

**Eighth North American Coordinating Committee Meeting of  
the Lausanne Consultation on Jewish Evangelism**

**An Encounter Between Rabinowitz and Lichtenstein:  
Key Issues for Us Today**

By Kai Kjaer-Hansen

Something happened in Budapest in October nearly 100 years ago. In what follows, I would like to draw attention to some events that took place on 5 and 6 and 7 October 1891. One of the key persons in these events is Joseph ben David Rabinowitz, the then well-known Russian Hebrew Christian leader from Kishinev in Bessarabia who in 1885-86 had formed the congregation "Israelites of the New Covenant". The other key person is Rabbi Isaak Lichtenstein - not to be confused with Yehiel Lichtenstein, Rabinowitz's brother-in-law who taught at the Institutum Judaicum in Leipzig. Rabbi Isaak Lichtenstein worked in Hungary and was also a well-known Jesus-believing Jew. And then - in spite of the title of my paper - I'd like to introduce a third key person, namely Rabinowitz's wife. Together with their daughter Rachel, Mr and Mrs Rabinowitz had come to Budapest on a three-day stay.

**5 October 1891**

On 5 October 1891 a message sent from Budapest set the telegraph ticking in Kishinev, Bessarabia. The telegram had only two words: Mama gerettet, mother saved. The sender was Joseph Rabinowitz. The recipients were his children. Mama was Rabinowitz's wife.

I think there is an important lesson to be learnt from what happened in Budapest nearly 100 years ago. In spite of all external difficulties and internal controversies, there were Jews who were *then* saved by faith in Jesus, Israel's Messiah. It can also happen *today*. The difficulties we are facing are not greater than the ones experienced by those who lived 100 years ago. On the contrary, if anything. So there's also hope for the Jews of our time.

Let's maintain this hope and strengthen our expectations by looking at something positive.

**It can also happen today**

In 1882, Joseph Rabinowitz had travelled to Palestine to look into the possibility of a Jewish settlement there for the hard-pressed Russian Jews. Immigration to Israel might be an answer to the Jewish question. His encounter with Palestine was a disappointment. But still, he returned to his hometown, Kishinev, as a new person. His brother, Yeshua Achinu, had met him in Palestine.

Our sources reveal many things that indicate that he did not travel to Palestine with the hope and desire of becoming a Jesus-believer. But his brother in the flesh, Yeshua, met him and took him by surprise. Even today we count on the possibility that the crucified and risen Jesus can take Jews by surprise and show them that he is Israel's Messiah.

When Jesus takes a person by surprise and creates faith in the heart of that person, it does not usually come as a bolt from the blue. Something precedes it. The completely unexpected, that which the Jew Saul experienced on the Damascus road, is and always will be an exception, the exception that proves the rule. Something led up to it, also in Rabinowitz's case. Many years earlier he'd been given a Hebrew New Testament. How much or how little he'd read in it remains uncertain. Compared to his subsequent studies of it, it was little. Compared to what other Russian Jews at that time had read, it was much. However, he brought it along on his journey. And a few words from the New Testament came to his mind while he was sitting on the Mount of Olives.

This shows that spreading the New Testament bears fruit. We may not see that ourselves. The rate of waste is, no doubt, great. But we'll not worry over that. Many Jews who have come to faith in Jesus witness that at some time they were given a New Testament and that they had peeked into it - sometimes secretly. It's a "dangerous" thing to peek into a New Testament - even if it's done secretly. For the New Testament testimony of Jesus may overcome you. And therefore we continue to spread the New Testament to Jews in the language they are most familiar with.

### **Back to Rabinowitz**

Back in Kishinev Rabinowitz set up as a legal consultant or lawyer, but when he began witnessing to his clients about his new-found faith, his business suffered. This is a reminder to us that we must never give people the impression that it is without problems to be a Jesus-believer. He took time to bury himself in scripture, and in time he gained greater clarity. This reminds us that God does not usually make a Jew who has recently come to faith lead a congregation the following day. Some things need to be learned and these things take time. God has time - though we often have not. Occasionally we may think that God takes far too much time! What I have said here is, of course, also true of non-Jews who come to faith in Jesus.

