Adjustment to the Field. Rapid, authentic adjustment to the field is an important key to effective cross-cultural communication of the Christian faith. During preparation, and especially on arrival, the missionary family must be aware of this challenge. The problems of adjustment must be anticipated and then positively experienced. The number one problem is CULTURE SHOCK. Basically, culture shock is an emotional and mental stalemate brought about by experiences in a culture that contrast too much with the culture a person is accustomed to. No missionary is exempt from culture shock; everyone will suffer from it to a certain extent. Like most ailments, it has its own symptoms, causes, and cures. Some never recover from it; others live in a constant state of such shock; many recover beautifully. Positive handling of culture shock is the first step toward genuine adjustment to the new field and its people.

Culture shock is precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse. When the missionary enters a strange culture, all or most of these familiar cues are removed; feelings of lostness and frustration are not uncommon. Rejection and regression result and strange reactions are common. Some symptoms are excessive washing of hands; excessive concern over drinking water, food, and bedding; fits of anger over delays; refusal to learn the language; and excessive fear of being cheated, robbed, or injured. A sequence of four stages is common: curious fascination; a hostile and aggressive attitude; a superior attitude to the people; and gradual acceptance that brings enjoyment and understanding. The stage of culture shock in which the missionary family lives will have great bearing on its cross-cultural witness.

What can be done to reduce culture shock's downward spiral? Usually missiologists recommend three things: empathy, observation, and experimentation. Empathy helps missionaries get to know the people of their host culture, to feel as others feel. How missionaries relate to others is the basis of cross-cultural effectiveness. Can they trust others? Can they accept help from others? Empathy leads to a mutually dependent relationship that results in a nonjudgmental attitude. Intentional observation makes missionaries break out of their cultural cocoon and become alert to what is going on around them. Experimentation, or, in other words, "trying out something and seeing what happens!" is the way a child learns a culture, by inquiry and discovery learning. Like the child, the missionary finds out through trial and error.

Adjustment comes as the missionary family learns to cope with culture shock. Coping comes through building a knowledge background of the culture, which includes the language; through copying a reliable model in the new culture; and through creatively acting on one's best insights and making appropriate adjustments. Like any healthy learning experience, mastering culture shock is an enriching experience. It produces a deeper sense of human values; it conquers harmful ethnocentrism; it earns a freedom to constructively criticize; and it builds immunity to further serious cases. Those missionaries who have successfully passed through culture shock and have successfully adjusted to their fields of service emerge different people, in many ways healthier and better adjusted than before.

JUSTICE C. ANDERSON

Bibliography. J. S. Hofman, *Mission Work in Today's World: Insights and Outlooks;* M. W. Hubbell, *Who Me? Go Where? Do What?: The Missionary and the Mission;* C. P. Wagner, *Frontiers in Missionary Strategy;* T. Ward, *Living Overseas.*

Anthropology, Missiological Anthropology. The relationship between anthropology and world missions has been a long and profitable one with the benefits flowing both ways. Though for philosophical reasons recent generations of anthropologists have tended to be very critical of missionaries, much of the data used by professional anthropologists from earliest days has come from missionaries. Anthropological pioneers such as E. B. Tylor (1832–1917) and J. G. Frazer (1854–1954) in England, L. H. Morgan (1818–82) in the United States, and Wilhelm Schmidt (1868–1954) in Austria were greatly indebted to missionaries for the data from which they constructed their theories. Such early anthropological pioneers as R. H. Codrington (1830–1922), Lorimer Fison (1832–1907), Diedrich Westermann (1875–1956), H. A. Junod (1863–1934), and Edwin Smith (1876–1957) were missionaries for part or all of their careers.

The first of the numerous Protestant missionary conferences in the English-speaking world to include formal discussion of anthropological matters was the WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE in Edinburgh (1910). Roman Catholics led the way on the Continent, sponsoring several workshops on missions and ethnology. A notable center for ethnological research was established in Vienna by Schmidt, who devoted his professional life to researching, teaching, and writing on languages and cultures in order to help missionaries. For this purpose he founded the journal *Anthropos* in 1906 and the Anthropos Institute in 1932.

Though the influence of professional anthropology on missionaries was small during this era, some impressive anthropological writing by missionaries emerged. Fison with A. W. Howitt published *The Kamileroi and the Kurnai,* still considered a basic work on Australian ab-

originals. Codrington's *Melanesians* contributed to anthropology its understanding of *mana*. Junod's two-volume *Life of a South African Tribe* was years later still regarded as one of the finest anthropological monographs. And Schmidt's twelve-volume study of the origin of religion did much to dissuade the academic community from their commitment to an evolutionary explanation.

The most notable early British advocate for missiological anthropology was EDWIN SMITH. Born in Africa of missionary parents, Smith for three decades wrote and taught widely on African cultures. His most famous book is *The Golden Stool.* Two other British missionary anthropologists to note are W. C. Willoughby, who published *The Soul of the Bantu,* and Denys Shropshire, who wrote *The Church and Primitive Peoples.*

In America, with the exception of Hartford Seminary Foundation's Kennedy School of Missions, where Willoughby taught from 1919 and Smith lectured from 1939 to 1943, little was done to provide anthropological instruction for missionaries before World War II. Wheaton College (Illinois) had begun an anthropology department, and the WYCLIFFE BIBLE TRANSLATORS' Summer Institute of Linguistics, though primarily focused on LINGUISTICS, was serving to alert many to the need to take culture seriously.

Though Gordon Hedderly Smith had published *The Missionary and Anthropology* in 1945, it was EUGENE NIDA who sparked the movement to make anthropology a major component in missionary thinking. He used his position as secretary for translations of the American Bible Society to demonstrate to missionaries and their leaders the value of anthropological insight. His lectures on anthropological topics in the 1940s and early 1950s, published as *Customs and Cultures* in 1954, contributed greatly to an awakening within the missionary community to the need for and benefits of anthropological insight. By the mid-1950s Nida had surrounded himself at the Bible society with four very perceptive, anthropologically oriented translation consultants, W. A. SMALLEY, W. D. Reyburn, W. L. Wonderly, and J. A. LOEWEN. As these men worked with translators around the world, they demonstrated the value of anthropology. In 1955, Smalley took over the editorship of the bimonthly journal *Practical Anthropology (PA),* which Robert Taylor had started in 1953 at Wheaton with the aim of applying anthropology to missions. The writings of Nida, Smalley, Reyburn, Wonderly, and Loewen in *PA* were formative for a generation of anthropologically oriented missionaries working in the 1950s and 1960s.

From 1965 on, another stream of missiological anthropology was developing under DONALD MCGAVRAN at Fuller Seminary's School of World Mission. McGavran's first faculty appointee was ALAN TIPPETT, an Australian anthropologist who had worked for two decades in Fiji. The Nida stream merged with this stream under McGavran's next two appointees, RALPH WINTER and Charles Kraft, both anthropologists strongly influenced by Nida and the other *PA* contributors. These events of the 1950s and 1960s laid the foundations for validating missiological anthropology within the professional subdiscipline of applied anthropology. Important publications of the 1960s included Nida's *Message and Mission* and LOUIS LUZBETAK'S *Church and Cultures,* which focused helpfully on the dynamics of cultural change. Tippett's *Solomon Islands Christianity* showed how competent anthropology could be used to analyze Christian witness and practice. KENNETH PIKE'S *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior,* though long and technical, contributed important insights concerning the relationships of language and culture. Many of the *PA* articles were collected by Smalley in *Readings in Missionary Anthropology,* which was followed by *Culture and Human Values,* a collection of perceptive articles by Loewen.

In 1973, *PA,* then edited by Charles Taber, an anthropologist teaching at Emmanuel School of Religion, was merged into *Missiology,* the fledgling journal of the newly formed AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MISSIOLOGY. Tippett became the first editor. This journal has maintained a strong focus on anthropology.

Currently, anthropology plays an important part in the majority of missionary training programs in evangelical institutions. The primary attention of missiological anthropology is directed toward understanding the nature of CULTURE and the pervasiveness of its influence on those we approach with the gospel. A second concern is to understand the influence of culture on the missionaries themselves. To this has been added the recognition that since the Bible is a cross-cultural book, those who would understand and interpret it correctly need cultural insight. The articles in *PA* provided understanding of these and many other important areas.

Over the years, missiological anthropology has sometimes followed the vogues of secular anthropology, sometimes resisted them. Missionary anthropologists have found congenial such secular anthropological insights as the focus on specific cultures, the strengths of research based on participant observation, certain aspects of the functionalist emphasis on the internal workings of culture, the dynamics of cultural change, and the necessity to understand WORLDVIEW. On the other hand, certain secular emphases have stirred up the opposition of Christian anthropologists. Among them are the overextension of evolutionary and relativistic thinking. Early on, one

of Schmidt's motivations was to combat the simplistic evolutionary theory concerning the origin and development of religion. His *Origin of the Idea of God* was so successful that most secular anthropologists dropped the theory. Christians have not been so successful in convincing the anthropological establishment that though certain aspects of evolutionary and relativistic thinking make sense, they need to be balanced by the recognition that someone started things and established certain absolutes.

There are four general areas in which the insights of anthropology are enabling greater effectiveness in Christian ministry. First, the two-way flow of influence between missiological anthropology and BIBLE TRANSLATION continues to be significant, especially in the United States. Nida has had a lot to do with this. A second significant application of anthropology relates to the influences of culture on the communication process. Nida's pioneering *Message and Mission* brought this topic forcefully to our attention. MARVIN MAYERS, a Wycliffe translator who taught at Wheaton and later at Biola, both highlighted and broadened this theme in his important book *Christianity Confronts Culture.* A third important area of application is the contextualization or inculturation of Christianity. Kraft in *Christianity in Culture* creatively used linguistic and Bible translation theory as well as basic anthropology and COMMUNICATION theory to produce a cross-cultural perspective on theology. This book did much to show both that an anthropological approach can positively influence theologizing and that CONTEXTUALIZATION should be an evangelical issue, not merely an ecumenical theory. A fourth important area presently in focus is that of WORLDVIEW.

In addition, we should mention Homer Barnett's psychological anthropology and especially his ideas on cultural change, which have had a strong influence on Tippett and Luzbetak. More recently, the symbolic anthropology of Clifford Geertz and Mary Douglas has influenced the perspectives of Paul Hiebert and Sherwood Lingenfelter. Important recent books by missiological anthropologists include Tippett's *Introduction to Missiology,* Darrell Whiteman's *Melanesians and Missionaries,* Hiebert's *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries* and *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues,* Daniel Shaw's *Transculturation* (1988), Lingenfelter's *Transforming Culture* (1992) and *Agents of Transformation* (1996), Hiebert and Eloise Meneses' *Incarnational Ministry* (1995) and Kraft's *Anthropology for Christian Witness* (1996). A lifetime of dealing with the Bible in cross-cultural perspective is summarized in Jacob Loewen's masterful *The Bible in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (1997).

CHARLES H. KRAFT

Bibliography. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Social Anthropology and Other Essays;* S. A. Grunlan and M. K. Mayers, *Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective;* P. G. Hiebert, *Cultural Anthropology;* D. L. Whiteman, ed., *Missionaries, Anthropologists, and Cultural Change.*

Association, the Socio-anthropology of. Of vital importance to the church's mission in general and urban missions in particular is the study of voluntary associations or common interest groups that have accompanied rapid social change and URBANIZATION. Not only should mission strategists capitalize on this, but anthropologically speaking, mission societies need to recognize that they themselves exist as part of this phenomenon.

At least thirty different disciplines, including missiology, sociology, and anthropology, currently recognize the significance of this topic. Distinct from what social scientists call primary groups or involuntary associations, which organize around such principles as age, sex, kinship, and territory, voluntary associations are secondary groupings, which organize around the principle of common interest or pursuit. In general, all of the above are subsumed under the larger subject known as social organization. Whereas involuntary groupings have existed universally as fundamental to the nature of society, voluntary groups have varied in nature and distribution depending upon the freedom of association allowed in the societies concerned (*see also* SOCIOLOGY).

Mission agencies should carefully study common interest organizations as forms of social critique or dissent. This would help to surface some key perceived needs and tensions socially existing during the lifetime of a given association. In some contexts associations will exist as political buffers mediating between governments with their demands and citizens with their common desires. In other situations common interest organizations will serve to expand services that the members deem lacking in the society and larger world. In this context it is instructive to note that social scientists often classify associations functionally as being either expressive or instrumental. The former signifies that a group exists primarily to meet felt needs common to its members. Contrastingly, the latter is more extroverted in that its mission is to influence and change the larger world outside its own membership.

Additionally, a mission body should recognize its identity as a common interest, voluntary association and as such study itself in the same way it would analyze a target affinity group. This would function to heighten its own sensitivity and discernment, thus allowing it to better identify with and serve other groups.

An "association" can be defined anthropologically as any common interest group. An adequate theory of association should at least include such areas as: (1) workable definitions allowing for wide comparative study; (2) a knowledge of the formative conditions that give rise to organizations; (3) knowledge of common types and classifications of associations; (4) organizational structures; (5) assumptions, values, and expectations; (6) functions; (7) membership recruitment process; and (8) visibility profile.

The formative conditions of modern associations are best summed up under the rubrics of rapid sociocultural change and urbanization. In urban contexts associations often reflect perceived deficiencies of city life and the desire for the continuity of rural services such as ethnic identity, mutual aid, and bereavement support of minorities, immigrants, and migrant laborers. With respect to rural communities the growth of common interest organizations often mirrors a growing awareness of the larger world outside and a desire for elements of it.

Social scientists appeal to four major criteria in setting up taxonomies of associations: cultural domain, stated purpose, practical function, and organizational structure. Under *cultural domain,* groups may be classified as being religious, economic, political, educational, recreational, and so on. Using the criterion of *manifest purpose,* we might classify them as professional, welfare, pressure, prestige, or philanthropic. *Practical function* classification involves the expressive-instrumental dichotomy. Instrumental groups may be further classified as majoral, minoral, or medial associations depending on whether they serve the major interests of society, focus on minorities, or mediate between institutions, respectively. *Organizational structure* is the final classificatory criterion. Groups may be either corporate in that they are autonomous and representative, or they are federal, operating in a centralized fashion in accordance with the sentiments of their founders. In this regard, it is interesting to note that many associations ideally claim to be the former, but in reality conform to the latter.

A study of the core values and the associated assumptions and social expectations is vital in taking one to the very heart or ethos of a common interest group. Identifying and distilling these makes explicit the driving motivations behind any association. Further, it reveals two cardinal objectives of many voluntary associations; namely, those of influencing cultural transformation and cultural transmission. These are vital in validating an organization's current existence as well as assuring its future continuity.

How associations recruit their membership and the visibility profile they maintain in the larger society are two valuable lines of inquiry. It is in this context that the subject of secret societies is often discussed. Even though the existence of secret societies is almost universal, cultures do differ as to the significance and meaning they attribute to the values of secrecy and exclusivity. Whereas in one context secrecy reveals the fear of oppression, in others it may serve to safeguard sacred cultural knowledge or to reinforce special social statuses.

Another fertile area of research is that of studying common interest groups in Scripture, such as Israel, Christ's band of disciples, and the church itself. Technically, the church, while fulfilling the criteria of a secondary or voluntary association, could also be viewed as a primary or kinship group in the sense of it being a spiritual family with a common Father and culture.

Research in this area is of vital importance to the growing field of urban missions. There is also the need to identify and understand voluntary affinity organizations in broader national and international contexts as well. The recruitment process for associations should also be examined carefully to determine how one can effectively penetrate them for the sake of God's kingdom. Manifest as well as latent values should be identified, realizing that in so doing one uncovers the objectives that serve to ensure the organization's survival and impact. Such study should enable a more relevant incarnation of the gospel. The study of guilds, clubs, and secret societies in rural or traditional settings also has value for missionaries in terms of reflecting indigenous perceptions of the home culture as well as the world outside. Valuable insights about contextualization can be gained from study of the success or failure of local citizens' attempts to organize around new ideas and activities.

DAVID A. NESS

Bibliography. W. H. Brackney, *Christian Voluntarism in Britain and North America: A Bibliography and Critical Assessment;* S. Grunlan and M. K. Mayers, *Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective;* W. A. Haviland, *Cultural Anthropology;* P. G. Hiebert, *Cultural Anthropology;* E. S. Miller, *An Introduction to Cultural Anthropology; International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences;* D. J. Publiese, *Voluntary Associations: An Annotated Bibliography.*

Behavior Patterns. Christian missionaries have always concerned themselves with the behavior of other peoples. Disobedience to even the most basic of God's laws constitutes evidence of their sinful condition. Prescribed behavioral change affords evidence of their conversion. However, with the development of the social sciences, German missiology since the latter part of the nineteenth century and American missiology since World War II have reflected increased understanding of human behavior.

Most prominent in this matter have been the contributions of the behavioral sciences—sociology, psychology, and cultural anthropology (including linguistics and cross-cultural communication). As part of a process termed socialization by the sociologist and enculturation by the anthropologist (*see* CULTURE LEARNING), people consciously and unconsciously learn which behavioral patterns are expected and which are not acceptable in their respective cultures. It is these learned action patterns, as opposed to reflexive and instinctive patterns, that are of special importance to missiologists. Taking many of their clues from the sciences, missiologists have attempted to integrate new understandings with Scripture and the missionary experience. These attempts have not always been completely valid (indeed, social science theories themselves are in flux), but on the whole this process has resulted in insights into human behavior that have greatly enhanced missionary theory and practice.

