation.[1]

More specifically, I focus on what some have called "conservative-evangelicals." This label, like so many other theological ones current, is purely functional. And even then it is clumsy. "Conservative" hardly seems appropriate as a designation for those in this circle who question past evangelical stances on the issue of women in the Bible. And I suspect there are many in this broad continuum who are even reluctant to use the term "evangelical" about some on the far opposite end of the spectrum from them.

However, my own purpose is not labelling so much as sampling. With a highly selective hand that has eliminated journal and magazine literature, I seek to introduce key selected writers in a growing discussion. I hope to point to some of the issues that are presently surfacing in the infra-fraternity discussion and to point to those that still need to be resolved for progress. As with most issues, the evangelical has entered the discussion as a latecomer. And ordinarily the choice of options perceived by the writers are limited to the two around which the contemporary discussion revolves - egalitarianism versus some form of hierarchism. Unfortunately the former is also designated as feminism, an equation I am not yet prepared to make. And equally unfortunately, the latter is often indistinguishable from some form of subordinationism, an equation more culturally formed than biblically, often as covert as overt.

Evangelical Options: Egalitarianism

The book that initiated evangelical participation came from within that camp in 1974 - *All We're Meant to Be* (Waco: Word Books) by Letha Scanzoni and Nancy Hardesty. Unlike so much evangelical writing, the work was not simply a negative, knee-jerk reaction against earlier feminist literature the evangelical frequently characterizes as "liberal" or "secular." Scanzoni and Hardesty, working within the evangelical orbit, startled it by commending an egalitarian position. Their call for equality in the male-female relationship, coming from within a community that assumed a hierarchical position as theoretically biblical, initiated the discussion. *Eternity* Magazine selected it as "book of the year" and it has remained very much at the center of evangelical discussions since then. Its serious attention to Scripture placed it in the evangelical camp and thus demanded evangelical attention for its new conclusions. The wide range of issues it dealt with were also striking. The width of its treatment, in fact, may be part of the reason why it continues to be a center of discussion. And why it also appears rather thin and superficial in its exegetical treatment of biblical texts. It minimizes a wide range of hermeneutical possibilities. And its resolutions of difficulties in interpretation are not always fully satisfactory. There is little admission of unanswered problems. Still, more than most evangelical literature in this field, it has come closest to understanding and interacting with the full agenda of topics raised by women's lib.

In 1975, the second major evangelical treatment of the issue appeared, this time from the pen of Paul K. Jewett. His book, *Man as Male and Female,* was much more narrowly limited in its scope and style. He paid little overt attention to the contemporary social and cultural questions. And one might even say it was more theological than exegetical. It remained more technically aimed at the theological issues involved.

Undoubtedly these were factors in making it a storm center of controversy. Many reasons could be added to the list. Like Scanzoni and Hardesty, the book rejected the traditional conservative defense of a hierarchical view of the man/woman relationship. Jewett saw such a view requiring not simply a priority of the male but even the superiority of the male. He rejected this classical statement of the evangelical as entailing a subordination of the female to the male. In its place, he argued for what he called "a model of partnership."[2]

In addition there were other reasons to anger the community in Jewett's argument. He used a modification of Karl Barth's idea of human sexuality as the key to understanding man, male and female, as image of God. In doing that, despite his strictures on Barth's argument, he angered the community in several directions. He had to challenge long-held exegetical traditions regarding the under-

Harvie M. Conn is Professor of Missions at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. *This article first appeared in the Westminster Theological Journal, Spring 1984. Reprinted by permission.*

standing of the image of God in man. And he had to do it by using as a foil the views of a theologican long suspect in those circles.

Another issue, however, became even more controversial for the evangelical family in their dialogue with the book. It was not so much Jewett's defense of a modified egalitarianism but his perceived questioning of the full integrity of the Bible over the issue of women. Specifically, it was the testimony of Paul, and Jewett's exposition of it, that became the firestorm.