In March 1885 Rabinowitz had been baptized in Berlin. While he was in Palestine in 1882, his eldest son had been baptized in St Petersburg, where he was a student. Rabinowitz's three daughters had been baptized in Rohrbach in October 1887 by the Hebrew Christian A. Venetianer. Rabinowitz's two other sons had been baptized in October 1888. Of his closest family, only *Mrs* Rabinowitz had not yet been baptized. E.H. Leitner, a clergyman in Constantinople, described her, after his visit to Kishinev in 1887, as a former "fanatical Jewess who now loves Jesus and together with Magdalene calls him 'Rabboni', i.e. Jesus 'my Master'".

Concerning the baptism, which took place in Budapest in the Free Church of Scotland's

meeting hall, the Reverend Andrew Moody writes the following:

We have had several baptisms during the year, the most interesting being that of Mrs. Rabinowitz, the wife of Mr. Joseph Rabinowitz of Kischineff, the well-known Hebrew Christian reformer. He was himself baptized some years ago in Berlin by Mr. Mead, an American pastor, it being his desire to confess in baptism the name of the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour, but not to be received into any of the existing churches in Russia. His children followed, and now his beloved wife. When her husband took the decisive step she had shed tears at the thought that one of such high repute in Israel and so dear to her should bend the knee before the despised Jesus of Nazareth, but she had herself soon after, responding to the call "Come and see", had her own eyes opened to behold the glory of Him who came out of Nazareth, and it was with joy that she now confessed her faith in Him as her own Saviour. The event was very touching and solemn. After the service, which took place on the afternoon of Monday, 5th October, Mr. Rabinowitz telegraphed home, "Mama gerettet ("Mother saved"). On the evening of the day following he delivered a lecture about Jesus in the large hall of our school building. There was a large attendance, and one or two prominent men of the Jewish community were present. Next day he had an interesting interview with Rabbi Lichtenstein, who, on my invitation, came in from Tapio-Szele to see him. Miss Rachel Rabinowitz, who came with her parents, remained here till Christmas, and had the opportunity of seeing something of our school work, and of the mission work generally.

The reason why Rabinowitz did not himself baptize his children and his wife is that the Russian authorities would not allow him to administer baptism. The reason why he and his family were not baptized in Kishinev by the Lutheran pastor Rudolf Faltin, with whom Rabinowitz was on good terms at the beginning of his public stand, is that he would then have to renounce his Jewish identity. Rabinowitz had himself been baptized in Berlin under extraordinary circumstances, not into any one denomination, which, according to the laws of the day, would have meant that he would have to give up his Jewish identity. He and his family were baptized into Christ's universal church retaining their Jewish identity. The Rabinowitz family's history teaches us that to Rabinowitz baptism was important, so important that he did not allow anything to prevent it. At the same time it was important that it took place in such a manner as would enable him to retain his Jewish identity.

*Mama gerettet* - these are strong words with an evangelical ring in connection with baptism.

#### **Rabinowitz and Rabbi Lichtenstein**

Concerning the encounter between Rabinowitz and Lichtenstein on 7 October 1891 Andrew Moody simply writes: "Next day he had an interesting interview with Rabbi Lichtenstein, who, on my invitation, came in from Tapio-Szele to see him." In a discreet way Moody manages to say that by arranging this encounter between two of that day's most eminent Hebrew Christian personalities he has earned his paycheck. Moody's

words, "interesting interview", do not exactly prompt a "hallelujah" from the reader, but still one presumes that the two men had a friendly and - well - interesting conversation. That is scarcely what happened. Three weeks after this encounter Rabinowitz gives an account of his thoughts concerning Lichtenstein.

In a letter of 30 October 1891 to H. Müller from the German Central Agency, Rabinowitz tells him that they had met at Moody's house on two occasions, and he conveys that he was critical about Lichtenstein's view of Christianity. Strange though it is to see them used by Rabinowitz himself, he here uses similar expressions in his criticism of Lichtenstein to those others might use against himself. By way of their conversations and by reading Lichtenstein's book "Judaism and Christianity" he reached the conclusion that Lichtenstein had not taken the crucial step away from Judaism or realized that one cannot put a patch onto an old garment. In his letter to H. Müller Rabinowitz expressed the hope that Lichtenstein might be granted "a living and pure faith in the only begotten Son, Jesus". Already in a letter of 22 February (r?) 1889 Rabinowitz wrote to Moody that Moody was to greet Lichtenstein and remind him of what was written in John 12:23 & 24 and Rom. 6:4. In the letter, which was published in the annual report of the Free Church of Scotland, Rabinowitz continued with some words clearly disapproving of Lichtenstein's failure to be baptized. "If Rabbi Lichtenstein verily loves his people Israel ... let him be baptized." By getting baptized he will set a good example to be followed by others, something there is more need of than theological learning.