Reacting to earlier psychological studies that emphasized the study of inner experiences or feelings by subjective methods, early in this century John B. Watson proposed that psychologists confine their study to observable behavior that can be studied by objective procedures yielding statistically significant results. While not agreeing with Watson's reductionism, B. F. Skinner nevertheless focused on controlled experiments and postulated a type of psychological conditioning called reinforcement. Skinner's learning theory is reflected in certain aspects of THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION BY EXTENSION with its programmed textbooks and learning. Behaviorism as such, however, yielded center stage to the humanism of Abraham Maslow and others in the 1950s, and Maslow's hierarchy of needs has exerted a greater influence in mission theory.

Of greater missiological importance has been the influence of anthropologists such as Edward T. Hall and linguists such as EUGENE A. NIDA. Hall proposed that human behavior can be understood in terms of ten "primary message systems," only one of which is verbal. Hall's overall theory has not met with widespread understanding or approval, but his ideas on the "silent language" and the communicative aspects of such things as time and space have captured the attention of American missionaries for over a generation.

Among missionary theorists, Nida has perhaps exerted the most influence in recent years. In addition to his impact on the understanding of language learning and translation, Nida has written insightfully on the relationship between belief systems and behavior, the symbolic nature of religious behavior, social structure and communicative behavior, and more.

As a result of studies such as the foregoing, contemporary missionaries can be far better prepared to deal with behavioral issues encountered when working in another culture. CULTURE SHOCK can be ameliorated when the missionary is prepared for the encounter with behavioral patterns that have meanings entirely foreign to her or him. Culture change is most readily initiated by discovering what is happening at the informal "imitation of models" level of learning, bringing it to the level of awareness, and introducing change at that point. CONVERSION is best understood, not first of all as change at the behavioral outer layer of culture, but at its basic belief system or worldview inner core.

DAVID J. HESSELGRAVE

Bibliography. E. T. Hall, *The Silent Language;* D. J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally;* E. A. Nida, *Message and Mission.*

Biculturalism. Ability to live comfortably in two differing cultural perspectives, crossing freely from one to the other as occasion merits. However, this ability may be conceived as ranging across a scale measuring the depth of identification. On one end, it simply indicates the ability of a person to understand both cultures, which might be termed *cognitive biculturalism.* At a second level, it refers to the ability to operate comfortably and without conscious consideration in each cultural setting. This may be called *functional biculturalism.* At the deepest level is the ability of the person to truly and naturally identify at the root level of both cultures emotionally and cognitively, which may be called *root biculturalism.*

While there is little doubt that short-term cross-cultural workers experience culture stress and some may experience changes in the way they view the world, only rarely if at all will they progress beyond cognitive biculturalism. Even though they may have many of the basic facts of the new culture, they simply do not have the time and exposure to internalize those facts as "natural" to themselves. Their biculturalism is generally limited to cognitive awareness and emotional attachment to their idealizations of the new culture, but only time and continuous exposure enable progress beyond that.

Those who grow up in a single cultural environment but who sojourn in another culture for an extended period often reach the stage of functional biculturalism. However, they can be said to be bicultural only to the extent that the new culture becomes a second "home" to them and they are able to identify with both cultures as "natural." For those who do not leave their culture until adulthood, moving beyond the functional to the deepest level of root biculturalism is unattainable simply because, as recent brain re-

search indicates, the windows of opportunity to identify at the deepest levels linguistically, psychologically, socially, and emotionally with the new culture have passed. Their level of adaptation, which may be truly remarkable and take decades to accomplish, simply cannot match those of indigenes in the second culture.

Simply growing up in a bicultural environment, however, does not guarantee the development of root biculturalism. Children who do not grow up bilingual, for example, will miss an essential element of the culture whose language they do not speak, and will not be bicultural at the deepest level. The children of missionaries are often bicultural at the functional level, but less often at the root level. The same can be said of immigrant families, whose children likewise grow up in a family of one culture but in an environment of another. At times in searching for their own identity they struggle to amalgamate elements of both cultures into a new "third" cultural framework unique to them as individuals, giving rise to the term Third Culture Kids (TCKs).

A. Scott Moreau

Bonding. In order to minister effectively in another culture, one must learn to communicate well with the people of that culture. But meaningful communication requires more than simply being able to speak the language; it also implies developing meaningful personal relationships within that cultural context, and a willingness to listen and to see life from the other's point of view.

The term "bonding" was coined by Thomas and Elizabeth Brewster in 1979 to refer to a missionary's deep sense of belonging in relationships in a second culture and the community's acceptance of the newcomer as an accepted outsider. The term was developed by analogy to the bonding that takes place between an infant and its parents at the time of birth.

Bonding with a new community can be facilitated by the new missionary's immersion in the life of the new community and society—spending as much time as possible with the local people upon arrival in the community, preferably living with a local family for the first few weeks or months. In this way, the newcomer begins to enter the community and to enter into the people's thought patterns, worldview, and values. It also enables the community to begin to know and understand the newcomer.

Bonding is facilitated by entering with a learner attitude. The one who is a learner is willing to be dependent on the people of the community and to be vulnerable with them. The learner role implies the humility to make mistakes in language and culture and to receive correction.

By developing relationships and gaining an empathetic understanding of the people's feelings, desires, and fears, the new missionary can adopt habits of lifestyle and ministry that can enable him or her to be good news from the people's perspective in order to draw them into a belonging relationship with God.

Bonding is based on an earlier concept—*identification*—in which the missionary was encouraged to enter sympathetically into the lives of the people in order to understand their way of thinking, and discover ways in which the gospel could enter in and transform their patterns of life. It is also rooted in a belief that the incarnation of Christ (John 1:14) provides the model for missionary ministry.

Criticism of the bonding concept has centered around three main areas: (1) questioning whether it is necessary or even possible for the newcomer to attempt to bond with the new community; (2) dislike of the use of the term and of the analogy with parent/infant bonding; and (3) disagreement about the relative importance of living with a family in the early days in a new community.

Elizabeth S. Brewster

Bibliography. E. T. and E. S. Brewster, *Bonding and the Missionary Task;* M. C. Chao, *PA* 7:1 (1960): 16–17; S. Granberg, *EMQ* 24:4 (1988): 344–50; D. N. Larson and W. A. Smalley, *Becoming Bilingual;* J. A. Loewen, *PA* 11:4 (1964): 145–60; K. McElhanon, *EMQ* 27:4 (1991): 390–93; W. F. Muldrow, *PA* 18:5 (1971): 208–21; E. A. Nida, *PA* 2:4 (1955): 90–95; L. E. Reed, *Preparing Missionaries for Intercultural Communication;* W. D. Reyburn, *PA* 7:1 (1960): 1–15; W. A. Smalley, *PA* 5:2 (1958): 83–84.

Communication. Communication is the missionary problem par excellence. The word comes from the Latin word *communis* (common). In order to fulfill the Great Commission a "commonality" must be established with the various peoples of the world—a commonality that makes it possible for them to understand and embrace the gospel of Christ. Accordingly, when Hendrick Kraemer sought to place questions having to do with the missionary task in a "wider and deeper setting" than that afforded by alternative words, he chose the word "communication."

From very early days the progress of the gospel has been aided by the communication skills of its proponents. One thinks immediately of John the Baptist's preaching in Judea, Peter's sermon on Pentecost, and Paul's ministry to the Gentiles. Jesus was a master communicator. However, a tension is introduced at this point because the New Testament makes it clear that human wisdom and communication skills are not sufficient to draw people to Christ and advance his kingdom (cf. 2 Cor. 2:1–6). Though the Lord Jesus commissioned the apostles to disciple the nations by preaching and teaching, he commanded them

to stay in Jerusalem until empowered by the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8). ELENCTICS, the "science of the conviction of sin" (Herman Bavinck), deals with this tension between human and divine components in Christian communication and is a pivotal, though often neglected, concern in missiology.

AUGUSTINE was perhaps the first to introduce secular communication theory to the church in a systematic way. Called as a young man to be the *rhetor* (legal orator) of Milan, Italy, he was profoundly impressed by the eloquence of the renowned preacher of Milan, Ambrose. Converted and baptized in 387, he returned to Hippo in North Africa where he became bishop in 396. Augustine questioned the Christian use of the rhetorical knowledge and skills he and various other church leaders of the time had mastered at the university. Taking his cue from the experience of the Israelites who were commanded to take clothing, vases, and ornaments of silver and gold with them upon their exodus from Egypt, he concluded that "gold from Egypt is still gold." Profane knowledge and communication skills can be used in kingdom service. Augustine then proceeded to write *On Christian Doctrine,* Book IV, which has been called the first manual of Christian preaching.

Augustine's work constituted an auspicious beginning, but only a beginning. Down through the centuries and especially for post-Reformation British and then American clergy, classical rhetorical theory informed homiletical theory and preaching methodology. Influential pulpits have been occupied by great orators familiar with the likes of Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, Cicero, and Fenelon. Only recently has the *summum bonum* of ancient classical education, rhetoric, been downplayed to the point that the very word has lost its original meaning and connotes flowery (and empty?) speech. Historically, both church and mission have profited greatly from a knowledge of classical rhetoric.

It must be admitted, however, that "Egyptian gold" came with a price. Ethnocentric rhetoricians of ancient times believed that if foreign audiences did not think and respond as Athenians and Romans did, they at least should be taught to do so. Until comparatively recently, Western clergy and missionaries alike have tended toward the same provincialism. With global exploration and then the dawn of the electric age, however, change became inevitable. In modern times monoculturalism has been replaced by multiculturalism; "new rhetoricians" speak of "multiple rhetorics"; speech theory has been eclipsed by communication theory; and communication theory takes into account not only face-to-face or INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATION, but MASS COMMUNICATION and cross-cultural, INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION as well.

As concerns the Christian mission, post–World War II years especially have witnessed great strides forward in this regard. First came the unparalleled number of cross-cultural contacts occasioned by the war itself. This was attended by numerous writings on culture, language, and communication. Among secular writings, *The Silent Language* and other works by Edward T. Hall had the greatest impact. But earlier contributions of Christian scholars such as HENDRICK KRAEMER and the postwar writings of Jacob Loewen, William D. Reyburn, William Samarin, EUGENE A. NIDA, and others also bore fruit. Nida's *Message and Mission: The Communication of the Christian Faith,* first published in 1960 and then revised, augmented, and republished in 1990, has perhaps been most influential in shaping missionary theory and practice. Authors of widely used texts such as Charles Kraft and David Hesselgrave readily acknowledge their debt to Nida. Written from his perspective as a marketing specialist, James F. Engel has contributed a comprehensive text highlighting audience analysis and media communication. At a popular level, Don Richardson's account of how the gospel was communicated to the West Irian Sawi tribespeople has had a significant impact.

Most widely used to illustrate and examine the communication process are cybernetic models based on electronic media. Thus classical categories (speaker, speech, audience) have largely given way to new categories and nomenclature such as source, message, respondent, channel, encode, decode, noise, feedback, and the like. One or another version of Nida's three-culture model of intercultural missionary communication is widely used to introduce important cultural components and highlight the relationship among cultures of Bible times, the missionary source, and target culture respondents.

For many years theorists and practitioners alike have discussed issues such as the best starting point for gospel communication (the nature and attributes of God or the person and work of Christ) and the establishment of common ground with the hearers. Current issues also have to do with the interanimation among language, cognition, and WORLDVIEW; the relationship among form, meaning, and function; the role of culture in special revelation and BIBLE TRANSLATION, interpretation, and application; and the relative importance of respondent understandings and preferences in CONTEXTUALIZING the Christian message. The significance accorded to the findings of the various sciences in these discussions, as well as in missionary communication theory and practice in general, serves to indicate that Augustine's "profane knowledge" problem is a perennial one. That being the case, contemporary theorists stand to benefit not just from his insight that Egyptian

gold is still gold, but also from his reminders that biblical knowledge is to be considered superior both qualitatively and quantitatively, and that secular approaches are to be used with moderation.

David J. Hesselgrave

Bibliography. J. F. Engel, *Contemporary Christian Communications;* E. T. Hall, *The Silent Language;* D. J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally;* H. Kraft, *Communication Theory for Christian Witness;* E. A. Nida, *Message and Mission;* D. Richardson, *Peace Child.*

Conscience. A term traditionally understood to refer to the part of a person which distinguishes right and wrong. Paul wrote about the reality of all humans having a conscience "now accusing, now even defending them" (Rom. 2:15). The Old Testament has no specific references to conscience. However, the foundation of the concept lies in God's knowing judgment of our actions and the consequent responsibility of the follower of God to be able to evaluate his or her actions and attitudes (e.g., 1 Sam. 24:5; 2 Sam. 24:10; Job 27:6; Jer. 17:9–10). While in the Old Testament conscience is seen more in the collective context of a covenant community, a more individualized and autonomous perspective appears in the New Testament, where conscience is considered a foundational part of every human being. Paul sought to keep his conscience clear (Act 24:16; 2 Cor. 1:12) and commended this as an example to others (1 Tim. 1:5; 3:9) even though ultimately it is God who is Paul's judge and not only Paul's conscience (1 Cor. 4:4). Some people have weak consciences and this must be recognized (1 Cor. 8 and 10:23–11:1). Others, however, have seared (1 Tim. 4:2) or corrupted (Titus 1:15) their consciences through willful participation in sin (see also Eph. 4:19).

The well known idea that Gentiles have the law of God written on their hearts (Rom. 2:14–15) does not refer as much to *content* as to *function.* Paul argues that the Gentiles' pagan laws functioned better (by both accusing and excusing them) than God's own law did in the hearts of the Jews (who only used it to excuse themselves). Here we see that conscience is not focused on content (*what* the rules are) as much as it is application of value judgments on actions and attitudes (*how* the rules are applied). Conscience "merely monitors the worldview that exists in our internal conversation" (Meadors, 114). Conscience, in this sense, acts as a moral restraint among all peoples, hindering a movement toward pure lawlessness, preventing cultures, peopled by sinful and selfish humans, from self-destructing. While the form and means of functioning of conscience will vary with the Worldview of the people, the fact of the presence of a conscience is a universal human quality.

What is the source of conscience in humanity? Sharing the Image of God, we are all born with the need and capacity to develop a sense of right and wrong. All humans, through the process of Enculturation, are given the rules their consciences require to distinguish right and wrong, albeit within the framework of their own cultural constructs. Conscience is thus a natural gift from God in all people and does not require a special work of the Spirit to be operative. Being part of the human makeup, it can be studied in its personal, familial, and cultural contexts.

The conscience has the function of producing Guilt or Shame when we have violated cultural norms. Though an oversimplification, it is not inappropriate to say that in an individualistic setting, *guilt* tends to be more operative—the conscience is internal, and produces guilt when one violates a norm whether or not others know what has been done. In a collective setting, *shame* is more operative—one shames the group and self through transgressions of group norms.

While no culture corresponds uniformly to God's kingdom values, every culture has vestiges of those values embedded within the rules, mores, and laws it maintains (*see also* Ethics). Human beings are not born with the values of God *already* in their hearts; they are born with a need for such values and the capacity to grow in appreciating them. As they grow, they are taught elements of God's values, together with cultural rules and regulations (*see also* Moral Development). These become the values which are applied by our consciences in evaluating our actions.

The concept of conscience appears in many of the major religions of the world, but conscience as an internal, universal human component appears to be unique to Christianity (Despland, 50). During the early stages of the modern missionary period, Christians observing other peoples and religions sometime disparaged them because of the perceived lack of conformity to the Western concept of an internal, individual conscience. This was built on the assumption that the development of such a conscience conformed to the biblical picture and was the hallmark of civilization. Western missionaries tended to assume that their consciences were advanced beyond that of local peoples, who they felt had little if any sense of right and wrong. They took on themselves the task of teaching moral scruples, all too often imposing new cultural (rather than biblical) values and belittling or trampling on local values in the process.

To understand the cultural forms of conscience is of critical importance in missionary work. It carries implications for Elenctics (the conviction of sin) as well as cross-cultural ethics. When we feel that another does not have a proper conscience, we are tempted to develop

one that matches ours. When we develop ethical systems, they tend to blend our cultural values together with biblical values, and may not make sense to our target population. In fact, in promulgating our ethical and moral systems rather than enabling the development of contextualized ones based on the local culture's reading of the Word of God, we develop a dependence mentality and inhibit spiritual growth, as Robert Priest aptly points out.

An approach to conscience which is biblical and culturally sensitive recognizes that (1) conscience is universal, (2) the indigenous conscience operates well, (3) it functions in its own context and in light of indigenous values, and (4) part of the missionary task is not to attack local value systems but to introduce people to the Word of God in such a way that they can see for themselves God's view of their culture through the eyes of Scripture. It is built on trust that God is at work in any people who call on his name; and that when they enter into a covenant relationship with him he is committed to enabling their growth as a body of believers into the likeness of Jesus (Eph. 4:7–16).

A. Scott Moreau

Bibliography. B. Adeney, *Strange Virtues: Ethics in a Multi-Cultural World;* M. Despland, *ER,* 4:45–52; G. T. Meadors, *EDT,* pp. 113–15; R. J. Priest, *Missiology* 22:3 (July 1994): 291–315.

Cross-Cultural Evangelism. In one sense any Evangelism involves crossing a cultural divide, since the evangelist must communicate spiritual truth to spiritually dead people who in their natural state are unable to comprehend it. Cross-cultural evangelism, however, has the added challenge of communication between people of different Worldviews and Belief Systems. As such, it is more often considered true missionary witness (whether geographical distance is involved or not) than is evangelism between members of the same culture.