To Jewett, there was Paul, the ardent disciple of Jesus Christ affirming that "there is neither . . . male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28). But there was also Paul, the rabbi of impeccable erudition and chauvinism, forbidding women to teach, exhorting women to keep silence in the churches. Evangelical commitment to the Scriptures had always sought harmonization as the solution for such apparent collision points. For Jewett, "there is no satisfying way to harmonize the Pauline argument for female subordination with the large Christian vision of which the great apostle to the Gentiles was himself the primary architect."[3] Jewett's commitment to the egalitarianism of Paul the Christian clashed with his understanding of the subordinationism of Paul the rabbi. He could not accept the traditional resolutions and harmonizations. He could only see two Pauls in the New Testament.

Harold Lindsell, in his 1976 book, *The Battle for the Bible*, saw these admissions as a rejection by Jewett of inerrancy.[4] That concern was a legitimate one. I am quick to add as well that Lindsell's domino theory seems to come close to saying that egalitarians hold a low view of Scripture since they reject what to him is such a clear view of Scripture (hierarchicalism).

Jewett responded by defending these Pauline self-struggles as "an indication of the historical character of biblical revelation."[5] But Jewett's reply was too mild to defuse the agenda now enlarging around the question of feminism. Egalitarianism, in the eyes of the evangelical traditionalists, was being seen increasingly as tied both to "feminism" and to what was described as a "lower" view of Scripture.[6] Lindsell's domino theory they saw as being proved again. The growing exodus of congregations in this same decade from mainline Presbyterian churches reinforced these concerns. The issue of the ordination of women to the teaching office of the church was being seen by conservative dissidents as really the issue of biblical authority.

Since these earlier works, the egalitarian position in the evangelical movement has continued to add supporters. Virginia Ramey Mollenkott, who wrote the foreword to Jewett's title, has provided her own full work, *Women, Men, and the Bible* (1977). It is perhaps the most strident in tone of all these works. Ranging more widely than Jewett's early title, she followed him in his attitude toward Paul, but went beyond him in using the term "contradictions" to describe the Pauline material. Sensitive to the controversies stirred by Jewett's work, Mollenkott writes, "I believe that Paul's arguments for female subordination, which contradict much of his own behaviour and certain other passages he himself wrote, were also written for our instruction: to show us a basically godly human being in process, struggling with his own socialization; and to force us to use our heads in working our way through conflicting evidence."[7]

I myself do not agree with Mollenkott (or Jewett) either in the interpretation of the Pauline data or in the proposed alternatives to traditional harmonizations. And I struggle with how far one can move to the left of the evangelical continuum on biblical authority before moving off it altogether. But I continue to hear evangelical sensitivities resonating in Mollenkott's argument. In seeking an answer to what she perceives as Pauline rationalization, her resort is not to a questioning of Pauline authorship. She uses no deus-ex-machina appeal to the scissors-and-paste unity of the letters I sense in other scholarship. Her struggle is not against biblical inspiration but the face of it. The problems, she says, are not with the text but "learning to interpret accurately."[8]

Mollenkott, in all this, is not just a Jewett *redivivus*. The book, for example, interacts directly with traditionalist writers in a way that Jewett does not. And it raises issues Jewett or even Scanzoni and Hardesty did not. A full chapter for example, and perhaps a chronological first in contemporary evangelical literature, is her study of the question, "Is God masculine?".

In the years since the mid 1970s, the egalitarian movement has grown among the evangelicals. An Evangelical Women's Caucus, organized in the mid 1970s, continues to expand its membership. By 1980 it had reached approximately 600. A small bi-monthly journal, *Daughters of Sarah*, now provides a writing platform for expanding evangelical study and influence. Within this side of the continuum, studies are enlarging beyond the original, more general agenda.