The above-mentioned Bible verses say: "And Jesus answered them, 'The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified. Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the ground and dies, it remains alone; but if it dies, it bears much fruit' (John 12:23-24). 'We were buried therefore with him by baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might walk in newness of life' (Romans 6:4).

We shall not here assess how great the gap actually was between Isaak Lichtenstein and Rabinowitz. For his own part, Rabinowitz felt there was a gap - and expressed this. Lichtenstein would not be told what to do, and died unbaptized in 1909.

Others had discussed baptism with Lichtenstein. In the autumn of 1888, Dr Somerville, a prominent figure of the Scottish Free Church, paid a visit. In a report from the Church's collaborator in Budapest 1889 it is stated:

Dr. Somerville, in writing to me recently, gave expression to his fear that he [Lichtenstein] would die without being baptized, and that thus his testimony might be weakened, and in measure lost. He does not as yet take the same view of the matter as we do, but still clings tenaciously to the idea that his testimony has greater weight because he is not baptized; but while we cannot dislodge him from his position by our arguments, we may hope and pray that he may be further instructed and led by the Spirit of God.

And in the same issue Moody relates the following about Lichtenstein:

Our friend the Rabbi of Tapio-Szele, whom I have happily the opportunity of seeing from time to time, still maintains somewhat the same position as he did a year ago. When in the Tyrol I addressed an earnest appeal to him, the purport of which was: - "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized!" He replied: - "Best thanks to you, reverend sir, for remembering me when you are at a distance. Be assured that your form hovers before my eyes, and that every day I pray fervently to the Almighty for your complete recovery. As regards your pious wish, I regret that in the interest of the holy cause itself I cannot fulfil it. It is high time that a Jew, as a Jew, should take his place at the gate of the camp and cry, 'Kiss the Son lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way.' 'Do homage to Jesus as the rightful heir to the Kingdom.' 'For He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, having abolished in His flesh the enmity. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.' He is that heavenly ladder which stands on the earth, the top of which touches the heaven, and the angels of God ascend and descend upon it, and the Lord himself stands above it. My adversaries agitate without ceasing against me, but I have built upon a rock, and am therefore not moved. Saluting you in the name of God, his Anointed, and the Holy Spirit who hath made both one, I am, yours respectfully, J. Lichtenstein, District Rabbi.

If - or rather - when Christians of Gentile origin cannot agree about baptism, it is not to be expected - or is it - that Jewish believers in Jesus can, and it is an indisputable fact that Christians do not agree about the meaning of baptism. For some Christians it has the effect that they cease to talk about baptism. In my opinion this conclusion is the worst solution imaginable. When some Jewish believers in Jesus choose the term immersion instead of baptism, it is a terminological issue open to debate. But if they have no more to say about the *content of baptism* than that it is "a Jewish practice", I think there is every reason to be on guard. No matter how each of us may look at these things and no matter how differing views of baptism we may hold, baptism *in or to the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit* is not something we can pass lightly over. In the New Testament, the commandment to baptize in/to the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is just as clear as the commandment to evangelize. All people. Jews included.

What am I trying to say? I am trying to say that in the New Testament, Jesus-faith and Jesus-baptism belong together. They must also do so for us. Therefore I am sorry if, or rather when, Jewish believers in Jesus make a virtue of not being baptized - as was the case with the Messianic Jews Beresfords in Israel, who had appealed to the Supreme Court of Israel because they had failed to obtain Israeli citizenship under the Law of Return. In this way they do not only distance themselves from other Jesus-believers today, but they also distance themselves from the first Jesus-believing Jews.

Let me try to spell this out. For me - a Jesus-believer of Gentile origin and of Lutheran confession - what an expression! - baptism in itself is an act of grace with God as the agent. It is my belief and conviction that baptism conveys "a flood of grace" - to borrow an expression from the 16th-century reformers. I know that as a Lutheran Christian I have many odds against me, but I have not yet given up the hope that Jewish believers in Jesus may also see this flood of grace in baptism. However, I cannot denounce as heretics those who do *not* (yet!) see the grace of baptism, but "only" - I know I am simplifying matters - see baptism as an act of profession. I hardly need to say that, conversely, there are areas where I have not grasped the full truth - and yet I believe that, for Jesus' sake, I am a child of God. But I cannot renounce the conviction that Jesus-faith and Jesus-baptism belong together.