Culture, of course, is generally seen as a society's folkways, mores, language, art and architecture, and political and economic structures; it is the expression of the society's worldview. Worldview has been described as the way a people looks outwardly upon itself and the universe, or the way it sees itself in relationship to all else.

For the cross-cultural evangelist, Witness involves a thorough understanding of one's own culture, the biblical context in which God's Word was given, and the culture of those among whom evangelism is being done. The message must be tailored or contextualized in such a way as to remain faithful to the biblical text while understandable and relevant to the receptor's context.

The late twentieth century has seen, along with widespread acceptance of anthropological insights, a flowering of respect for culture in missions and evangelism. James Engel devised a scale to measure people's understanding of the gospel and their movement toward Christ. It can be used to gauge the spiritual knowledge and involvement of both individuals and groups. At one end of the Engel Scale are those with no awareness of Christianity (-7), followed by those aware of the existence of Christianity (-6), followed by those with some knowledge of the gospel (-5). Conversion is numerically neutral on the Engel Scale. At its far end are incorporation of the believer into a Christian fellowship (+2) and active gospel propagation by the believer (+3). Bridging the knowledge gap often, but not always, involves cross-cultural evangelism.

At the Lausanne Congress on World Evangelism (1974), Ralph Winter argued that 2.7 billion people cannot be won to Christ by "near-neighbor evangelism" since they have no Christian neighbors. Winter said evangelists must cross cultural, language, and geographical barriers, learn the languages and cultures of these unreached peoples, present the gospel to them, and plant culturally relevant churches among them. Winter delineated three kinds of evangelism: same culture (E-1), culture closely related to one's own (E-2), and culture different than one's own (E-3). Winter's emphasis on crossing cultural boundaries to reach other cultural groups laid the foundation for the unreached peoples movement and the AD 2000 and Beyond Movement. Winter clearly distinguishes between evangelism (presenting the gospel to one's own people) and missions (crossing cultural boundaries).

At the 1978 Lausanne Committee consultation on "Gospel and Culture," thirty-three missions leaders and theologians drafted The Willowbank Report, which set down a detailed acknowledgment of the critical role of culture in missionary communication. Included in the document were evangelical understandings of culture, Scripture, the content and communication of the gospel, witness among Muslims, a call for humility, and a look at conversion and culture. The authors asserted that conversion should not "de-culturize" a convert (*see also* Cultural Conversion). They also acknowledged the validity of group, as well as individual, conversions (*see also* People Movements). Participants noted the difference between regeneration and conversion, the dangers of Syncretism, and the church's influence on culture (*see also* Gospel and Culture).

As evangelical understanding of culture has progressed, a number of innovative evangelism methods have been advanced. Noting that the theology of the Bible is often encased in stories, Tom Steffen of Biola University and others argue that Storytelling can be more effective in oral cultures than the Western-style cognitive teach-

ing approach. Baptists working among the Muslim Kotokoli people of Togo have found that storytelling can lower cultural barriers to the gospel.

Use of Western forms of communication may stigmatize the gospel as alien in some cultures. A cross-cultural approach advocated for SHAME cultures—some Islamic societies, for example—is to emphasize the gospel as the answer for defilement and uncleanness rather than sin and guilt. J. Nathan Corbitt distinguishes between hard media (media more concrete in format and presentation, such as books and films) and soft media (media allowing flexibility during its creation and use, such as storytelling, drama, music, and conversation). Corbitt says that to communicate across cultures, evangelists must "soften" their media—using local people and focusing on the process of Christianity rather than its specific products—to spark the greatest amount of understanding and communication within a community.

Some critics have questioned the effectiveness of popular evangelism tools such as the JESUS FILM and Evangelism Explosion when used apart from an adequate understanding of the culture. Steffen argues that before the Jesus film is shown, the audience's worldview must be known, the presenters must earn the right to be heard, the film must be seen first by the community's information gatekeepers, the presenters must grasp how the community makes decisions and must know how to incorporate converts into healthy churches, and the audience must have a significant foundation for the gospel. Not to have these cultural prerequisites in place, he and others argue, is to invite nominalism or syncretism with our evangelism.

STANLEY M. GUTHRIE

Bibliography. J. N. Corbitt, *EMQ* 27:2 (April 1991): 160–65; D. J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally;* T. Steffen, *EMQ* 32:2 (April 1996): 178–85; idem, *EMQ* 29:3 (July 1993): 272–76; B. Thomas, *EMQ* 30:3 (July 1994): 284–90; R. D. Winter, and S. C. Hawthorne, eds., *Perspectives on the World Christian Movement.*

Cross-Cultural Ministry. The theological basis for cross-cultural ministry lies in its examples within both Old and New Testaments, coupled with the universal nature of the Christian faith and the Lord's Commission to "disciple the nations." It may be further argued that the incarnation of Christ demands that we take culture seriously in ministry, because it is in the realities of the cultural context that the gospel is manifested (*see* INCARNATIONAL MISSION). Thus Gitari has written, "Jesus did not become a Jew as a convenient illustration of general truths. He came into real problems, debates, issues struggles and conflicts which concerned the Jewish people." The gospel requires specific cultural contexts in which to be manifested.

The missionary expansion of the church from its earliest days is evidence of the seriousness with which Christians have grasped and implemented cross-cultural ministry. In recent times the SOCIAL SCIENCES have contributed to the conscious acknowledgment of the importance of culture in relation to this missionary endeavor. EUGENE A. NIDA'S *Customs and Cultures* stated that "Good missionaries have always been good 'anthropologists' . . . on the other hand, some missionaries have been only 'children of their generation' and have carried to the field a distorted view of race and progress, culture and civilization, Christian and non-Christian ways of life."

The context for much nineteenth-century Protestant missions was that of European colonial expansion and this resulted in examples of the export of European culture and expressions of Christianity alongside the gospel (*see* COLONIALISM). The twentieth century witnessed first the increasing American missionary endeavor and the rise of Two-Thirds World missions (*see* NON-WESTERN MISSION BOARDS AND SOCIETIES). As a result of the internationalizing of missions and the GLOBALIZATION of communications (with its own consequences in terms of cultural change), the issues of CULTURE and mission are today even more complex. Complementing the recognition of the importance of culture in missionary communication has been an examination of culture itself from a Christian and biblical perspective. In the New Testament we find that Paul's willingness to lay aside personal freedoms and status for the sake of the gospel (1 Cor. 8:9–13; 9:22; Phil. 3:8) illustrate the primacy of the gospel over the messenger's attitudes and behavior.

Bishop STEPHEN NEILL has asserted that there are some customs which the gospel cannot tolerate, there are some customs which can be tolerated for the time being, and there are customs which are fully acceptable to the gospel. The Lausanne Covenant affirmed that "Culture must always be tested and judged by Scripture. Because man is God's creature, some of his culture is rich in beauty and goodness. Because he is fallen, all of it is tainted with sin and some of it is demonic." Bishop David Gitari has welcomed this emphasis that "*all* cultures must always be tested by the scriptures."

The relativization of the cultural expressions of the Christian faith has resulted in the popular acceptance within missions of the concept of CONTEXTUALIZATION, which aims to be faithful to Scripture and relevant to culture. Such an approach intends to apply the absolutes to which Scripture refers within a plurality of culturally appropriate forms. However, disquiet at the prominence currently given to contextualization

in missiology was expressed by Christians with a Reformed perspective at a Caucus on Mission to Muslims held at Four Brooks Conference Centre in 1985.

The practical expression of the Christian faith in a culture is a pioneer venture which is liable to the criticism that the true nature of the gospel may become distorted by SYNCRETISM or compromise. In the West there has been a debate between evangelicals and liberal Christians over how best to represent Christianity within a modern scientific culture. In the Muslim world, Phil Parshall's *New Paths in Muslim Evangelism* laid out the contextualization of Christian mission among Muslims (*see* MUSLIM MISSION WORK). This not only covered issues of COMMUNICATION, "theological bridges to salvation," but also the forms and practices of a culturally relevant "Muslim-convert church." Others have argued that the creation of separate convert churches and the Christianization of Muslim devotional means in "Jesus Mosques" (such as the position of prayer or putting the Bible on a special stand) fall short of the requirements for Christian unity in Muslim lands where historic Christian communities exist. This debate is a reminder that Christian mission needs to be sensitive to a broader range of issues than the culture of the unevangelized.

PATRICK SOOKHDEO

Bibliography. D. Gitari, *Proclaiming Christ in Christ's Way—Studies in Integral Evangelism,* pp. 101–21; C. H. Kraft, *Christianity in Culture;* Lausanne Committee for World Evangelisation, *The Lausanne Covenant—An Exposition and Commentary by John Stott.* idem, *The Willowbank Report—Gospel and Culture;* H. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture;* E. A. Nida, *Customs and Cultures;* P. Parshall, *New Paths in Muslim Evangelism.*

Culture. The word "culture" may point to many things—the habits of the social elite; disciplined tastes expressed in the arts, literature, and entertainment; particular stages of historical and human development. We use the term "culture" to refer to the common ideas, feelings, and values that guide community and personal behavior, that organize and regulate what the group thinks, feels, and does about God, the world, and humanity. It explains why the Sawi people of Irian Jaya regard betrayal as a virtue, while the American sees it as a vice. It undergirds the Korean horror at the idea of Westerners' placing their elderly parents in retirement homes, and Western horror at the idea of the Korean veneration of their ancestors. It is the climate of opinion that encourages an Eskimo to share his wife with a guest and hides the wife of an Iranian fundamentalist Muslim in a body-length veil. The closest New Testament approximation for culture is *kosmos* (world), but only when it refers to language-bound, organized human life (1 Cor. 14:10) or the sin-contaminated system of values, traditions, and social structures of which we are a part (John 17:11).

Cultures are patterns shared by, and acquired in, a social group. Large enough to contain subcultures within itself, a culture is shared by the society, the particular aggregate of persons who participate in it. In that social group we learn and live out our values.

The social and kinship connections that shape a group of people vary from culture to culture. Americans in general promote strong individualism and nuclear families, usually limited tightly to grandparents, parents, and children. Individual initiative and decision making are encouraged by the belief in individual progress. By comparison, Asians and Africans as a rule define personal identity in terms of the family, clan, or kinship group. Families are extended units with wide connections. And decision making is a social, multipersonal choice reflecting those connections: "We think, therefore I am."

Cultures are not haphazard collections of isolated themes. They are integrated, holistic patterns structured around the meeting of basic human needs. Their all-embracing nature, in fact, is the assumption behind the divine calling to humankind to image God's creative work by taking up our own creative cultural work in the world (Gen. 1:28–30; *see* CULTURAL MANDATE). Eating and drinking and whatever cultural activities we engage in (1 Cor. 10:31)—all show the mark of interrelationship as God's property and ours (1 Cor. 3:21b–23). Thus the Dogon people of central Mali build their homes, cultivate their land, and plan their villages in the shape of an oval egg. This represents their creation myth of the great placenta from which emerged all space, all living beings, and everything in the world.

Among the ancient Chinese the cosmic pattern of balance and harmony, the yin and the yang, was to be re-created again and again in daily decisions. The yin was negative, passive, weak, and destructive. The yang was positive, active, strong, and constructive. Individuality came from these opposites. The yin was female, mother, soft, dark; the yang was male, father, hard, bright. The decisions where to live and where to be buried were made by choosing a site in harmony with these opposites.

The anthropological theory of functionalism underlined this holism; subsequent studies, however, have introduced modifications. Functionalism tended to assume that cultures were fully integrated and coherent bounded sets. Later scholarship, wary of the static coloring, admits that this is only more or less so. Cultures are neither aggregates of accumulated traits nor seamless garments. There is a dynamic to human cultures that makes full integration incomplete;

gaps and inconsistencies provide opportunities for change and modification, some rapid and some slow.

The Dimensions of Culture. All cultures shape their models of reality around three dimensions: the cognitive (What do we know?); the affective (What do we feel?); the evaluative (Where are our values and allegiances?). The cognitive dimension varies from culture to culture. Take, for example, the view of time. In the West time is a linear unity of past, present, and infinite future; in Africa time is basically a two-dimensional phenomenon, with a long past, a present, and an immediate future. Similarly, cultures differ in their conceptions of space, that is what they consider to be public, social, personal, and intimate zones. For an American, the personal zone extends from one foot to three feet away, the intimate zone from physical contact to a foot away. For Latin Americans the zones are smaller. Thus when an Anglo engages a Latino in casual conversation, the Latino perceives the Anglo as distant and cold. Why? What for the Anglo is the social zone is for the Latino the public zone.

Affective and evaluative dimensions also differ from culture to culture. Beauty in the eye of a Japanese beholder is a garden of flowers and empty space carefully planned and arranged to heighten the deliberative experience. To the Westerner a garden's beauty is found in floral profusion and variety.

Whom can we marry? In the West that is an individual decision; in clan-oriented societies the kinship group or the family decides. Among the Dogon a man's wife should be chosen from among the daughters of a maternal uncle; the girl becomes a symbolic substitute for her husband's mother, a reenactment of mythical incest found in the Dogon account of the creation of the universe. Among the kings of Hawaii and the pharaohs of Egypt, brother-sister marriage was practiced to preserve lineal purity and family inheritance.

The Levels of Cultures. Cultures are also multilayered models of reality. Like a spiral, they move from the surface level of what we call customs through the cognitive, affective, and evaluative dimensions to the deep level of WORLDVIEW. To illustrate, the Confucian ethic of moral etiquette consists largely in making sure that relationships properly reflect the hierarchical scale. In China and Korea, where cultural backgrounds are shaped deeply by the Confucian ethic, the idea of *Li* (righteousness) makes specific demands at different cultural levels: different forms of speech in addressing people on different levels of the social scale; ritual practices; rules of propriety; observance of sharply defined understandings of the relationships of king to subject, older brother to younger brother, husband to wife, father to son. And linking all these together is the religious perception of their specific places, in the *Tao* (the Way, the rule of heaven).

In this process, cultural forms (e.g., language, gestures, relationships, money, clothing) are invested with symbolic meanings conventionally accepted by the community. They interpret the forms and stamp them with meaning and value (*see* SYMBOL, SYMBOLISM). Each cultural form, ambivalent by itself, thus becomes a hermeneutical carrier of values, attitudes, and connotations. Clothing can indicate social status, occupation, level of education, ritual participation. Foot washing in ancient Hebrew culture became an expression of hospitality (Luke 7:44). In Christian ritual it became a symbol of humble service (John 13:4–5).

This symbolic arbitrariness can either help or hinder communication between persons and groups. Jesus' reproof of hypocrites as a generation of vipers (Luke 3:7) would be a great compliment to the Balinese, who regard the viper as a sacred animal of paradise. On the other hand, his rebuke of the cunning Herod as that fox (Luke 13:32) would make good sense to the same Balinese, in whose fables the jackal plays a treacherous part. The Korean concept of *Li* (righteousness) can be a point of contact with the Bible, but also a point of confusion, as the Confucian focus on works confronts the Pauline focus on grace.

At the core of all cultures is the deep level where worldviews, the prescientific factories and bank vaults of presuppositions, are generated and stored. Here the human heart (Prov. 4:23; Jer. 29:13; Matt. 12:34), the place where our most basic commitments exist, responds to those divine constants or universals that are reshaped by every culture (Rom. 2:14–15). Twisted by the impact of sin and shaped by time and history, those internalizations produce cultures that both obey and pervert God's demands (Rom. 1:18–27). In some cultures, for example, murder is condemned, but becomes an act of bravery when the person killed belongs to a different social group. Other peoples view theft as wrong, but only when it involves the stealing of public property. Thus Native Americans, who see the land as a common possession of all, as the mother of all life, view the white intruders with their assumption of private ownership as thieves. When the Masai of Africa steal cattle, they do not regard the act as theft, for they see all cattle as their natural possession by way of gift from God.

Besides reflecting and reshaping God's demands, cultures are also the means of God's common grace. Through his providential control God uses the shaping of human cultures to check the rampant violence of evil and preserve human continuity. They provide guidelines to restrain our worst impulses, sanctions of SHAME or GUILT to keep us in line. Cultures and worldviews, then,

are not simply neutral road maps. Created by those who bear the IMAGE OF GOD (Gen. 1:27–28), they display, to greater or lesser degree, both the wisdom of God and the flaws of sin.

RELIGION, given this understanding, cannot be, as functionalism argues, simply one of many human needs demanding satisfaction. As the human response to the revelation of God, it permeates the whole of life. It is the core in the structuring of culture, the integrating and radical response of humanity to the revelation of God. Life is religion.

In the building of culture, worldview or religion is the central controlling factor: (1) it explains how and why things came to be as they are, and how and why they continue or change; (2) it validates the basic institutions, values, and goals of a society; (3) it provides psychological reinforcement for the group; (4) it integrates the society, systematizing and ordering the culture's perceptions of reality into an overall design; (5) it provides, within its conservatism, opportunities for perceptual shifts and alterations in conceptual structuring. This fifth characteristic of worldview, that is, susceptibility to change, opens the door for the transforming leaven of the gospel. The coming of Christ as both Savior and judge takes every thought captive (2 Cor. 10:5). When that divine work is initiated, people, under the impulse of the Spirit, begin to change their worldview and, as a result, their culture.

In the language of CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, the change wrought by the gospel is a threefold process: reevaluation (a change of allegiance), reinterpretation (a change of evaluative principles), and rehabituation (a series of changes in behavior). With regard to the change in the individual, the Bible speaks of repentance (Luke 5:32) and conversion (Acts 26:20). With regard to the wider social world, it speaks of the new creation (2 Cor. 5:17); the age to come, which has already begun in this present age (Eph. 1:21); and the eschatological renewal of all things (Matt. 19:28), the beginnings of which we taste now in changed behavior (Titus 3:5).