Ecclesiastical concerns still retain a major interest. Jewett's 1980 work, *The Ordination of Women*, expands his argument into what, for many conservatives in the evangelical camp, will be regarded as "inevitable consequence" to his earlier title. And Jewett's method of argument will only reinforce that suspicion. He assumes the exegetical basis of his previous book and spends the bulk of his time here in demolishing what appear to him to be the major traditionalist objections to women's ordination—their appeal to the nature of women (ch. 2), the nature of the ministerial office (ch. 3), and the (masculine) nature of God (ch. 4). His positive arguments remain limited largely to the fifth chapter, women's "right to the order of ministry."

A possible tactical mistake of Jewett's may have surfaced in his "all-purpose" case for the ordination of women. He attempts a discussion of ordination that is general enough to interact with both Protestant and Catholic alike. Ramsey Michaels conjectures, "it is doubtful that his 'end run' around the ecumenical issue can succeed."[9] Given conservative sensitivities on this question, assuredly it will raise as many objections as eyebrows in that corner of the evangelical house. I personally suspect that the understanding of ordination may be more central than Jewett has made it.

In the meantime, there has appeared the beginnings of study on the biological, social and cultural influences affecting role relationships. Peter DeJong and Donald Wilson's 1979 work, *Husband and Wife: The Sexes in Scripture and Society* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House), focuses on traditional sex roles. Its strength is particularly in the valuable sociological input on these questions. Its weakest link is in its exegetical treatment of the topic.

Also growing at this end of the continuum spectrum is the discussion of the problem of sexist language in the Bible and worship. It is, to this writer, the best chapter in Jewett's 1980 volume. And it has been expanded further by a more recent title, Vernard Eller's *The Language of Canaan and the Grammar of Feminism* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Comp., 1982). Eller's work is a brief, but intriguing, use of language analysis as a starting point for the examination of sexist language. The more traditional evangelical circles, by contrast, are virtually silent about this topic. Little seems to have appeared also from this latter camp regarding the influence of culture and society on role models.

Evangelical Options: Hierarchy Views

In all this, the "traditional" evangelical end of the spectrum has not been totally silent. But, with few exceptions, it has appeared as more negative in tone than the egalitarian view and decidedly more limited in its agenda. Its major writers have reacted not so much to the socio-cultural questions of western society as to the rise of egalitarianism within its own ranks. And even here there is further reductionism. Its temper is not always dictated so much by egalitarianism as it is by its concern over those positions it associates with the egalitarian position—in particular, a perceived "lower" view of Scripture. One senses much more fearfulness over compromise of biblical integrity in its defenders. That concern is a legitimate one. But too often it becomes more dominant in the literature than it should.

The end result of this narrowing of perceptions gives the "traditionalist" more the appearance of a knee-jerk reaction agent. And for those outside any Christian camp at all it reduces further any desire to listen. This is tragic at a time when evangelicals are awakening more and more to the social obligations of the gospel. And when western society frequently and incorrectly dismisses evangelical perceptions as "right wing" or "Moral Majority-ism."

A sample of how these problems arise is illustrated in the 1977 book by George Knight III, *The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women*. Knight's work is the briefest of all the books we have mentioned thus far. And that in itself works

against his own purposes. The style is extremely compact and difficult to follow. Again, his concerns are not with the social problems of male chauvinism and male/female equality. They are with "the question of admitting women to the teaching and ruling function of the church."[10] He deals briefly with the marriage relationship. But he does so only as part of his argument that this relationship, with its concept of male headship, is the basis for understanding the question of women in ecclesiastical office.

Adding to this complexity of style and narrowed agenda is Knight's strong apologetic against the works of Scanzoni and Hardesty, and of Jewett. Whether this is entirely fair is a question. None of these earlier works have the strongly narrowed area of interest Knight has limited himself to in his book. Further, each of Knight's chapters open with a section offering "biblical evidence" and then "objections answered." The sections responding to the egalitarian advocates are much lengthier than the more positive materials. Out of two central chapters (pp. 19–53), 27 pages out of a total of 34 are devoted to critical interaction. The effect is to minimize even more the positive elements of Knight's argument.