I "side with" Rabinowitz against Lichtenstein. It is my *opinion* that Lichtenstein ought to have been baptized. It is also my opinion that this is not a matter of minor importance, but a major one. But I also *believe* that for Jesus' sake Lichtenstein was a child of God. This is tied up with something fundamental that concerns my *opinion* and my *faith*, namely that faith transcends any opinion.

In continuation of this I must also say that of course *opinions* about Jesus and salvation are not unimportant to me. To put it in other words: theology is not unimportant. A weak theology may not be important to a sincere Jesus-believer today, but it may be so tomorrow. To others.

The encounter between two key persons in Jewish evangelism in Budapest nearly 100 years ago prompts me to conclude the following for us who are also involved in Jewish evangelism: as our relationship to the Law must always be on our agenda, so must our relationship to baptism. Jesus-faith *without* the accompanying baptism is not a New Testament phenomenon.

I am pleased to note that in the Jew for Jesus Newsletter (Volume 3:5751, 1991) the duty to baptize is taken seriously. The Newsletter has a baptismal liturgy, and in the introduction it says:

Jews for Jesus is not a church, but an evangelistic agency that serves various congregations in their gospel outreach to Jewish people. We usually do not perform baptisms ourselves, although we are qualified to do so. When someone comes to know the Lord, we direct the individual to a congregation where we feel he or she will be encouraged to grow in faith. Then that congregation has the duty to baptize and formally welcome the new Jewish believer into the body of Christ according to its own tradition.

Occasionally, however, Jewish believers ask us to baptize them in a more "Jewish" setting. For this purpose we have designed a special ceremony. It helps the invited family and friends of new Jewish believers to understand that baptism symbolizes the believer's entrance into Messiah and cleansing from past sin, *not* the washing away of that person's Jewishness.

I would like to give a brief outline of Rabinowitz's view of baptism.

### **Rabinowitz's baptism**

Rabinowitz was baptized in March 1885 in Berlin. This came as a shock to Rudolf Faltin, the Lutheran pastor in Kishinev. If Rabinowitz had been baptized by Faltin, he would have become a Lutheran, and according to existing Russian legislation he would no longer be considered a Jew. But Rabinowitz wanted to remain a Jew, he wanted to retain his Jewish identity - or with a phrase that Rabinowitz did not coin himself but which I think covers his opinion: Holy baptism does not drown the Jewish identity.

Rabinowitz was not forced to baptism. He has already discussed the question thoroughly with Wilhelm Faber, Professor Franz Delitzsch's collaborator and right hand, in 1885 when Faber for the second time was in Kishinev. In the course of those conversations Rabinowitz gradually arrived at the conviction that the right form of baptism is infant baptism and that baptism is a sacrament. He adopts the interpretation of baptism that is expressed in the documents of the Reformation, i.e. the interpretation subscribed to by the Evangelical Lutheran Churches, and the view expressed in the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Anglican Church or the Book of Common Prayer.

After discussions in Leipzig with, among others, Franz Delitzsch and John Wilkinson, arrangements were made for Rabinowitz to be baptized in Berlin - and under quite extraordinary circumstances, one must say. He was baptized in the Bohemian Lutheran church by the Congregationalist (Methodist) Pastor and Professor C.M. Mead from Andover, Massachusetts, in the presence of a few invited people, and baptized - on a creed written by himself in Hebrew - after having testified to being in complete concurrence with the Apostles' Creed. But still he wanted his own Creed in seven articles for his own congregation.

In that way - and that is the important point - Rabinowitz was baptized into the universal church of Christ without becoming a member of a certain denomination and without losing his Jewish identity. Delitzsch recognized this and defended Rabinowitz when he was later attacked.

Rabinowitz himself was baptized, but he never got permission to baptize or to administer the sacraments. The authorities would only allow him to function as a preacher. So when the term "Rabinowitz's congregation" is used, it should always be borne in mind that he was never given permission to establish a church proper. It goes without saying that a church proper cannot exist without Baptism and Holy Communion. And that being the case it is no wonder that Rabinowitz's movement crumbled after his death. In 1887 it looked as if this situation could be avoided. Some members of his congregation had been baptized in Rohrbach by a Hungarian Jew called Venetianer. But the authorities put a stop to that - possibly owing to corridor activities by Faltin or others from the Lutheran church in Kishinev.