Peripheral changes run the risk of encouraging CULTURAL CONVERSION rather than conversion to Christ. The goal of missions must be larger, to bring our cultures into conformity to the KINGDOM OF GOD and its fullness. The whole of cultural life ought to be subjected to the royal authority of him who has redeemed us by his blood (Matt. 28:18–20).

HARVIE M. CONN

Bibliography. E. Hall, *Silent Language;* P. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries;* C. Kraft, *Christianity in Culture;* S. Lingenfelter, *Transforming Culture: A Challenge for Christian Mission;* J. Loewen, *Culture and Human Values;* L. Luzbetak, *The Church and Cultures: New Perspectives in Missiological Anthropology;* E. Nida, *Customs, Culture, and Christianity;* B. Ray, *African Religions: Symbol, Ritual, and Community;* J. Stott and R. Coote, eds., *Down to Earth: Studies in Christianity and Culture.*

Cultural Learning. The intercultural worker who desires to become competent in the culture of ministry must commit to intentional activities and to a lifestyle that results in cultural learning (*see also* INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCY). The best time to engage in intentional cultural learning is during the first two years of ministry (*see* BONDING). If the intercultural worker establishes good habits of intentional learning, those habits will carry on throughout the life of one's ministry and make a person much more effective. This brief essay highlights seven significant steps in the cultural learning process. Each can be accomplished within the first two years of living and working interculturally.

Language Learning. (*See* SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION.) Language learning is essential to the whole cultural learning process. Individuals who choose to minister interculturally and do not learn language will always be excluded from a deep understanding of the local culture. While some cultural practices can be picked up through observation of behaviors, the meaning of those practices can only be understood through the language of the local people. In many social settings in the world people speak more than one language. Intercultural workers may be tempted to learn a national language and then presume that this is enough to work among a local people. While the national language is important, the deeper understanding of a local culture requires learning the local language as well. The best way to learn a local language is to employ a local language speaker who has some training in teaching that language and who is willing to teach on an intensive daily basis for a period of at least six months. If such a person is not available, then Brewster and Brewster (1976) have provided a handbook of activities that the learner can use to pick up the local language. While some people find this method very helpful and easy to use, others find it quite difficult. Whatever method you choose, learning the local language is central to deeper cultural understanding.

Economic Relations. Since all intercultural ministry involves working with people, understanding the organization of labor, cultural conceptions of property, and social expectations for payment, borrowing, and exchange is essential to effective ministry activities. These activities are best learned by participant observation in the daily economic activities of people, and by interviewing the people, seeking their explanation of how and why they do what they do. Participant observation can be done while learning language. Inquiry into economic activities, which

are daily and ordinary, provides opportunity for developing one's vocabulary and deepening one's understanding of the daily life of people. Lingenfelter (1996, 43–96) provides a series of research questions that are useful in the collection of data on property, labor, and exchange, and in the analysis and comparison of those data with one's home culture.

Social Relations. Every community structures its social relations in accord with principles of kinship, marriage, interest, and other kinds of associations (*see* Association, Socioanthropology of). Understanding the nature of authority in family and community is crucial to framing ministry activities and working in effective relationships with leaders in the community. Several anthropological tools are very helpful in understanding the structure of social relations. Making maps and doing a census of a particular section of the community will help one learn who is who in a community and how they are connected (or not) to one another. Doing genealogies of selected members in the community provides a conceptual map of how people think about their relationships with reference to kinship ties. The map and the census become extremely useful to intercultural workers because it provides for them names and locations of people with whom they are certain to interact during the ministry. Lingenfelter (1996, 97–143) provides questions on family and community authority that help the researcher understand the structure of authority relationships and compare them with one's home culture and commitments.

Childrearing. At first glance intercultural workers might wonder if observing childrearing practices has any relationship to intercultural ministry. What they fail to realize is that the children are the most precious resource in any community, and that the parents of children invest much time and effort in transmitting their cultural values and coaching the next generation to become mature and effective adults in the community. Childrearing practices provide direct insight into the deeper values and commitments that are crucial for acceptance and effectiveness in the wider society. It is helpful for the intercultural worker to have intimate relationships with two or three families with children in which they may observe and with whom they may dialogue about the process of raising children. Because children have unique and distinctive personalities, the childrearing process also helps the intercultural worker learn how people in the culture deal with distinctive personalities. This can be most useful when one engages these distinctive personalities as adults. Recording case studies of how parents deal with a particular child over a period of time can be a very useful form of observation and learning. Interviewing the parents about their intentions in the process can illuminate further cultural values and understanding. Spradley (1979) provides very helpful insights on structuring interviews, and collecting and analyzing interview data.

Conflict and Conflict Resolution. The careful study of Conflict is one of the most fruitful areas for research on a culture. In situations of conflict people engage in heated exchanges that focus around issues that are of extreme importance to them. An effective cultural learning program includes the careful recording of case studies of conflict, and the interviewing of participants in the conflict to understand what people are feeling, what they value, why they are contesting with each other, and what their hopes are with regard to resolution. In addition, careful analysis of the social processes that people employ for the resolving of conflict is very important. Inevitably each intercultural worker will experience interpersonal conflict with national co-workers. Understanding local processes for conflict resolution will enable that person to proceed with wisdom and with support in the local cultural setting (*see* Lingenfelter, 1996, 144–68, and Elmer).

Ideas and Worldview. Because Christian intercultural workers are interested in sharing the gospel with other peoples, they must seek to understand the ideas and Worldview of the people with whom they work. These ideas are best understood by careful research in the language, by recording and studying the stories, and by observing and understanding the significant life cycle rituals of the local community. Research on funerals is probably one of the most profitable activities that the intercultural worker can do for an understanding of the ideas and deeper values of the local culture (*see also* Death Rites). Funerals engage the widest circle of family and friends of any particular individual. At these events people discuss issues of life and death, and act together on the beliefs that they hold with regard to the causes of death and the transition from life to after life. Other life cycle activities such as marriage, naming, and birth of children provide similar fruitful insights into the belief system of a culture (*see* Lingenfelter, 1996, 165–205, and Elmer 1993).

Application for Ministry. Cultural learning for its own sake is interesting and helpful, but for the intercultural worker it is important to practice the discipline of application. Each of the areas outlined above provides very useful information that the intercultural worker may apply to build more effective ministries. However, application must be learned and practiced. The application of cultural learning to ministry typically works through analogy. One finds a particular structure of authority and organization in a community, and thinks about the analogy of that structure to a growing body of

believers. One observes patterns of learning among children and draws analogies to learning among adults who are involved in community development or other ministry programs. Learning to think analogically about cultural learning and ministry is crucial for ministry effectiveness. Paul Hiebert and Eloise Meneses (1995) provide very helpful guidelines for application in the ministries of church planting. Marvin Mayers (1987) provides valuable insight into the application of cultural learning for interpersonal relationships and other kinds of intercultural relationships.

SHERWOOD LINGENFELTER

Bibliography. E. T. Brewster and E. Brewster, *Language Acquisition Made Practical;* D. Elmer, *Cross-Cultural Conflict;* P. G. Hiebert and E. H. Meneses, *Incarnational Ministry: Planning Churches in Band, Tribal, Peasant, and Urban Societies;* S. G. Lingenfelter, *Agents of Transformation: A Guide for Effective Cross-Cultural Ministry;* M. K. Mayers, *Christianity Confronts Culture;* J. P. Spradley, *The Ethnographic Interview.*

Culture Shock. The concept of culture shock was brought into prominence in missionary circles by the reprinting in the journal *Practical Anthropology* of Kalervo Oberg's pioneering articles entitled, "Cultural Shock: Adjustment to New Cultural Environments." In this article the condition is described as the result of "losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse" as we interact in a foreign cultural environment. Culture shock is the condition, experienced by nearly everyone at the start of life in a different culture, in which one feels off balance, unable to predict what people's reactions will be when one does or says something. It is a real psychological response to very real perceptions and must be taken seriously.

Though the condition can be serious to the extent of debilitation, it is an overstatement to label it "shock" (in the medical sense), as if every case were crippling. Many prefer the term "culture stress" with the recognition that serious cases can approach a condition similar to that labeled shock by the medical profession. The good news is that most people can survive long enough in another society to overcome at least the worst features of culture stress if they are determined enough and work hard at adapting to the new cultural world they have entered.

Four major stages have been identified as reactions to culture stress in the adjustment process. The first of these may be labeled the honeymoon or "I love everything about these people" stage. This period may last from a few weeks to several months if the person stays in the foreign environment. This is a good time to commit oneself to a rigorous program of language and culture learning, before the realities of the new situation thrust one into the next stage. Unfortunately, many return home before this period is over and write and speak very positively about an experience that was quite superficial.

If they stay, they are likely to enter the second stage which can last from months to years. This is the period in which the differences and the insecurities of living in an unpredictable environment get on their nerves, sometimes in a big way. For some this is an "I hate everything" stage. People in this second stage of culture stress are often overly concerned about cleanliness, food, and contact with those around them. They often have feelings of helplessness and loss of control, may become absent-minded, and frequently develop fears of being cheated, robbed, or injured. Not infrequently physical and spiritual problems can accompany these psychological difficulties and the cross-cultural worker's life becomes very difficult.

As Oberg points out, "this second stage of culture shock is in a sense a crisis in the disease. If you overcome it, you stay; if not, you leave before you reach the stage of a nervous breakdown." Or, as many have done, you stay but spend all your time with your kind of people, effectively insulating yourself against the people that surround you and their culture. Unfortunately, many mission compounds and institutions have provided just such a refuge for missionaries who never got beyond this stage of culture stress. To survive this stage you need to feed your determination, force yourself to be outgoing, in spite of many embarrassing situations, and plug away at your language and culture learning even though nothing seems to be coming together.

Those who survive the second stage begin to "level off," accepting that things are going to be different and difficult to predict while they are beginning to be able to function in the language and culture. They develop an ability to laugh at themselves and to endure the frequent embarrassing situations in which they don't understand what is going on. They begin to recognize that the people they are living among and their way of life are neither totally good nor totally bad but, like their own people and their way of life, some of each. By this time a person has attained enough facility in the language to function reasonable well in several situations so that sometimes, at least, things look hopeful.

Even with this improvement in attitude, however, discouragement may take over and lead to a kind of truce with the cross-cultural situation that issues in a "plateauing" or holding pattern rather than continuing growth and adaptation. Many stop at this point, having learned to function reasonably in most social situations, especially those they can control, and having learned to assert and maintain control regularly.

With developing facility in the language and culture, however, and an increasing sense of belonging, one may move to the fourth or "adjusted" stage. Though many of the problems of the third stage may remain, the determination to succeed and to master the language and culture coupled with encouraging success enable one to keep growing without giving in to discouragement. The key is to continue learning and growing, accepting the fact that you are attempting to learn in a few years a whole way of life that has taken the insiders many years to learn. Curiosity, a learning attitude, enjoyment of the process, and just plain determination are your best allies as you give yourself to the task.

Some (e.g., Dodd, 1995, 213–16) have seen the whole spread of reactions observed among humans under stress in the way different people go about the process of adapting to a new culture. Especially in stage two, they note that some dissolve in fright and never get over it. Others react by flight and return home. Still others develop one or another filter approach by moving into the escapism posture in which they resort to unhealthy attitudes such as denying differences, living in exaggerated memories of their home culture or going native. Others are determined to fight and may do this constructively, conquering the obstacles, or destructively by developing a negative, belligerent attitude toward the new culture. Those with constructive, fighting determination, however, learn to flex by accepting, learning and growing into effective functionaries in the new cultural world. These are the ones who succeed.

CHARLES H. KRAFT

Bibliography. C. H. Dodd, *Dynamics of Intercultural Communication;* A. Furnham and W. J. Lonner, *Culture Shock;* K. Oberg, *PA* 7 (1960): 177–82.

Decision-Making. A decision begins with an unmet need, followed by the (1) *awareness* that there is an alternative to the situation, an (2) *interest* in the alternative, and (3) *consideration* of the alternative. This consideration reviews both utilitarian and nonutilitarian issues involved. A (4) *choice* is made, and (5) *action* must follow to implement the decision. Action will require (6) *readjustment*. That, in turn, may create the awareness of further necessary changes, and the decision cycle is repeated.

Decision-making in practice, however, seldom happens in a simple, circular fashion. There are pauses and rapid skips forward and backward. There is no clear beginning or end in the decision process. Each of the identified stages must be expanded to gain a clear picture of the complexity of decision-making.

Improving Quality of Decisions. A Decisional Balance Sheet lists all known alternatives with the anticipated positive and negative consequences of each. The Decisional Balance Sheet will lead to improved decisions when seven criteria for information processing are met:

1. Consider a wide range of alternatives.
2. Examine all objectives to be fulfilled by the decision.
3. Carefully weigh the negative and positive consequences of each alternative.
4. Search thoroughly for new information relevant to each alternative.
5. Assimilate and use new information or expert judgment.
6. Reexamine all known alternatives before making a final decision.
7. Make careful provision for implementing the chosen decision.

Personality and Decisions. Individuals have been categorized as *sensors* or *intuitors* in their decision-making approaches. Sensors analyze isolated, concrete details while intuitors consider overall relationships. Intuitors have been found to have better predictive accuracy in decisions.

Other studies have suggested four personality styles in decision-making:

Decisive, using minimal information to reach a firm opinion. Speed, efficiency, and consistency are the concern. *Flexible,* using minimal information that is seen as having different meanings at different times. Speed, adaptability, and intuition are emphasized. *Hierarchic,* using masses of carefully analyzed data to reach one conclusion. Association with great thoroughness, precision, and perfectionism. *Integrative,* using large amounts of data to generate many possible solutions. Decisions are highly experimental and often creative.

It cannot be assumed, however, that individual decisions are the fundamental level of decision-making. In most societies of Central and South America, Africa, and Asia, no significant decision (individual or group) is reached apart from a group process to achieve consensus. In the more individualistic orientation of North American and European societies, group decision is often achieved through a process of argumentation and verbosity, with the sum of individual decisions expressed in a vote.

Group Decisions. A group decision is reached by accumulating emotional and factual information in a cyclical fashion. Beginning with a position accepted by consensus, new possibilities are tested. If accepted, those ideas become the new "anchored" (consensus) position; if rejected, the group returns to the original position, reaching out again as new possibilities emerge. The final stage of group decision is the members' public commitment to that decision—the essence of consensus.

Group judgment is not better than individual judgment, unless the individuals are experts in the area under consideration. Ignorance cannot be averaged out, only made more consistent. A lack of disagreement in group discussion increases the possibility of "groupthink" (an unchallenged acceptance of a position). A lack of disagreement may be construed as harmony, but contribute to poorer-quality decisions.

Higher-quality decisions are made in groups where (1) disagreement is central to decision-making, (2) leaders are highly communicative, and (3) group members are active participants. Clearly, achieving social interdependence in the group is prerequisite to quality decisions. However, mere quantity of communication is not sufficient; the content of intragroup communication affects the quality of decision. The more time spent on establishing operating procedures, the lower the probability that a quality decision will result. Gaining agreement on the criteria for the final decision and then systematically considering all feasible solutions increases the probability of a good decision.

Consensus decision-making groups show more agreement, more objectivity, and fewer random or redundant statements than nonconsensus-seeking groups. Achievement of consensus is helped by using facts, clarifying issues, resolving conflict, lessening tension, and making helpful suggestions.

Cultural Effects on Decision-Making. A group must have decision rules, explicitly stated or implicitly understood, to function. These rules vary with culture; thus a decision model effective in societies of an American or European tradition will probably not function well in Asian or African groups. For example, probability is not normally seen as related to uncertainty in some cultures. For these cultures, probabilistic decision analysis is not the best way of aiding decision-making.

Perception of the decision required by the decision-maker must be considered. What is perceived depends on cultural assumptions and patterns, previous experience and the context. The problem as presented is seldom, if ever, the same as the perception of the problem. The greater the differences in culture, the greater the differences in perception.

DONALD E. SMITH

Bibliography. R. Y. Hirokawa and M. S. Poole, *Communication and Group Decision-Making;* I. L. Janis and L. Mann, *Decision Making: A Psychological Analysis of Conflict, Choice, and Commitment;* D. K. Smith, *Creating Understanding;* G. Wright, ed., *Behavioral Decision Making.*

Dependency. Dependence is a necessary part of life, an inborn tendency which cultural, social, and psychological conditions shape. The real problem of dependence is not its existence or nonexistence, but the manner of being dependent.

Overdependency of any kind (financial, physical, emotional, or intellectual) may result in erosion of self-respect, inhibiting initiative in using existing resources and leading to imitative behavior that destroys cultural integrity. But dependency also may build relationships and knit a society together, strengthening individual and group security and sense of identity.

One-way dependency is negative, ultimately destroying healthy relationships. The person or society depended upon feels exploited, and the dependent individual or group grows to resent the other.

Such dependency reduces self-respect because of an apparent inability to do anything other than receive. Lacking self-respect, the receiver may reject familiar cultural patterns and imitate the person or group that is the source of help. The consequent change is often not appropriate, creating a need for more help. A downward spiral results that leads to psychological or social dysfunction. The group helped is crippled in their ability to care for their own affairs.