Knight recognizes that outside these family and church spheres are those areas where men and women "are mutually dependent upon one another and relate to one another outside of a particular sphere of authority."[11] At the same time, his strong advocacy of headship as a characteristic of maleness and of submission as the role of femaleness minimizes even this admission for the chauvinist-concerned reader. He cautions that "every relationship does have the overtone of one's maleness or femaleness."[12] And given his strong defense of hierarchy in the roles, this caution does not comfort the reader by way of balance.

Another feature of the discussion also hurts Knight's case. With many evangelicals, he shares a failure to verbally appreciate the cultural and social factors that also play a part in our understanding of even biblically-dimensioned role relationships. He gives no substantive acknowledgement to these dimensions anywhere I could find in the book. This absence is reinforced by his argument concerning the three key passages relating to these questions (I Timothy 2:11–15, I Corinthians 14:33b–38 and I Corinthians 11:1–16).He says the commands prohibiting women from ruling and teaching men in the church "are grounded not in time-bound, historically and culturally relative arguments that apply only to Paul's day and age, but in the way God created men and women to relate to each other as male and female."[13]

At this point, we are not saying Knight is right or wrong about this interpretation. But we are saying that the effect of this argument, combined with his strong defense of hierarchy, transforms for the hearer the argument for hierarchy into an argument for subordinationism. And this whether Knight intends it or not. His assault on any form of cultural relativism will be understood as a simplism that leads to subordinationism.

A much fuller and more helpful presentation of the traditional viewpoint of hierarchy is found in Susan Foh's *Women and the Word of God* (1980). She too dialogues constantly with evangelical egalitarians. But it is much more subdued and gracious, stylistically more controlled than that of Knight. Her writing style is rather wooden but far less antagonistic than Knight's. She too is concerned with egalitarian attitudes towards the Scripture. In fact, the opening chapter of her work is entitled, "Can We Believe the Bible?" Unfortunately, her work shows no awareness of the centrist postures of the Boldreys and of Gundry.

Her work benefits also from a more comprehensive search than Knight. There are useful discussions on singlehood, on God as male and female, on the metaphysics of sex. And, in addition, there are the expected treatments of headship, submission and women's ordination to ministry.

There is beyond all this a refreshing sensitivity to the exploitation of women in culture. And this is rather unique in traditionalist literature. Repeatedly her illustrations warn against the way in which evangelical male traditionalists can too easily capitulate to this chauvinist danger. She warns of a glib prooftexting of male boorishness or a subtle shifting of the responsibility of the husband to love his wife from him to her.[14] She does not hesitate to criticize fellow traditionalists like Wayne Mack,[15] and to support egalitarians like Scanzoni and Hardesty in several areas.[16] She is much quicker to distinguish between biblical demands for role-playing and cultural stereotypes than Knight seems to do.

At the same time, Foh's work is not ultimately directed by her concerns over cultural chauvinism. Her obvious awareness of the realities is there. But her argument and her solid exegetical work are not directed to that topic. She has written an "in-house" reaction to other evangelical writers. The subtitle of her book tells it: "A Response to Biblical Feminism" (her term for evangelical egalitarians). It is here she cannot match the scope of Scanzoni and Hardesty's work. She has not really seen the cultural woods for the egalitarian trees.

The end result of this narrowing of perceptions gives the "traditionalist" more the appearance of a knee-jerk reaction agent.

Why? Is it related to her argument over "cultural relativism" early on in the book? She argues that a recognition of cultural conditionedness to parts of the Bible makes the Bible therefore non-authoritative.[17] "The commandments to women rest on unchanging principles."[18] Her legitimate concern is undoubtedly over those, who in the name of cultural conditionedness, discredit the integrity of the Bible. And these views she obviously associates with the likes of Jewett, Mollenkott and others. But, at the same time, her rather simplistic response can overcompensate.