And now back to Rabinowitz and Lichtenstein. Allow me, in the light of Rabinowitz's and Lichtenstein's disagreement, to conclude with a few comments for further

reflection.

### **Disagreement**

I have some knowledge of Rabinowitz. I have little knowledge of Lichtenstein. I note that in their own day there were people who supported them both. I also note that Rabinowitz's theological view of baptism is closer to mine than Lichtenstein's.

When disagreement arises, it is important that one has the ability and courage to distinguish between main issues and side issues. The problem is, of course, that often it is not possible to reach agreement as to what is a chief concern and what is of secondary importance. It is also important that one has the courage to face the fact that there was disagreement in the early Christian community - even among the apostles. Only he who cannot read or who wilfully shuts his eyes will be able to deny this. The New Testament does not hide it. Paul and Barnabas could not agree whether to take John Mark with them on their second missionary journey (Acts 15:36 ff) - a dispute concerning persons involved in an evangelistic campaign. There was a controversy between Paul and Peter as to how Jewish Christians should behave among Gentile Christians in Antioch. In Galatians (ch. 2) Paul rebukes Peter sternly for his behaviour. There was disagreement concerning the proper attitude to dietary laws (Rom. 14) - hardly a trivial matter. And if we consider Paul's way of presenting the gospel with Peter's and James's, we shall find that there are differences. I am not talking about differences in essentials but of differences in matters of minor importance. They certainly were different when it came to the way they communicated the gospel. Other things could be mentioned in this connection.

The reason why I draw attention to these things is that I want to ask some rhetorical questions and point to some circumstances that are also important for us who, in some way or other, are involved in LCJE today.

Does God desire disagreement among Jewish believers in Jesus? Or among believers in general? I think there is only one answer to that question: No. Anyway, in his intercessory prayer (in John 17) Jesus prays that they may all be one. I am firmly convinced that disagreement impairs the work of evangelization. This means that battling disagreement must always be a primary concern among us. On the other hand, from my reading of the New Testament I can conclude that God is not stopped by our disagreement. God uses sinners - yesterday and today. Forgiven sinners, sinners who live in forgiveness.

In the light of the New Testament and of the encounter of two key persons in Jewish evangelism - in Budapest nearly 100 years ago - I venture to say the following:

1. *Disagreement should be acknowledged.* Nothing is gained by sweeping disagreement under the carpet. If one accepts there is disagreement about side issues in a relatively stable organisation/church, one must also accept that there are differing views in a network like LCJE. He who dare not acknowledge theological disagreement runs the risk of letting good intentions influence his theological foundation. And that is not a



sound approach.

2. *Disagreement should be discussed face to face.* I presume that Rabinowitz and Lichtenstein discussed their theological disagreement during their encounter in Budapest. Whether Paul discussed his difference of opinion with Peter before he had it "printed", I don't know. Whether it was with or without Rabinowitz's consent that Müller printed Rabinowitz's account of his encounter with Lichtenstein, I don't know. But I think it serves the Gospel best that those who differ have the courage to face each other, to discuss their disagreement, to print it - and to face each other again. Furthermore, I believe that all which is printed must be true, but not all which is true must be printed. And I think it is especially important that disagreement owing to non-theological issues should be discussed face to face.
3. *Disagreement may subsequently be discussed with a third party as a witness.* If this procedure is followed, it will be difficult to entertain base opinions about one's opponent.
4. *Disagreement should not be indulged in.* It is possible to indulge in disagreement, and the worst form is when non-theological differences are being theologized, or when side issues become main issues. Sentiments caused by heredity, environment, personality and partial understanding are often allowed to dominate, and then to be theologized. It is important that disagreement due to differing temperaments does not become theologized. For when that occurs, little can be done about it.
5. *When there is disagreement concerning essential theological issues and about strategy,* it is important that the differences are made clear. The result of this may be that one has to refrain from close cooperation. If one is convinced that the other party is wrong but that, because of Jesus, he is a child of God and that the people he wins for Christ are children of God, then one should be extremely cautious of expressing public criticism. When it comes to strategy, to the question of who should evangelize where, one should not put obstacles in the way of others. Only that group or that church that think that they have reached all people, are allowed to think that they do not need the efforts of others. And even if cooperation is impossible - if everybody shows good will, we can coordinate, can't we?
6. *God is greater than our disagreement.* The New Testament, history, and our own experience teach us that God will not be stopped by our disagreement. If the believers in times before ours had postponed evangelization till they had reached agreement about all things, we would never have heard the Gospel.