One-way dependency is an addictive process in which participants become co-dependents who are unable or unwilling to see people and things realistically. The addictive process takes control of participants, pushing participants to think and do things inconsistent with their values, including deceptive behavior, in the attempt to justify dependency and yet maintain the illusion of independence.

As with any addiction, everything comes to center around satisfying a craving. More and more is needed to create the desired effect, and no amount is ever enough. Perception of information is distorted and relationships become subservient to the addiction. There is an awareness that something is wrong, but addictive thinking says that it is somebody else's fault. No responsibility is accepted. Addicts tend to be dependent and to feel increasingly powerless. The idea that they can take responsibility for their lives is inconceivable to them.

This pattern of thinking is equally applicable to individuals and groups. Either can be addicted to dependency systems (economic, structural, and psychological) as strongly as to drugs.

Economic dependency has been shown to inhibit national development, yet economic dependency has been repeated in church-mission relationships. Both national and church dependency are characterized by a very few sources investing/giving heavily through an indigenous controlling elite. Fundamental decision-making is implicitly the prerogative of the donor not the recipient. Foreign assistance is large relative to the receiving economy. A large proportion of its

university students and leadership are trained in a few foreign sites, and a considerable portion of the aid is spent on purchases from abroad. The economic top 20 percent receive most of the funds, which reinforces their position, and the bottom 40 percent almost none.

Christian ministries unwittingly perpetuate economic dependency when they plead "just send money," separating funds from fellowship contrary to the example and teaching of 2 Corinthians 8 and 9. "It continues to make the national church dependent. . . . It often robs the national church of its natural potential. When easy money . . . is available, very few want to explore indigenous ways of fund raising."

Dependency is also created by imported structures, methodologies, and institutions that are suitable for churches of one culture but not for another area. By placing inappropriate and even impossible demands on the churches, those churches become dependent on the guidance of outsiders who understand the imported system. A form of Christianity is created that cannot be reproduced. Paternalism and its mate, dependence, thus may grow from the very structures of mission and church, not from some weakness in either the new believers or the missionaries.

In cultures of North America and Europe independence is considered an absolute good. A central therapeutic assumption in Euro-American psychology is that healthy behavior is self-reliant, self-sufficient, and independent. The in-born tendency to dependency, either individually or in the social structure, is to be removed as quickly as possible.

Very different assumptions are present in many cultures of Asia, Africa, and South America concerning dependency. It is two-way, part of mutual support, obligation, and reciprocity that binds the society by building relationships of interdependency. Life requires cooperation at every point. Dependency is not weakness but a part of the natural order where help always moves in circles, not in a straight line. What is given will return.

In a basic way, most of the world's people are dependent. Peoples as widespread as the Japanese, American Indians, Matabele (Zimbabwe), and the Malagasy (Madagascar) all accept dependency as necessary and positive. A reward is expected for relying on another, because you have given by receiving. *Amae* is a fundamental concept in Japanese social psychology, an automatic good expressed supremely in the role of the emperor who depends on others to rule and carry out every task yet is honored as the ultimate expression of the nation. Dependency is pivotal in the WORLDVIEW that underlies Malagasy society, and the dependency systems of India affect nearly every transaction.

Missions function within these two opposing concepts of dependency. Euro-American missionaries tend to regard all dependency as bad, and Asian-African-South Americans regard it as necessary and good. Failure to recognize these fundamental differences in attitudes to dependency leads to misunderstanding and alienation.

Gurian and Gurian provide a model that describes destructive extremes and the desirable balance. They note that a one-way dependency may result in entrapment, enslavement, helplessness, suppression, surrender, submission, and submergence. Total independency, on the other hand, can result in abandonment, estrangement, selfishness, narcissism, withdrawal, alienation, and isolation. True interdependency, a position in tension between the two poles of dependency and independency, can lead to continuity, bonding, reciprocity, mutual and healthy obligation, trust, commitment, and involvement.

Scriptures teach the interdependence of believers within the Body of Christ, not crippling dependency nor extreme individualism. Christian workers from every cultural heritage are obligated to build that interdependence within the international church, avoiding patterns that lead to either extreme.

DONALD F. SMITH

Bibliography. M. P. Gurian, and J. M. Gurian, *The Dependency Tendency;* W. Lustbader, *Counting on Kindness: The Dilemmas of Dependency;* A. W. Schaef, *When Society Becomes an Addict;* G. Schwartz, *EMQ* 27:3 (1991): 238–41; R. Wood, *Mission Frontiers,* 19:1 (1997): 7.

Disciple, Discipleship. During Jesus' earthly ministry, and during the days of the early church, the term most frequently used to designate one of Jesus' followers was "disciple." A central theme of Jesus' earthly ministry, discipleship likewise is a central theme that is to occupy the mission of the church throughout the ages as they make disciples of all the nations (Matt. 28:18–20) and then help new disciples advance in their discipleship in following Jesus.

Disciple. In the ancient world the term "disciple" was used generally to designate a *follower* who was committed to a recognized leader or teacher. In Jesus' day several other types of individuals were called "disciples." These disciples were similar to, yet quite different from, Jesus' disciples.

The "Jews" who questioned the parents of the man born blind (John 9:18ff.) attempted to scorn the blind man by saying that, although he was a disciple of Jesus, they were "disciples of Moses" (John 9:28). They focused on their privilege to have been born Jews who had a special relation to God through Moses (cf. John 9:29). The "disciples of the Pharisees" (Mark 2:18; Matt. 22:15–16) were adherents of the Pharisaic party, possi-

bly belonging to one of the academic institutions. The Pharisees centered their activities on study and strict application of the Old Testament, developing a complex system of oral interpretations of the Law. The "disciples of John the Baptist" (John 1:35; Mark 2:18) were courageous men and women who had left the status-quo of institutional Judaism to follow the prophet.

What then is different about Jesus' disciples? Jesus' disciples were those who heard his invitation to begin a new kind of life, accepted his call to the new life, and became obedient to it. The center of this new life was Jesus himself, because his disciples gained new life through him (John 10:7–10), they followed him (Mark 1:16–20), they were to hear and obey his teachings (Matt. 5:1–2), and they were to share in Jesus' mission by going into all of the world, preaching the gospel of the kingdom and calling all people to become Jesus' disciples (Luke 24:47; Matt. 28:19–20). In the Gospels the disciples are with Jesus, the religious leaders are those who are against Jesus, and the crowds or multitudes are those who are curious, but have not yet made a commitment to Jesus. The word "disciple" when referring to Jesus' followers is equivalent to "believer" (cf. Acts 4:32; 6:2) and "Christian" (Acts 11:26).

We should distinguish between the disciples in a narrow and broad sense. In the narrow sense we recognize especially those twelve who literally followed Jesus around and later became the apostles. We also recognize a broader group of Jesus' disciples which was composed, among others, of the large group of people who had become Jesus' followers (Luke 6:13), a variety of individual men and women (Luke 8:2–3; 23:49, 55; 24:13, 18, 33), tax-collectors (Luke 19:1–10), scribes (Matt. 8:18–21), and religious leaders (John 19:38–42; Matt. 27:57). The term "disciple" designates one as a believer in Jesus; all true believers are disciples (cf. Acts 4:32 with 6:2). The Twelve were distinguished from the larger group by a calling to become "apostles" (Luke 6:13). The Twelve were both disciples (i.e., believers) and apostles (i.e., commissioned leaders) (Matt. 10:1–2).

Discipleship. The initiative of discipleship with Jesus lies with his call (Mark 1:17; 2:14; Matt. 4:19; 9:9; cf. Luke 5:10–11, 27–28) and his choice (John 15:16) of those who would be his disciples. The response to the call involves recognition and belief in Jesus' identity (John 2:11; 6:68–69), obedience to his summons (Mark 1:18, 20), counting the cost of full allegiance to him (Luke 14:25–28; Matt. 19:23–30), and participating in his mission of being a "light to the Gentiles" (Acts 13). His call is the beginning of something new; it means leaving behind one's old life (Matt. 8:34–37; Luke 9:23–25), finding new life in the family of God through obeying the will of the Father (Matt. 12:46–50), and being sent by him to the world as the Father had sent Jesus (John 20:21).

When Jesus called men and women to follow him, he offered a personal relationship with himself, not simply an alternative lifestyle or different religious practices or a new social organization. While some of the sectarians within Judaism created separations between the "righteous" and the "unrighteous" by their regulations and traditions, Jesus broke through those barriers by calling to himself those who, in the eyes of sectarians, did not seem to enjoy the necessary qualifications for fellowship with him (Matt. 9:9–13; Mark 2:13–17). Discipleship means the beginning of a new life in intimate fellowship with a living Master and Savior. Thus discipleship also involves a commitment to call others to such a relationship with Jesus Christ.

Jesus' gracious call to discipleship was accompanied by an intense demand to count the cost of discipleship (cf. Luke 9:57–62; 14:25–33). The demand to count the cost of discipleship meant exchanging the securities of this world for salvation and security in him. For some this meant sacrificing riches (Matt. 19:16–26), for others it meant sacrificing attachment to family (Matt. 8:18–22; Luke 14:25–27), for still others it meant abandoning nationalistic feelings of superiority (Luke 10:25–37). For all disciples it means giving of one's life for gospel proclamation in the world.

Jesus declared that to be a disciple is to become like the master (Matt. 10:24–25; Luke 6:40). Becoming like Jesus includes going out with the same message, ministry, and compassion (Matt. 10:5ff.), practicing the same religious and social traditions (Mark 2:18–22; Matt. 12:1–8), belonging to the same family of obedience (Matt. 12:46–49), exercising the same servanthood (Mark 10:42–45; Matt. 20:26–28; John 13:12–17), experiencing the same suffering (Matt. 10:16–25; Mark 10:38–39), and being sent in the same way to the same world (John 20:21). The true disciple was to know Jesus so well, was to have followed him so closely, that he or she would become like him. The ultimate goal was to be conformed to Jesus' image (cf. Luke 6:40; Rom. 8:28–29; 2 Cor. 3:18; Gal. 4:19) and then live out a life of witness in word and deed to the world that Jesus is Lord.

John's Gospel carries three challenges of Jesus to his disciples. These challenges offer the means by which a disciple grows in discipleship to become like Jesus. First, true discipleship means abiding in Jesus' words as the truth for every area of life (cf. John 8:31–32). Abiding in Jesus' words means to know and to live in what Jesus says about life. Instead of listening to the world's values, disciples must listen to what Jesus says. This begins with salvation (cf. Peter's example in John 6:66–69), but involves every other area of life as well (Matt. 28:19–20). Second, true disci-

pleship also means loving one another as Jesus loved his disciples (John 13:34–35). Love is a distinguishing mark of all disciples of Jesus, made possible because of regeneration—where a change has been made in the heart of the believer by God's love—and because of an endless supply of love from God, who is love (cf. 1 John 4:12–21). Third, Jesus also said that the true disciple will bear fruit: the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. 5:22–26), new converts (John 4:3–38; 15:16), righteousness and good works (Phil. 1:11; Col. 1:10), and proclamation witness to the world (John 20:21).

No matter how advanced Jesus' disciples would become, they would always be disciples of Jesus. In other master-disciple relationships in Judaism the goal of discipleship was one day to become the master. But disciples of Jesus are not simply involved in an education or vocational form of discipleship. Disciples of Jesus have entered into a relationship with the Son of God, which means that Jesus is always Master and Lord (Matt. 23:8–12). Therefore, this relationship with Jesus is a wholistic process—involving every area of life as the disciple grows to become like Jesus—and it lasts throughout the disciple's life.

The church therefore is a community of disciples, the family of God (cf. Matt. 12:46–50), composed of all those who have believed on Jesus for salvation. In our day we have lost that perspective. Often people of the church feel as though discipleship is optional, that perhaps it is only for those who are extremely committed, or else it is for those who have been called to leadership or ministry. We must regain the biblical perspective: to believe on Jesus draws a person into community, a community which defines its expectations, responsibilities, and privileges in terms of discipleship.

Mission and Discipleship. We have seen above that a primary goal of discipleship is becoming like Jesus (Luke 6:40). This is also understood by Paul to be the final goal of eternal election (Rom. 8:29). The process of becoming like Jesus brings the disciple into intimate relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ, and, as such, is the goal of individual discipleship. But discipleship is not simply self-centered. In a classic interaction with two of his disciples who were seeking positions of prominence, Jesus declares that servanthood is to be the goal of disciples in relationship to one another (Mark 10:35–45). The reason that this kind of servanthood is possible is because of Jesus' work of servanthood in ransoming disciples. He paid the price of release from the penalty for sin (cf. Rom. 6:23), and from the power of sin over pride and self-centered motivation. The motivation of self-serving greatness is broken through redemption, and disciples are thus enabled to focus upon others in servanthood both in the church and, with other Christians, servanthood in the world. This is very similar to Paul's emphasis when he points to Jesus' emptying himself to become a servant: Jesus provides the example of the way the Philippian believers are to act toward one another (Phil. 2:1–8).

Through his final GREAT COMMISSION Jesus focuses his followers on the ongoing importance of discipleship through the ages, and declares the responsibility of disciples toward the world: they are to make disciples of all peoples (Matt. 28:16–20). To "make disciples" is to proclaim the gospel message among those who have not yet heard the gospel of forgiveness of sins (cf. Luke 24:46–47; John 20:21). The command finds verbal fulfillment in the activities of the early church (e.g. Acts 14:21), where they went from Jerusalem to Judea, to Samaria, to the ends of the earth proclaiming the gospel of the kingdom and calling the peoples of the world to become disciples of Jesus Christ. In the early church, to believe in the gospel message was to become a disciple (cf. Acts 4:32 with 6:2). To "make disciples of all the nations" is to make more of what Jesus made of them.

A person becomes a disciple of Jesus when he or she confesses Jesus as Savior and God and is regenerated by the Holy Spirit (cf. John 3:3–8; Titus 3:5). The participles "baptizing" and "teaching" in Matthew 28:18 describe activities through which the new disciple grows in discipleship. Growth includes both identification with Jesus' death and resurrection (baptism) and obedience to all that Jesus had commanded the disciples in his earthly ministry (teaching). Baptism immerses and surrounds the new believers with the reality and presence of the Triune God as they dwell within the church. Obedience to Jesus' teaching brings about full Christian formation for disciples.

Jesus concludes the Commission with the crucial element of discipleship: the presence of the Master—"I am with you always, to the very end of the age" (Matt. 28:20). Both those obeying the command and those responding are comforted by the awareness that the risen Jesus will continue to form all his disciples. The Master is always present for his disciples to follow in their mission to the world throughout the ages.

MICHAEL J. WILKINS

Bibliography. D. Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship;* A. B. Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve;* J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus' Call to Discipleship;* M. Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers;* R. N. Longenecker, ed., *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament*; D. Müller, *NIDNTT,* 1:483–90; K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT,* 4:415–61; F. F. Segovia, ed., *Discipleship in the New Testament;* G. Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*; M. J. Wilkins, *The Concept of Disciple in Matthew's Gospel: As Reflected in the Use of the Term*

Mathetes; idem, *Following the Master: A Biblical Theology of Discipleship;* idem, *Reflecting Jesus.*

Enculturation. Learning of a culture through growing up in it. Enculturation is the process that begins from the moment of birth in which the cultural rules and pathways, values and dreams, and patterns and regulations of life are passed on from one generation to the next. Every human being is born without culture but with the innate need to learn how to live as a member of a culture. Learning how to communicate, the rules and regulations of social behavior, evaluating events and values as positive or negative, as well as connecting to God (or the transcendent) are all part of the enculturation process.

The chief means of enculturation are the normal everyday patterns of life, which every person observes, interprets, and internalizes while growing up. The way our parents raise us, the way siblings respond to us, our spiritual and physical environments, the values we see in relationships and social institutions, and the media to which we were exposed were all factors in our own enculturation processes.

Missionaries have the tendency to forget their own enculturation and how deeply their own cultural values are embedded in them, and they are tempted to criticize inappropriately the process of enculturation as they observe it in a new culture, often because what they see does not "feel" right to them. Understanding the enculturation process is important for successful CONTEXTUALIZATION, for it provides crucial insights needed for success in the process of helping people of a new culture understand the message of the gospel.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. S. Grunlan and M. K. Mayers, *Cultural Anthropology: A Christian Perspective;* L. J. Luzbetak, *The Church and Cultures.*

Ethics. Christians can all agree, at least in a general sense, to the notion that ethics are in some way important for theological reflection and mission. Confusion can arise, however, as to what some key fundamental terms mean and to how discussions on ethics should be articulated. A brief introduction to the nature of ethical discourse, therefore, can provide a framework for a more informed exploration into the relationship of ethics to both Christian mission in general and cross-cultural missionaries in particular.

Basic Definitions and General Orientation. In popular parlance, often no distinction is drawn between morality and ethics. Within the academic discipline of ethics, however, these two terms are not synonymous, although they are related. The first concerns the concrete manner in which people act and order their lives; the second, on the other hand, refers to articulating the explanations and justifications of why and how people do what they do. To speak of "ethics in mission" is to deal with both of these aspects—that is, with the mundane realities of human existence and the theoretical foundations of behavior and values. This opening part of the discussion will focus on the insights that philosophical and theological ethics can offer into the nature of ethical reasoning. These might serve missiological reflection and missionaries facing complex ethical quandaries by helping to specify the nature of the issues at stake and by identifying at what point dialogue (or disagreement) and resolution (or confrontation) can be expected. They can also aid ethical discussions through fomenting more careful analysis of different points of view and solutions.