By far, the fairest and best of the hierarchical statements is that made by James B. Hurley in *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (1981). Hurley makes no sustained effort to paint the twentieth century discussions on women as the introductory context for his work. And this may be the book's largest problem to me. But it is clearly the setting which he seeks to address in the book. The major intent of the book is "to present a careful examination of the relevant biblical texts within the context of their day and to discuss their relevance to the present."[19]

His focus is heavily on exegesis, and not just limited to New Testament data. He proceeds chronologically through the Bible, with chapters on women in Israelite culture, women in the ministry and teaching of Jesus, women in the life of the apostolic church and basic attitudes reflected in the apostolic teaching.

A distinctive of his work, and one seldom used by the traditionalists, is his attention to the cultural settings of the Bible. How were women viewed in the ancient near east, the background to the Old Testament? How were women treated by Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world of the first century? This background goes a long way to unfolding the sharp break that biblical attitudes displayed in its host cultures.

In all this Hurley is less strident and apologetic in his tone. Though he is well aware of critical opinion on key texts, he deliberately refrains from naming names and devouring opponents' houses. Alternative choices are fairly laid out and answered. But his discussions do not get in the way of positive exposition of the text as they do in Knight's work. Hurley's volume will likely be *the* book for understanding the hierarchical position.

Finally, in the concluding ninth chapter, he seeks to draw guidelines for the application of his biblical study to the present day. He raises a large number of case studies and deals with each, using

the materials he has provided in previous chapters. In terms of his stated purpose, this is a rather skimpy offering in the name of application and relevance. And, to be sure, it is all very carefully defined by his understanding of submission to male authority. But it is worthwhile. And it is significant that he tries it.

Again, however, in common with so many of the traditionalist writers, Hurley's orientation is to ecclesiastical questions. Can a woman address a local congregation with the approval of the elders? Can she teach a Sunday school morning adult Bible class? There are other questions equally or more important to our culture that demand answers. What of culturally determined "maternal" roles in the home? What of sexual harassment on the job, salary inequities in society? How far does one use the Bible in determining marriage roles, and how far may one accede to cultural patterns? How does a Christian vote on the ERA? On the drafting of women? On legal action against discrimination because of "sexual preference" (a euphemism for homosexuality)? This agenda is not treated in the Hurley book.

I would have some difficulty describing Knight's book as "feminist". Most feminists would also, I suspect. But Hurley comes closer to hearing the pain. He is open enough to the agonies to be open to a larger agenda. Though still a traditionalist, he is a traditionalist who is sensitive to and truly listens to feminist concerns and arguments. That, to me, places him very close to the feminist camp, if not in it.

Part II, "Where Do We Go From Here?", will appear in the next TSF Bulletin.

CHRISTIAN FORMATION

Personal Renewal: Reflections on "Brokenness"

by Roberta Hestenes

The biblical promise and possibility of personal spiritual renewal is broader than any simple definition. In the Old Testament, "renewal" seems to carry a meaning of restoration and repair—putting right that which has been broken or disrupted (I Samuel 11:14; I Chronicles 15:8; Psalm 51:10, 104:30; Lam. 5:21). Renewal of strength is seen as drawn from waiting upon the Lord (Isaiah 40:31; 41:1), watching and listening in expectant anticipation for the powerful action of the creative and energizing Lord of the nations.

In the New Testament, renewal is used to speak both of the initial Christian experience of the working of God—"regeneration and renewal in the Holy Spirit" (Titus 3:5)—and of the subsequent work where daily the Christian experiences the transforming power of God (2 Cor. 4:16; Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:23; Romans 12:1-2). Renewal is both that which is given to us and accomplished in us by God and a reality we seek and a process to which we give ourselves.