#### **Some main issues**

Whether we are Jewish believers in Jesus or Jesus-believers of Gentile origin, it is a chief concern what we teach about the *Fall and its consequences*. If our doctrine is "Jewish", i.e. if it conforms to the generally accepted Jewish view, then atonement is made superfluous.

Whether we are Jewish believers in Jesus or Jesus-believers of Gentile origin, it is a chief concern what we teach about *Messiah/Christ*. If Christ is not the "Word" who was with God and who is God, then he is not able to make atonement for sin. If he is "no more" than a Jewish prophet, although the greatest, we shall remain in our sins.

Whether we are Jewish believers in Jesus or Jesus-believers of Gentile origin, it is a chief concern that the Gospel is preached in such a way that it is clear it is for sinners, not for people who have shown that they themselves have conquered sin. In continuation of this: that the Gospel is also for believers, because believers always - no matter to what degree, by God's help, they have been able to conquer specific sins in their own lives - need forgiveness for their sin. He who passes on the Gospel to a sinner is, at the same time, receiving the Gospel as a sinner.

In a network like LCJE our duty is not to evangelize together. If some do that, it is fine, but this is not our primary goal. We are in this network to inspire each other to evangelize, to help each other to think constructively and to be self-critical. We have been placed here to study together in order to keep each other on the road - we who only know in part.

In Jewish evangelism, we need each other. It is not enough to say Jesus. The main issue has always been: What kind of Jesus? Nor is it enough to say that Jesus was a Jew. The main issue is: What kind of Jew? Indeed, what a Jew!

?  
9/1/2000

## Discussion

Following the paper is much discussion about baptism for the Jewish believer.

Bill Bjoraker informed us that while he was in Israel, he heard that the Beresfords did say there had been baptized "unofficially." Kai understands this point was made to separate from the Christian church. Moishe feels that this case should be put behind us, that we should not use them as a cause celebre, don't use them for a precedent. Different stories are going around and they did poorly in court.

Kai says that Rabinovitch made liturgy for Holy Communion, but he could not administer it. For resources, see Susan. Kai does not necessarily get inspired by great Hebrew Christian scholars, but he is inspired by people like Rabinovitch.

Art says that it is good to be reminded at meetings like this of the importance of baptism. Glen Penton described the Russian laws concerning Jewishness. The nature of Jewishness (religious or ethnic category) changed with the basis of anti-Semitism. Moishe adds that passports had "religion" on them because it was felt that each group would take care of their own. If we accept the description that Christian is non-Jewish, we turn against ourselves. We need to leave the ghosts of the past in the past.

Kai said that some sources say Lichtenstein baptized himself, but not in the ordinary way so was able to be buried in a Jewish lot -- which means he could not have had a Christian baptism. Dr. Goldberg said his mother's reaction was that he "drove a knife in my heart," because baptism meant he had taken the final step to "Christian conversion." Philip was once asked by a Jew: Is baptism when they were branded with the cross? Ghosts of the past.

Bill Bjoraker feels the commitment level must be more sincere with Jewish baptism. But Kai says it is the same with Muslims; it is not exclusive to Jews. Susan adds that the negatives of baptism loom larger to non-believing Jews. When she saw it in Scripture, she didn't see it as an obstacle. Dr. Goldberg had been convinced with the theological necessity of baptism, but did not know how to deal with the community. Barry feels that the reaction has always been the same with Jewish people. If we could put the ceremony in a proper, Jewish context, it might become more acceptable. All these things should be put back into a proper, Jewish context. If you are communicative, and not confrontational, you can be heard. Redefine the present understanding of baptism.

There follows a sharing of different baptism experiences, and then discussion on circumcision and infant baptism.

Kai ends saying the purpose of the paper is that we can learn from history. Consider what baptism is all about. It is better to be in disagreement than to not discuss disagreements. Saying *mikvah* is the same as baptism is dangerous. *Mikvah* does not contain "in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit." Philip points out that *mikvah* was done to oneself before a reliable witness so Lichtenstein was baptized if it was done "in the name of . . ." before a reliable witness.