To begin with, ethicists differentiate among four levels of ethical discourse. These range from the spontaneous human responses to given situations (level one) to accepted cultural mores and unquestioned socialized patterns (level two), and on to more reflective debate on ethical principles (level three). Lastly, there is the meta-ethical level, which posits an answer to the ultimate question "Why be ethical?" Christians, for instance, in certain situations might react in similar patterns to others within their context (levels one and two). They may or may not hold to broadly held views of justice or compassion and make common cause on individual issues (e.g., abortion, POVERTY), even though the principles underlying their opinions and actions would be grounded in their faith (level three). Christians will necessarily part with others over the most fundamental grounding of ethical behavior (level four). For them, the person of God and the demands of the gospel provide unique motivations for individual and corporate life. Ethical interaction with those of different commitments becomes increasingly difficult as one moves up these four levels.

Philosophical ethics traditionally has categorized ethical reasoning according to a few classical approaches (Fairweather and McDonald). Deontology (from the Greek *dei,* "it is necessary") focuses on duty and making correct decisions in accordance with transcendent principles. Teleological (from the Greek *telos,* "the end") ethics focuses on consequences and desires to seek the greatest good. In contrast, virtue ethics centers not so much on the decision-making process, but on the character of the person or community; it highlights the nurture and formation of moral people. Each of these ways of formulating ethics finds echoes in the Bible and defenders among Christian ethicists. A comprehensive ethic would need to incorporate the contributions of each emphasis.

What is more, all ethical persuasions utilize a variety of sources (Verhey, 1984, 159–97; Wright, 1995, 11–178). All usually appeal in some fashion to human reason, conscience, and experience. Christian ethics do also, although the understanding and evaluation of these potential sources for ethics is influenced by belief in the CREATION, the FALL OF HUMANKIND, and REDEMPTION. Ethical stances can be linked as well to traditions of particular communities, which attempt to train their members to conform to certain values and lifestyle models. The church, of course, would be the locus for a specific set of traditions and provide the communities for the Christian. The conviction that God has revealed himself in word and deed argues for two other sources for ethical direction: the Bible and the Holy Spirit of God. These general affirmations, however, in no way should minimize the fact that Christians differ over the viability and use of these multiple sources. For example, disagreements surface over the ability of the CONSCIENCE to discern right from wrong, the nature of biblical authority, the relationship between the two Testaments, and the means by which the Spirit guides believers. A Christian ethic must be conscious of the breadth of theological formulations that would comprise a coherent and comprehensive ethical stance.

This list of theological issues, and the options taken on each one, are inseparable from a final factor to take into account: the impact of theological frameworks on ethical discussion. The three major theological streams that flow out from the REFORMATION—Lutheranism, Calvinism, Anabaptism—have developed different ethical visions. Over the centuries and around the world each has generated different kinds of societies and Christian communities. Each as well has proposed views which have determined how Christians have perceived their identity and their mission in the world. The positions developed vis-à-vis, for instance, the responsibility of the Christian and the church to the state, the essence of Christ's work on the cross, the relevance of the theme of the KINGDOM OF GOD today, and the use of violence, all inevitably help shape how missiology and individual missionaries comprehend ethical problems, conceive of what sources to appeal to in their ethical thinking, and decide among possible courses of action (*see also* CHRIST AND CULTURE). More recently, LIBERATION THEOLOGY has proffered a new paradigm of reflection and PRAXIS: the partial realization of the kingdom in the achievement of justice in oppressive situations. This theological construct, that begins from the perspective of the preferential OPTION FOR THE POOR, is now suggesting different slants to those crucial theological issues that must occupy any serious ethical reflection (Schubeck).

Missionary Cross-Cultural Ethics. In addition to the aforementioned philosophical and theological topics that demand thoughtful consideration, missionaries working in a cross-cultural setting can face the additional obstacles of having to deal not only with ethical issues alien to their own experience, but also with a context that might define and solve problems from another vantage point. A sort of "cultural-ethical" shock can result. Hence, the need for greater missionary self-awareness of cultural makeup and differences.

Missionaries should be cognizant of how their background and the host culture in which they labor compare concerning items such as the significance of time, the importance of social STATUS AND ROLE, GENDER ROLE differences, the role of GUILT AND SHAME, and the meaning of success. Each culture has its own orientation to life and structures the many institutions of its society accordingly. Missionaries can reject, substitute for their own, add to or synthesize with their own, the new ethical values and positions they encounter. The descriptive task of properly understanding this different ethical world, when joined with the virtue of humility, is the solid first step before any missionary attempt at prescriptive words or actions. The subsequent challenges are multiple. Legal implications for those missionaries who are foreigners are unavoidable, and wrestling with the possibilities and the right to act within the limits set for those from outside can be a source of tension. Missionaries must strive to be true to their faith and the biblical witness; they must be willing to listen and learn, to admit to inappropriate behavior and change biblical interpretations if warranted, and to have the courage and wisdom sometimes to take uncomfortable ethical stands. In sum, missionaries are called to cultural sensitivity and realism and Christian integrity, even as they try to avoid slipping into ethical relativism (Adeney, 1995; Carroll R., 1986, 1994; Mayers, 1987, 241–63).

An orientation to cross-cultural ethics that adds another dimension to the thrust of these comments is suggested by the science of ELENCTICS (Priest). This term (from the Greek *elenchō*, "to convict, rebuke"), coined by the missiologist J. H. BAVINCK, points to the issues of human conscience and guilt. The conscience is operative in all human beings (e.g., Rom. 2:1–15; 2 Cor. 4:2), but is greatly influenced by cultural norms, values, and ideals. The variability of conscience holds true for the believer and non-believer alike. Therefore, missionaries should be careful not to uncritically identify the content of their conscience with the divine will and to quickly condemn others whose conscience does not respond in the same way to similar situations. Once more, the necessity of self-awareness and the priority of the descriptive task over the prescriptive

are apparent. The New Testament teaches that God appeals to the conscience to convict humans of their sin; after salvation, the Scriptures and the Spirit of God work together to correct and renew the conscience of all who believe. Missionaries, then, should partner with God in touching the conscience of those who need to respond to the gospel message and endeavor to help believers to mature in their faith so that they might live with a sanctified conscience.

Social Ethics in Context. The distinction between individual ethics and social ethics for missiology and missionaries can frequently be a false one, even though the differentiation might prove to be theoretically helpful. Personal experience can bring one in touch with dangers of wider import. Good examples are the problems of BRIBERY, the experiences of women, and PEACE. Attempts to seek resolution and redress can lead into the labyrinth of government corruption, the ugliness of some manifestations of gender inequality, and the abuse of political power. All of these items demand not only theological clarity, but also wisdom and valor in the meeting of the pragmatic challenges that they force on those desiring to obey the will of God (Adeney, 1995, 142–62, 192–250).

The phrase "social ethics" many times is associated with certain kinds of issues that impact the broader body politic. If the phrase, though, is defined simply as the shared moral values and behavior of a specific context, then it ties back into the earlier part of the discussion. For believers, identity and duty are linked with Christian faith, tradition, and community, even as they are inseparable from the life of other human beings around them. The continual struggle for Christians and the church is to balance being faithful to their particularity and sensitive to the realities of their cultural setting and environment (Carroll R., 1994).

Another understanding of "social ethics" would relate the phrase to issues of social structures and processes. The focus is now on more global items, like how societies are put together and function economically and socially (*see* ECONOMICS). Interest is no longer limited to individuals—how they should respond to different social pressures or certain demands. Rather, concern is directed especially at identifying, analyzing, and evaluating the policies and practices of institutions, then proposing alternative schemes that might better conform to certain ethical standards. Topics include justice, equity, and HUMAN RIGHTS. Each touches the gamut of human communities, from the family to governments bound together by treaties in the international arena.

Regarding justice, debates revolve around whether it should be distributive (so that all get an equal share—an ideal of socialism) or productive (all have equal opportunity—an ideal of capitalism); whether the achievement of justice (however defined) for the whole can legitimate the possible deprivation of justice of particular individuals or groups; and whether and to what degree the state can intervene in the life of citizens to attain greater justice for everyone or for particular groups. Equity raises questions, at one level, of how the government carries out its duties and apportions benefits; it also concerns the call to the individual not take unfair advantage of others in, for example, work and judicial settings. The concept of human rights posits certain inalienable and irrevocable rights possessed by all human beings, regardless of the rulings and practices of any government. These rights have been inscribed in international agreements and are used to evaluate states which are thought to be suspect in their observance.

The scope and the obvious complexity of these social issues are indeed daunting. They require an informed and interdisciplinary approach: a sagacious and educated utilization of the social sciences and a thoroughly biblical and theological orientation. The SOCIAL SCIENCES stand as an unexplored and untapped source for ethics for many evangelicals. On the other hand, the Reformation traditions alluded to earlier, from the pens of their founders to the present day, have striven in different times and places to respond theologically to human realities. At least in many North American evangelical circles, a related quality of missiological reflection to meet the larger crises of modern life has not emerged. For several decades, some evangelicals have manifested a reluctance to entertain issues of systemic and global justice and human rights for fear of diverting attention away from evangelism and church planting (*see* JUSTICE OF GOD). Some also would warn of the possible danger of an interest in the social sciences replacing a commitment to the Bible as the final authority in ethical thinking. However one might appraise liberation theologies, that theological current has seriously dealt with these problems at a communal, national, and international level and places the theme of justice as the foundational criterion for all ethical reflection and PRAXIS.

Any evangelical missiological entrance into these sometimes explosive issues will require a mature evaluation and acceptance of pertinent elements of the Reformation heritage, as well as interaction with the insights from philosophical ethics. Contextual awareness and sensitivity must also not be forgotten, as missiologists and missionaries attempt to grapple with specific problems in the warp and woof of daily life in other socio-cultural settings.

M. DANIEL CARROLL R.

Bibliography. B. T. Adeney, *Strange Virtues: Ethics in a Multicultural World;* M. D. Carroll R., *JETS* 29:3

(1986): 307–15; idem, *Themelios* 19:3 (1994): 9–15; I. C. M. Fairweather and J. I. H. McDonald, *The Quest for Christian Ethics: An Inquiry into Ethics and Christians Ethics;* M. K. Mayers, *Christianity Confronts Culture: A Strategy for Cross-cultural Evangelism;* R. J. Priest, *Missiology* 22:3 (1994): 291–315; T. L. Schubeck, *Liberation Ethics: Sources, Models, and Norms;* A. Verhey, *The Great Reversal: Ethics and the New Testament;* Christopher J. H. Wright, *Walking in the Ways of the Lord: The Ethical Authority of the Old Testament.*

Ethnocentrism. The term "ethnocentrism" may simply be defined as the belief that one's own people group or cultural ways are superior to others. An ethnocentric person generally has an attitude/opinion of prejudice (prejudging others as inferior). This internal orientation may be manifested in individual action or institutionalized policy toward others as in the case of anti-Semitism, apartheid, bigotry, fascism, and racism.

Prejudice or discrimination in a scientific sense can be both positive and negative. However, in the social sciences, including missiology, the terms are generally used with a negative connotation. It is necessary to distinguish between the two: prejudice is an attitude; discrimination is action or social interaction unfavorable to others on the basis of their religious, ethnic, or racial membership.

Prejudice is the subjective prejudgment of others to be inferior, whereas ethnocentrism is the subjective presumption that one's own people-group or cultural ways are superior. Bigotry (i.e., narrow-mindedness or intolerance due to differences between self and others) and racism (i.e., the presumed cultural superiority or inferiority as caused by genetically inherited physical characteristics such as facial feature, skin color, etc.) are two general forms of prejudice.

Institutionalized manifestation of ethnocentrism and prejudice can be found in specific cases historically. Fascism (i.e., authoritarian nationalism) of Benito Mussolini, which emerged in the 1920s in Italy, and Adolf Hitler's control of Germany in the 1930s are cases in point. Hitler's belief in the superiority and purity of his own kind gave impetus to anti-Semitic measures that led to the holocaust of the Jews. The black and white racial conflicts in the United States and South Africa are examples of institutionalized manifestation of ethnocentrism and prejudice.

Ethnocentrism is Contrabiblical to Mission. Mission is the divine design of bringing spiritual blessings to all nations, reflected in God's covenant with Abraham (Gen. 12) and Christ's GREAT COMMISSION to bring the gospel to all nations. God's desire is that none should perish but all should come to repentance (2 Peter 3:9).

Ethnocentric pride of many Jews prevented them from performing their duties as God's choice instruments of grace to the nations (Rom. 7–9). The apostles had difficulty in following the resurrected Christ's command to bear witness to the nations (Acts 1:9) Even during persecution they persisted in evangelizing only their own kind (Acts 11:19).

The detailed description of the Holy Spirit's directing Peter toward the Roman official Cornelius in Acts 10 is very telling regarding ethnocentrism and mission. The Holy Spirit prepared Peter personally by leading him to lodge at Simon's house (cf. the Jewish ceremonial law of Lev. 11) prior to giving visions and directions to both Peter and Cornelius. Later Peter came to a new understanding: "I now realize how true it is that God does not show favoritism and accepts men from every nation" (Acts 19:34–35). When witnessing the "Gentile pentecost," the Jewish Christians "were astonished that the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles" (10:44–45).

Ethnocentrism is Counterproductive in Missions. "Missions" are the ways and means whereby the Christian church fulfills its mission of world evangelization. INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION, CROSS-CULTURAL MINISTRY, and CHURCH PLANTING are parts of the process of world evangelization. At any of these points ethnocentrism can curtail or cripple efforts in missions.

Persons with an ethnocentric orientation have difficulty developing a genuine social relationship with members outside their group. While we must recognize that no one is entirely without prejudice or ethnocentrism of some kind, ethnocentrism in the Christian inhibits obedience to the GREAT COMMANDMENT ("love your neighbor as yourself") and the Great Commission. Ethnocentrism is a significant obstacle to missionaries serving as messengers of the "gospel of reconciliation" (2 Cor. 5).

The ethnocentric Western Christian has the tendency to presuppose a "guilt feeling" in the audience in talking about justification, atonement, and so on. People from a shame culture (*see* SHAME; avoid embarrassment and "losing face" at all cost and acquire honor and "save face" by all means) may be more ready to appreciate and accept Christ as the "Mediator, Shamebearer, Reconcilor" (Rom. 5; 2 Cor. 5; Eph. 2; Heb. 9; etc.)

Some Western Christians are predisposed to the use of informational/impersonal evangelistic means of the technological society as compared to oral and mostly relational cultures of the target group. The understanding of "limited cultural relativism" (viewing cultural ways as relative, an antidote to "ethnocentrism") will enable Christians to adapt to new cultural contexts with the relevant gospel message and flexible evangelistic methods.

Ethnocentrism Still Inhibits Missions. Martin Luther despised the Book of James as "the

straw epistle" and preferred Romans and Galatians. This is a historical example showing the power of prejudice. His pattern of preferential treatment of different books of the Bible can still be found in modern missions in prioritizing Bible books for translation. In a similar manner, cross-cultural church planters may disregard the cultural context of the target ethnic groups and persist in imposing their own Christian tradition on new converts in terms of worship and preaching style, discipleship programs, and church policy.

At a personal level, missionaries may not be completely free from ethnocentrism in their attitude, etiquette, and action. All missionaries must be willing to ask themselves on a regular basis if they are displaying ethnocentric attitudes in what they communicate by the very way they live.

Enoch Wan

Bibliography. W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice;* J. D. Dovidio and S. L. Gaertner, *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism;* P. Jackson, ed., *Race and Racism: Essays in Social Geography;* D. Kitagawa, *Race Relations and Christian Mission;* R. A. LeVine and D. T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior;* V. Reynolds, et al., eds., *The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism.*

Extent of Missionary Identification. Missionary identification pervades all levels of the missionary task. A complex concept, effective missionary identification lies at the heart of making Christ known across cultures and involves all that we are as human beings. A superficial missionary identification merely imitates the local customs of a people hoping to gain access for a hearing of the gospel. With time, however, the receiving culture will recognize such identification as a gimmick. As Nida notes, the goal is not to "propagandize people into the kingdom" but to identify with them so as to communicate more clearly with them. This can only come about by being with them where they are and working *with* them rather than *for* them.

Historically rooted in anthropological research techniques where the researcher studied his or her "subjects" in their own context, identification was recognized as a means of increasing insights, sympathy, and influence among the people under study. The sensitive missionary, however, goes further and benefits more deeply by becoming subjectively involved with the people among whom he or she ministers. Recognizing that the final decision for Christ lies with the hearer, not the advocate, early concepts for missionary identification called for the missionary to work in light of human social institutions and the associated means to make decisions in the local setting when presenting the gospel.

Contemporary missiology presents missionary identification based on an incarnational model for ministry (*see* Incarnational Mission). The model functions within three main arenas: the life of the missionary, the message itself, and the medium or forms that convey the message.

The first arena, the missionary's lifestyle, fosters the most powerful means of identification. The missionary seeks to become a full participant in the host society. Recognizing the reality of misunderstanding, the missionary enters the new culture as a learner rather than teacher. He or she is open to genuinely sharing his or her own cultural background. Thus, the missionary becomes a type of culture-broker living between two worlds, transmitting information from one to the other, bringing the gospel from without and giving from one cultural context to contemporary yet culturally different recipients. The goal of identification is to achieve a cross-cultural understanding in order to effectively communicate the message of Christ. The result of participating deeply in another culture forces one to think in new ways and recognize differing views of reality. In doing so, the missionary becomes a "bicultural" person with a broader vision that enables the ability to pull away from the home culture and work meaningfully in the new one (*see* Biculturalism). Incarnational missionaries thus develop a new cultural framework based on the two cultures known to them, allowing more effective ministry in the host culture. Additionally, they often find new perceptions about their home culture.