In this paper I will focus on one of the ingredients of personal renewal—a "broken and contrite heart". In addition, I will explore a few of the dangers along the way for even the experienced traveler. Three key texts form the center of my exploration:

> *Psalm 51*: especially verses 10-12 and 17 : "Create in me a pure heart, O God, and renew a steadfast spirit within me. Do not cast me from your presence or take your Holy Spirit from me. Restore to me the joy of your salvation and grant me a willing spirit, to sustain me. . . . The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise."
>
> *Matthew 5:6:* "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied."
>
> *James 4:6* (quoting Psalm 138 and Proverbs 3): "'God opposes the proud but gives grace to the humble.' Submit yourselves therefore to God."

I want to center on the theme of "brokenness" as an ingredient in renewal, drawing on David's statement, "A broken and contrite spirit you will not despise." It may seem strange to speak of brokenness to contemporary seminarians and academicians who live in an age constantly stressing self-actualization and self-fulfillment. Here are a group of people, many of whom are eager, committed, bright and energetic—successful according to many definitions of the word. Yet David also knew something of striving and success. It was in the middle of that success that the occasion for this psalm arises. It comes out of a devastating experience in David's life. It had begun with adultery and deception, had moved to trickery and murder, had resulted in confrontation and exposure, and the death of a child. The hidden sin was known and David was devastated.

In this response of David's there are some lessons for us:

1) The reality of temptation for even the most spiritual of persons in the most spiritual of places. David lives in the holy city, the resting place of the ark. Spiritual history and spiritual status provide no safe security. They are not impermeable barriers to temptation and sin. David loved God, but he sinned.

2) The necessity of the community of God's people willing to "speak the truth in love" to help us face ourselves and to know the holiness and the love of God. The dangers of isolation and personal lack of accountability in the midst of large numbers of people can only be overcome through the maintenance of a few significant relationships where the truth, even if unwelcomed, can be said and heard.

3) The reminder that the work we do for God and our study about God is no substitute for the holy life lived in vital relationship with God. It is important not to coast on our spiritual history, but to maintain a fresh, ongoing personal fellowship with God.

4) The forgiving and renewing mercy of God available at the deepest points of our need. This renewal comes in prayer, waiting for and seeking God.

In the face of exposed sin, David confessed and repented. He knew the value of a heart humbled before God. In our day which emphasizes self-confidence, self-assertion and self-fulfillment, we need to learn again the lessons of brokenness—of humility and gentleness before God and each other. This "brokenness" speaks not of self-worthlessness nor a malformed personality, nor deep clinical depression. It points toward a deeper reality, the response to a prompting of the Spirit in certain circumstances of need, demand, or spiritual yearning and hunger. Brokenness is a yielded heart open before God, a heart emptied of pride and self claims, of all arrogance, knowing our sin, our self-deception, our frailty, weakness and inadequacy. We discover ourselves again to be hungry and thirsty, poor and needy when we had thought ourselves full and needing nothing. Along with this awareness comes a rediscovery of God's love, mercy and forgiveness—His affirmation of us, care for us, and claim upon us.

Spiritual brokenness can come in different ways:

1) A vision of God. Isaiah sees the Lord "high and lifted up" and sees his own uncleanness and the uncleanness of the people of God. "Woe is me," he exclaims. Receiving the cleansing of God, he is able to hear and respond to the call of God upon his life—"Here I am; send me." But his ministry follows his heightened awareness of the holiness of God and his own sin.

2) A desire to be blessed. Jacob wrestled with God—"I will not let you go unless you bless me"—and emerges wounded and blessed to become Israel, the prince of God. In his encounter with God, he must acknowledge his identity as Jacob the deceiver before receiving the new name and promise.

3) An awareness of weakness, failure or sin, as we see in David in Psalm 51.

4) An encounter with Christ. Saul on the Damascus Road: "Saul, Saul why do you persecute me? It hurts you to kick against the

Roberta Hestenes is Associate Professor and Director of Christian Formation and Discipleship at Fuller Theological Seminary.