Inherent to the goal of living in two worlds as a bicultural person is the danger of rejection of one of our two worlds. We may either reject the culture in which we are ministering or reject our own culture by "going native." Neither of these options is helpful to the missionary personally or professionally. The first option denies the validity of the people with whom we are ministering. The second option denies the fact that we will always be seen as outsiders. Our goal is to learn to accept what is true and good in *all* cultures and to critique what is false and evil in each of them based on deeply rooted biblical truth.

The practice of incarnational missionary identification functions on three levels: (1) lifestyle—external identification in terms of language, dress, food, patterns of courtesy, use of local transportation, and housing; (2) willingness to serve alongside and eventually under a local leader; (3) inner identification, the deepest of all levels. Attitudes of dignity, respect, and trust speak of our genuine love for the people with whom we minister. Genuinely deep love forms both the foundation and capstone for all levels of identification.

The second arena for missionary identification deals with the content and presentation of the

message. Drawing from COMMUNICATION theory, the missionary is encouraged to adopt the receptor's frame of reference where one becomes familiar with the conceptual framework of the receptor and attempts to fit communication of the message within the categories and felt needs of the receptor's WORLDVIEW. Thus, the message is presented in a way that "scratches where the hearer itches." Jesus demonstrated this when he spoke to the woman at the well about living water and her background. He also dealt with Nicodemus on his own Pharasaic terms. He interacted differently with Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1–10), the rich young ruler (Mark 10:21), and the demoniac (Luke 8:38–39). Furthermore, the apostle Paul followed Jesus' example when he determined to be Jewish or Greek depending on his audience (1 Cor. 9:19–22), clearly seen in his address to the Athenians (Acts 17:22–31).

The third arena for missionary identification lies in the development of the forms and media for conveying the gospel message. The missionary who has not learned the beliefs, feelings, and values of a culture will often fail to recognize the most appropriate methods for communicating Christ. There is the continued danger of simple translation of Western books, songs, drama, and films. As Tippett suggested, "the first step in identification is to accept as many indigenous forms and procedures as can legitimately be retained as Christian." Although the cost in time and effort to pursue such CONTEXTUALIZATION of the gospel is great, it does not match the cost and threat of miscommunicating the gospel. A syncretistic acceptance of the gospel and stilted or stunted churches easily result from lack of identification on this level.

Missionary identification today is not an option: it is an imperative. Historically, one of the results of poor missionary identification has been the national outcry of "Missionary go home!" We must learn from our mistakes and move ahead with greater determination, especially in light of modernity's more complex degree of multiculturalism. In spite of our tendency to work at external identification, people still need to experience love on deeper levels. Missionaries must incarnate themselves by recognizing and working within the individual needs and social contexts of peoples.

ROBERTA R. KING

Bibliography. K. Bediako, *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion;* P. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries;* C. H. Kraft, *Christianity in Culture;* E. Nida, *Message and Mission: The Communication of the Faith;* P. Parshall, *New Paths in Muslim Evangelism;* A. Tippett, *Introduction to Missiology.*

Friendship Evangelism. Evangelism that emphasizes the crucial role that relationships play in constructing a platform from which the gospel can be communicated effectively. In this approach, friendships are not conceived of as supplanting the gospel. They are bridges over which the gospel may be delivered and received.

This approach is also commonly known as LIFESTYLE EVANGELISM. It highlights the necessity of living out the Christian life in a consistent and winsome manner in the context of family and friendships. This is foundational to the companion step of proclaiming the gospel. A living demonstration of the gospel must go together with its proclamation. This is particularly true in friendship evangelism. The foundational premise is that a lifestyle of obedience to the lordship of Christ makes one's verbal witness credible.

The biblical basis for sharing the gospel along lines established by friendships and intimates is strong. The example of Jesus is instructive. He was known as a friend of sinners (Matt. 11:19). Yet for that reason the multitudes heard him gladly. The earliest disciples of Jesus were won along such webs of relationships. John the Baptist pointed two of his disciples and friends to the Lord. One of these, Andrew, immediately sought his brother, Peter. Philip, a likely friend of Andrew and Peter, was the next convert. In turn, Philip found his friend Nathanael and brought him to the Lord (John 1:35ff.). After Jesus had healed the Gadarene demoniac he instructed him, "Go home to your family, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and how he has had mercy on you" (Mark 5:19 [NIV]). In the Book of Acts the account of the Gentile centurion Cornelius illustrates this same principle. This seeker gathered together his extended family and close friends to hear the message that Peter was commissioned to share with him (Acts 10:24).

The advantages of friendship evangelism are significant. First, it makes use of the most natural avenue for the spread of the gospel. The close emotional and physical proximity of unbelieving intimates provides ample opportunities for witness. Second, the unbeliever who has observed a wholesome Christian witness from a personal friend is much more likely to receive the message of salvation and become a disciple.

Dangers are also inherent in this method. It is possible to allow the friendship factor to supplant a clear presentation of the demands of the gospel. A good testimony, as invaluable as it is, can never take the place of the gospel message in the process of salvation (Rom. 1:16). Also, one might be tempted to neglect strangers or slight acquaintances who need the gospel in favor of investing exclusively in closer friends.

The Christian has no right to limit obedience to the GREAT COMMISSION to a select circle. Nevertheless, believers should be cognizant of their responsibility to share the gospel with their friends and intimates. Even more, Christians of all cul-

tures should be intentional in cultivating genuine friendships with unbelievers.

Jeffery B. Ginn

Bibliography. J. Aldrich, *Life-Style Evangelism: Crossing Traditional Boundaries to Reach the Unbelieving World;* D. Owens, *Sharing Christ When You Feel You Can't: Making It Easier to Tell Your Friends and Family about Your Faith in Christ;* T. Stebbens, *Friendship Evangelism by the Book;* C. Van Engen, *You Are My Witnesses.*

Gender Roles. The term "gender" refers to the nonbiological, social, cultural, and psychological aspect of being male or female. Gender roles reflect the cultural norms of the society and can be defined as the learned or socialized differences in behavior between male and female. Society's definition of feminine and masculine gender role expectations has changed throughout history and there continues to be pressure for the redefining of gender roles. Few areas of inquiry are so fraught with personal biases as the gender-role related characteristics of men and women. Though formerly research in this area was done primarily by men, a large number of research-trained women are now involved and new insights have resulted.

All societies provide institutionalized gender-appropriate roles. In some societies moving into womanhood requires special ritual and celebration for girls, often perceived as preparation for marriage. Gilmore (1990), who has researched the approved way of being an adult male in many societies around the world, sees manhood as generally needing to be achieved. It is a precarious state that boys must win against powerful odds and that can be diminished or lost as well. It involves conceptually separating adult males from the women and girls in society. Womanhood, in contrast, he sees as a natural condition that happens through biological maturation and is culturally refined or augmented through body ornamentation or cosmetic behavior.

Though male domination is a universal with men filling the positions of authority and power, women have great influence. Men and their values, status, and work, tend to be "in focus" while women have much responsibility and work hard in the background, more "out of focus." In many societies a woman's status depends on her husband's status in society. In others, a woman's status depends almost totally on her position among the other women. Another way of contrasting men's and women's status is to see men's position as "public" and women's as "private" (in the home). Men are most often seen as protectors and providers and women as childbearers and nurturers, both being necessary for the well-being of society.

The Bible clearly states that all humans are created in God's image, both male and female (Gen. 1:27). Furthermore, humans, both male and female, have been given salvation and made ambassadors for God (2 Cor. 5:17–20). However, there are a variety of interpretations of what the Bible teaches concerning the relationships of men, women, and God. On the one hand, a hierarchical arrangement is perceived with woman under man who is under God (Mickelsen, 1983). On the other hand, equality between male and female is perceived with both being equally responsible to God (Spencer, 1985). Yet another interpretation focuses on complementarity with male and female using their God-given strengths for honoring and serving God (Hull, 1987).

The institutionalized Western church has generally reserved the positions of authority, decision making, and top leadership for males. However, from the very beginning of the modern mission movement women have played an active role. Besides providing home-front support, they responded to God's call and went to the field, first as wives and mothers but later as teachers, nurses, and nannies. Once on the field they became church planters, evangelists, preachers, and administrators. Their choice to become missionaries reflected their deep Christian commitment and their search for a structure that would allow them to unite the spiritual with practical needs in the world. In the early decades of the twentieth century women outnumbered men on the mission field by a ratio of more than two to one. They have been the "guardians of the great commission" (Tucker, 1988). Though there were forty-four women's missionary boards sending both men and women to the field in 1910, today the authority structure and decision-making power in mission organizations is mostly in male hands.

It is important for missionaries to understand the fact that differences in gender roles are socially defined. In cross-cultural work the tendency is to impose the cultural patterns of the carrier of the gospel on the assumption that they are biblical without even investigating what it means to be male or female in the receptor society. The Bible, however, shows God working according to the gender role definition of each biblical society. In divided societies where women function in the women's world and men in the men's world, it is usually best that the carrier of the gospel be the same sex as the hearer. Women need to reach the women and the men the men in such a society. If one gender creates and sings the songs of the society, then that sex should be tapped as a key resource for that role in the church. Division of labor according to gender as prescribed by the society does not have to change when people become Christian. Leadership training in the church for males and females should be related to the roles they play in

society. Brusco (1995) has done an excellent anthropological study on the effect of conversion to evangelical Protestantism on gender roles in Colombia. Her work shows how allegiance to Christ brings gender role changes.

Dealing with these and other changes is important to crosscultural communicators of the gospel. Often legislation allows for change long before there is a change in attitude and practice. For instance, in areas where the women's role has been traditionally in the home and then they are given the option of training for a career, when they are working outside the home they continue to be unconsciously evaluated by society on how well they run their homes. New technologies, urbanization, education, war, and industrialization all result in subtle changes in gender roles. There needs to be sensitivity not just to the logistics of what is happening, but to the meaning of what is happening to both genders. Changes affecting the women also bring change for the men, and vice versa. All of these changes influence the structure and program of the church and development programs. Often a different approach is needed to reach those choosing to retain traditional role definition from those who choose change.

MARGUERITE G. KRAFT

Bibliography. E. E. Brusco, *The Reformation of Machismo: Evangelical Conversion and Gender in Colombia;* D. D. Gilmore, *Manhood in the Making: Cultural Concepts of Masculinity;* G. G. Hull, *Equal to Serve: Women and Men in the Church and the Home;* A. Mickelsen, *Authority and the Bible;* A. B. Spencer, *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry;* R. A. Tucker, *GGC;* M. S. VanLeeuwen, *Gender and Grace: Love, Work, and Parenting in a Changing World.*

Guilt. Guilt refers both to an objective reality (of moral, sinful culpability) and to a subjective reality (a subjective perception and experience of oneself as culpable, a feeling of guilt). Both are relevant to missions.

Sinful human beings violate moral law(s)—both human and divine. They violate other persons—both human and divine. And they fail to exemplify and be characterized by the moral sentiments, character traits, and virtues called for by human conscience and by the God who created them in his own image. Objectively, then, all are guilty sinners deserving of death and judgment. It is this objective reality that explains both the need for Christ's work on the cross and the need for missions. And it is this objective reality of human sin and guilt that is a critical component of the missionary's message.

The call for repentance and faith is a call for an inner response in which one's subjective experience and perceptions are congruent with objective realities. The Bible itself (Romans 2) indicates that there is within each individual a set of inner perceptions and judgments (conscience) that does in fact ratify the biblical message of sin and guilt. Yet missionaries frequently complain that those to whom they proclaim the objective reality of sin and guilt do not subjectively perceive and experience themselves as sinful and guilty. In some contexts there seems to be no inner assent of conscience and soul to the message of sin, guilt, and judgment and the need for forgiveness and salvation.

In part, this is because missionaries often fail to understand subjective guilt, as it varies from culture to culture, and missiologists fail to address methodologically how objective guilt and subjective guilt should be brought together in the presentation of the gospel message.

No society can afford to affirm unbridled evil in all directions. All societies work to inculcate moral norms, interpersonal moral obligations, and personal character ideals in their members. Some cultures place formal moral codes, moral prohibitions, at the center of their moral system, carefully delineating the line at which an infraction occurs and punishment can be meted out. The transgressor in such a culture is likely to feel "law-guilt." Other cultures put the moral focus on interpersonal sensitivity and obligation. Here transgression is against persons. The transgressor feels "person-guilt." Still other cultures emphasize moral ideals in a model identity characterized by correct moral sentiments, character traits, and virtues. When self-identity is seen to fall short of model identity, "shame-guilt" is felt.

Western missionaries historically come from backgrounds stressing law-guilt, and tend to emphasize selectively the corresponding biblical imagery (sin as crime, as transgression of the law; guilt as formal pronouncement of a judge in a court of law, as deserved punishment; grace as justification, canceling of deserved punishment). When they go to Tahiti or Japan, where person-guilt and shame-guilt are stressed, they generally fail to utilize the appropriate corresponding biblical imagery (with person-guilt: sin as rebellion, ingratitude, personal harm; guilt as alienation, as debt requiring restitution; grace as restored relationship, canceled debt, redemption; or with shame-guilt: sin as falling short; guilt as nakedness, filthy uncleanness, dishonor, desire for concealment; grace as sins covered and forgotten, regeneration, a new self, glorification). Instead they retain imagery focusing on law-guilt. As a result their message of an objective guilt and proferred salvation fails to resonate with their hearers.

Furthermore, such norms, personal obligations, and ideals involve a curious mixture of conventional elements and universal moral elements, and thus vary from one culture to another. The issues here are complex, and missiol-

ogy needs to go much further in generating understandings of sin, guilt, and conscience in relationship to culture, the gospel message, and missionary methodology.

ROBERT J. PRIEST

Bibliography. T. W. Dye, *Missiology* 4 (1976): 27–41; R. J. Priest, *Missiology* 22 (1994): 291–315.

Honesty. The issue of honesty and mission calls for a critical look at two sets of relationships. First of all, it needs to be understood in the relationships involving the missionary, the mission, and the donor. Second, it needs to be understood in the relationship between the missionary and the host culture.

In today's missions, when the amount of financial support available for a particular ministry or project is often tied proportionately to the level of productivity, what is communicated to donors or potential donors about the ministry's level of success or failure may prove to be the deciding factor in whether the support, and possibly the ministry, is continued or not. Under such circumstances, honesty in communication becomes a very important factor between the missionary and his or her mission and donors and also between the mission and its donors. Honesty becomes an issue of Christian conscience in being straightforward in these relationships, and it becomes an issue of faith in our sovereign Lord who is in complete control and who is building his church. Missionaries must always remember that they cannot serve God and mammon, regardless of the noble reasons for trying.

As in many such issues, the understanding of honesty will vary from culture to culture. Therefore it is very important that the missionary be sensitive to the cultural definitions and to the standards of honesty in culture. In order to do this, the missionary must have a clear understanding of this issue within the three cultural horizons of missions: the biblical culture, his or her own culture, and the host culture. In the study of Scripture, the missionary will gain a Christian ethic with a biblical understanding of honesty. This may not be as easy as it seems when one considers God's blessing of the Hebrew midwives for lying to Pharaoh about the Hebrew women giving birth in Exodus 1:15–21; or of God caring for Rahab because she lied to protect the two spies as seen in Joshua 6:25. With this biblical understanding of honesty, the missionary must judge his or her own culture. The missionary may find that he or she is laboring under misconceptions of true honesty.

Having done this, cross-cultural missionaries are able to look more fairly at the host culture. The missionary must be able to answer cultural questions related to honesty such as ownership of property or work ethic or what is considered polite. They must gain an understanding of community and of what is considered proper within the host culture. Every culture has an understanding of what is honest and what is dishonest. The missionary must always let Scripture be the judge of whether that understanding is correct or incorrect. As the Holy Spirit sharpens the CONSCIENCE of the people and as the Scriptures inform them of their cultural inconsistencies, they will develop a more biblical understanding of honesty (as well as other moral issues) and their application of it. In this way the culture will move toward a Christian culture in context, rather than a missionary culture.

THOMAS L. AUSTIN

Bibliography. R. J. Priest, *Missiology* 22:3 (1994): 291–316.

Individualism and Collectivism. A minority of the world's peoples live in cultures where individual interest (individualism) prevails over group interest (collectivism). Individualism is strong in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Italy, and Western European societies. Collectivism dominates elsewhere. However, even in predominantly collectivist nations exposure to Western individualist-oriented media may shift urban groups toward individualism.

Individualism assumes that a person is the essential unit of society; collectivism assumes that a group is the basic unit. Ties between individuals are loose in an individualist society, but in a collectivist society people are woven into a cohesive unit to which they give lifelong loyalty.

A person has significance in a collectivist society only as a member of a group. In contrast, one person in an individualist culture has significance that is expressed through individual choices and actions with only secondary reference to the group.

The "group" in a collectivist society may be the extended family, the work group, caste, or entire tribe. Whatever the particular group, its survival is paramount. Group goals control social behavior, and loyalty to that group is fixed. Loyalty means the sharing of resources, whether for living expenses or for special group efforts. It is expressed and reinforced in obligatory participation in funerals, weddings, and other ritual occasions as well as in group crises.

On the other hand in an individualist society, the group is used to achieve individual objectives. There is a loose loyalty to the group, which may be disavowed if individual preferences seem to be better served elsewhere. Sharing of resources is not expected, since individuals are responsible for meeting their own needs and desires. Participation in ritual occasions is

expected, but not compulsory, to maintain good standing in the group.

Variation along this individualism—collectivism continuum is perhaps the single most significant dimension of culture differences. It is related to major differences in cultural values and patterns, social systems, morality, religion, and economic development.

Leadership and Change. In a collectivist society the leader often "embodies" the characteristics of the group. The group identifies with the leader, so that the character, beliefs, wealth, and power of the leader are seen as an expression of the group. When the leader changes, the group changes.

Change in a collectivist society may also come when a large part of the group changes, catalyzing change in the remainder of the group. Decision is reached by consensus rather than by voting, which is the sum of individual choices (*see* DECISION-MAKING). Group opinion is dominant, and personal opinions either do not exist or are not tolerated. The person who does not speak or act in harmony with group opinion is considered to have a bad character.

To understand an individualist culture, study of individual beliefs and values gives the best picture. Leaders may reflect opinions and beliefs of a majority of members in an individualist society, but their authority rests on gaining or losing support of individual members. The leader's view does not necessarily express the views of the society as a whole.

Authoritarian behavior is more acceptable in collectivist cultures, and a greater social distance exists between leaders and those they lead. In contrast, individualists are most comfortable in horizontal relationships with minimal social distance between employer and employee, or leaders and group members. Individualists will seek to reduce social distance, often only reluctantly recognizing vertical relationships, while collectivists are more likely to increase social distance and reinforce a higher status for leaders (vertical relationships).

Cooperation and Confrontation. Within the in-group of a collectivist society, cooperation is extensive. Confrontation is unacceptable. Members will often mediate any conflict within the group that threatens group stability and harmony. Any perceived threat to the group's existence is dealt with severely by the power of the group, rejecting the person or cause of the threat. Loss of group membership is similar to exile, being made a non-person without rights or essential support for survival.

In an individualist society, individuals compete with and confront other individuals. Status is achieved through individual accomplishments, rather than by group membership. Confrontation is encouraged to achieve understanding and clarify the rights and limits of individuals. Group membership is relatively unimportant, allowing great freedom for a variety of individual choices.

Communication. Collectivist societies utilize their total context for communication—including space, time, body motion, objects, taste and smell, touch—giving a strong emotional content to acts of communication. The verbal content is of less importance and silence can be satisfying. Group togetherness is of greater importance than anything that might be spoken.

In comparison, individualist societies are highly verbal, avoiding silence as empty, even hostile. Content must be specifically stated because the group's relative unimportance makes communicating through the context much less certain.

Inter-group Relationships. Relationships with outsider groups are primarily competitive in collectivist cultures, even confrontational and often marked by distrust and hostility. Support of the in-group is considered necessary in dealing with outsiders, an "us against them" approach. The factionalism that fragments some nations originates in the collectivist cultures of their many constituent groups and tribes.

The individualist is expected, in contrast, to be able to function independently. Children are taught to observe, think, and act by themselves. Depending on others is considered a weakness, reducing the need for a strong supportive group. Outsiders are not normally treated with suspicion simply because the distinction between insider and outsider is much less important. Consequently, cooperation with other groups is relatively easy if that cooperation is seen to benefit individual members.

Values. Harmony, family relationships, equality in use of wealth, and modesty are high-values in collectivist societies. The possibility of bringing SHAME to the group is a strong control on behavior. The shame is in others knowing, not in the action itself. It is very important to meet the expectations of others, thus maintaining "face." Education concentrates on preparation to be a good group member, so it emphasizes tradition, rote memory, and the ability to quote respected scholars.

Freedom, self-fulfillment, recognition, honesty, and distribution of wealth according to individual effort are high values among individualists. Rather than group-centered shame, the individual feels individual GUILT when standards are violated. Education is valued when it enables individuals to cope with demands, be productive, and maximize individual abilities.

Business Dealings. Among collectivists, personal relationships are essential. Business is conducted by first establishing a social relationship, then proceeding to details of the task, and the exchange of goods, services, and money. Legal

contracts are secondary to knowing the groups involved and establishing rapport and trust. Management focuses on groups as the basic unit. It is almost compulsory that persons in the in-group be given advantages in hiring, assignment of jobs, and other realms of business. Failing to do this is considered disloyalty to the group.

Individualist societies approach social and business relationships in an impersonal, factual manner that centers on the task to be accomplished. Knowing and liking among the participants is secondary to agreements carefully drafted to specify each party's obligations. Business is primarily controlled by law; personal relationships are secondary. Management focuses on individuals as the basic unit. Rewards are distributed according to the work completed, independently of personal relationships. To act otherwise is considered unfair and even dishonest.

Some Implications for Missions. Contemporary evangelical missions have predominantly originated in individualist societies, and gone to collectivist societies. Differing assumptions and expectations have led to frequent misunderstandings and antagonism. The continuing resistance of some people groups to the Christian message may well be a serious consequence.

Individualist–oriented missionaries have expected individual acceptance of the gospel, overlooking the value of a favorable group response before individuals are discipled. Antagonism and resistance often come from a perceived threat to stability and security of the group. Anything that would fragment the group is not acceptable, allowing no place for individual choice where survival of the group is thought to be involved. An individual who responds apart from group approval is a threat to unity, who must be dealt with by social exile or even death.

Missionary focus must be on the group in a collectivist culture, rather than attempting to "extract" individuals from the group. The result of an "extraction" approach is most likely to be the creation of a new group which will be considered an "out-group" by the main society. Thus, the new Christian group is to be confronted and opposed. Potential ministry bridges to the larger society are destroyed.

In a collectivist society, the pastor and church authorities are much more likely to be authoritarian, with considerable social distance between themselves and their congregations. Selection of leadership often depends more on group affiliation than on objective criteria, coming through discussion and agreement rather than election. Following the biblical pattern to become servant-leaders is a major challenge within a collectivist society.

DONALD K. SMITH

Bibliography. G. Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind;* idem, *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values;* S. Lingenfelter, *Agents of Transformation: A Guide for Effective Cross-Cultural Ministry;* H. C. Triandis, R. W. Brislin, and C. H. Hui, *Intercultural Communication: A Reader,* pp. 370–82.

Intercultural Communication. Interaction among people of diverse cultures. Since cultures have different symbols, different contexts, different social rules, and different expectations, development of shared understanding is often exceedingly difficult. Thorough study of COMMUNICATION patterns to identify these differences and adapt to them is the foundation of effective CROSS-CULTURAL MINISTRY.

Intercultural communication is distinct from cross-cultural communication, which compares a particular behavior or behaviors in differing cultures. International communication deals with comparative mass media communication in different nations and to communication between nations. Global communication is a term usually limited to the technology and transfer of information without regard to national borders.

Two general categories of communication models, mechanistic and humanistic, are useful to more fully understand the dominant, but differing, approaches to intercultural communication,

Mechanistic Models. Mechanistic models are most clearly seen in the development of "information theory" used in telephones, computers, and related devices. The behavioristic perspective (from behavioristic psychology) stresses stimulus and response. The transmissional perspective (Berlo and DeVito) suggests ten components of communication: source, encoding, message, channel, noise, receiver, decoding, receiver response, feedback, and context.

Use of a mechanistic model has led to emphasis on sending out a message without great attention to who is actually receiving and comprehending the message. It has also stimulated development of electronic translation units that are said to make intercultural communication possible. Equivalent words from one language are given in a second language. Applied to intercultural communication, a mechanistic model frequently overlooks significant areas, such as cultural assumptions, context, and experience. Though frequently followed in intercultural ministry, mechanistic approaches to communication have little, if any, biblical support as a pattern for either evangelism or discipling.

Humanistic Models. Humanistic models emphasize the human element in communication. The transactional view of communication recognizes that knowledge of the receiver or listener is part of shaping the message form. Communica-

tion is seen as sharing. Symbols are used to stimulate the formation of meaning in another person, and consequently the sharing of meaning through a context-sensitive process. The interactional approach recognizes the reciprocal nature of communication, in which a circle that includes feedback and alteration represents the communication process. Both the transactional and interactional views of communication are consistent with biblically based INCARNATIONAL MISSION. A Christian view of communication must also recognize the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the communicative process.

Most humanistic models developed in the Western world assume that sharing of information is the primary aim of communication. However, East Asian societies that are deeply influenced by Confucianism (China, Korea, Japan especially) view communication as primarily to establish and maintain harmony. Balance and harmony in human relationships are the basis of society. Interpersonal communication is guided by social rules specific for each situation, depending on age, status, and intimacy. Thus, communication is an "infinite interpretive process" (Jandt, 1995, 29) where everyone concerned seeks to develop and maintain a social relationship. Communication is a way to seek consensus, not essentially to transmit information. Difficulties in intercultural communication will arise from the fundamentally different purposes in communicating between East and West, as well as from the more obvious differences in style, context, and vocabulary.

Communication and Culture. Is communication synonymous with culture, or an aspect of culture? CULTURE is a code we learn and share, and learning and sharing require communication. Every act and every cultural pattern involve communication. It is not possible to know a culture without knowing its communication, and communication can only be understood by knowing the culture involved. If culture existed without communication, culture would be unknowable. Communication, on the other hand, functions only as an expression of culture. Culture and communication are inseparable, This fundamental level is implicit to communication. It is a part of being alive, of being in any kind of community.

Communication arts focuses on specific communication modes such as graphic and fine arts, drama, music, journalism, and literature. Specific ways a particular mode (communication art) is developed depends on the purpose and cultural context. This is explicit or utilitarian communication, a skill to be acquired and used for particular purposes.

Problems in intercultural communication occur at both implicit and explicit levels of communication. It is difficult implicitly because of differing assumptions about God, humanity, the world, and the nature of reality as well as different values and different experiences, When these differences are ignored, assuming similarity instead of difference, communication across cultural boundaries will be ineffective or even negative in its effects.

Eastern Perspectives. The Eastern perspective on communication is historically based on the goal of achieving harmony between humanity and nature. Through communication the individual seeks to rise above personal interests to become one with the "universal essence" by use of ritual, meditation, and myth. Today's patterns of communication used in Eastern nations as different as communist China, Japan, and Korea derive from this common background. Kincaid and Cushman point out three characteristics shared by Eastern social and political systems: (1) subordination of the individual to a strong hierarchical authority, (2) a subjugation maintained by a symbolic perception of harmony, and (3) a belief that events have meaning as evidences of universal principles. An Eastern view of communication emphasizes the implicit aspect.

Western Perspectives. By contrast, the Western perspective on communication emphasized its role in establishing and maintaining individual political, social, and economic freedom. Communication is used to manipulate circumstances and people so that personal goals can be achieved. Communication is utilized to reach personal or group goals, the explicit or utilitarian approach.

Intercultural communication is difficult at the explicit or utilitarian level because of language difference, nonverbal misinterpretations, and personal attitudes. These problems can be identified and overcome, but mature understanding may still not be achieved. Effective intercultural communication demands recognizing and overcoming difficulties at both the explicit and implicit levels.

Signal or Symbol System. Twelve systems of signals are used by every culture. In fact, almost all of human communication occurs by use of one or more of the twelve systems: verbal (or spoken language), written, numeric, pictorial, artifactual (three-dimensional representations and objects), audio (including silence), kinesic (what has been called "body language"), optical (light and color), tactile (touch), spatial (the use of space), temporal (time), and olfactory (taste and smell).

Even though the same signal systems are used in every culture, the many significant differences in their usage make clarity of understanding between members of different cultures difficult to achieve. One culture may emphasize the importance of the verbal (the spoken word), while another emphasizes the unspoken use of body language, the kinesic system. Another culture may

have highly developed pictorial communication, while still another has an intricate system of communication involving numbers. The individual signals may have totally different signification in different cultures, for example, a gesture may mean approval in one culture and be considered obscene in another or a word may indicate appreciation in one setting but rejection in a different culture. Effective intercultural communication at the explicit-utilitarian level demands learning both the relative importance of the various signal systems in different cultures as well as learning the meaning intended by various signals.

In summary, intercultural communication is a process depending on increasing involvement of the parties seeking to communicate. Only through involvement can both implicit and explicit communication contribute to shared understanding. Such involvement is demonstrated in the life of Christ, who became flesh and lived among us (John 1:14). It is also the pattern for missionary service (John 17:18). Paul clearly modeled this kind of intercultural communication as he explains in 1 Corinthians 9:19–23.

DONALD K. SMITH

Bibliography. W. B. Gudykunst and Y. Y. Kim, *Communicating with Strangers An Approach to Intercultural Communication;* G. Hofstede, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind;* F. E. Jandt, *Intercultural Communication: An Introduction;* D. L. Kincaid, *Communication Theory: Eastern and Western Perspectives;* L. A. Samovar and R. E. Porter, *Intercultural Communication A Reader;* D. K. Smith, *Creating Understanding: A Handbook for Christian Communication Across Cultural Landscapes.*

Intercultural Competency. To live and work effectively interculturally, a person must engage in CULTURAL LEARNING with the goal of becoming effective in the broad range of behaviors that are part of becoming competent in any culture. Since the members of a culture have a whole lifetime in which to learn its inner workings and complexities, an intercultural worker will never have the competency of someone born in that culture. Yet, with careful and intentional learning, a missionary can master a broad range of skills required for effective COMMUNICATION, interpersonal relationships, and continuous learning in a ministry setting.

The goal of intercultural competency is to gain sufficient understanding of the broad range of required cultural behaviors so that one is sensitized to intercultural tensions, aware of cultural expectations and practices, and continually learning the finer points of communication in each area of cultural practice.

There are seven distinctive areas in which a cross-cultural worker should seek to achieve competence in any culture.

Language Fluency. The mastery of a language of a culture is essential to effective communication. Intercultural workers should master the grammatical structures of the local language, and vocabulary in all the areas of communication that are essential to their work.

Understanding the Rules of Labor and Exchange. Every culture has adopted economic practices and values that govern the organization of labor and exchange within a community. Since all intercultural workers are involved in some form of labor and exchange relationships with people in the community, understanding their rules and values with regard to work are essential for effective intercultural service.

Understanding Authority Relations in Family and Community. Every community defines structures to govern relationships between individuals and groups. The intercultural worker should seek to understand the rules and roles that are significant in family and community structures, and know how these are practiced by members in the indigenous community.

Mastering the Basics of Conflict Resolution. Conflict is inevitable in any kind of community. Every community also has its basic assumptions and requirements for conflict resolution. An intercultural worker cannot hope to be effective unless she or he masters the patterns of conflict resolution that are practiced within the local community.

Understanding Basic Values and Personality. The bringing up of children is one of the most important activities in any culture. Through this process adults impart to children the basic values that are essential in the cultural setting, and channel the unique personalities of children into proper cultural behaviors. Understanding this process of shaping children into mature adults is crucial for competency in a culture (*see* ENCULTURATION). Learning the values that parents impart to their children and the process through which they channel unique personalities into appropriate adult behavior is crucial for effective cultural learning.

Understanding Beliefs and Worldview. All human beings actively reflect on their cultural experience and articulate the meaning of these experiences in their beliefs and WORLDVIEW. Once an intercultural worker has a good working knowledge of the language, and has acquired competencies in the other aspects of culture above, then exploration of beliefs and worldview is essential to gaining a whole picture of culture.

Effective Communication and Contextualization of Work and Ministry. The desired outcome of intercultural competency is effective communication in every area of culture. The goal of cultural competency is to contextualize work and ministry in the cultural system that is known and practiced by people in the local com-

munity. The intercultural worker must intentionally frame communication and ministry within the cultural systems available to local cultural participants. This requires that intercultural workers rethink what they do and how they do it, and reframe it into the language, economic, social, and value systems of the local culture.

Many missiologists define cultural competency with reference to incarnational ministry (*see* Incarnational Mission). The example for incarnational ministry is the Lord Jesus Christ. In Philippians 2:6–7, Paul speaks of Jesus as being "in very nature God," yet not clinging to that identity, but "taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness." Lingenfelter and Mayers (1986, p. 15) characterize Jesus as a "200% person." They then draw the analogy that the intercultural missionary must become at least a 150% person—ideally, retaining their own cultural identity at least at the level of 75%, and yet adding a new identity of 75% of the culture in which they serve. The challenge of incarnational ministry is becoming more than we are, and learning and incorporating the culture of our hosts into our lives, and participating effectively in ministry within their cultural context. Yet incarnational ministry is not enough. As Christians we are engaged in lives of pilgrimage; as Peter says, "as aliens and strangers in the world, . . . live such good lives among the pagans that, though they may accuse you of doing wrong, they may see your good deeds and glorify God on the day that He visits us" (1 Peter 2:11–12).

Sherwood G. Lingenfelter

Bibliography. P. G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries;* S. G. Lingenfelter and Marvin K. Mayers, *Ministering Cross-Culturally: An Incarnational Model for Personal Relationships.*

Interpersonal Communication. Though communication may be intrapersonal (talking to oneself), it is usually interpersonal communication (communication between persons) that we refer to when we speak of "communication." Whether the communication is between members of the same family or between those of different language communities (Intercultural Communication), it always involves persons and thus is interpersonal. Even public communication, such as lectures or sermons, can be seen as interpersonal, since they consist of a large number of one-to-one (i.e., speaker to each listener) interactions. Though communication via electronic or print media is not usually seen as interpersonal, there are important interpersonal aspects to these forms as well, especially if the receptors know the communicator(s) personally.

Since Eugene Nida first introduced the concept into missiology in *Message and Mission* (1960, rev. ed. 1990), it has been customary in missiological circles to speak of communicational interaction as consisting of a *source* (or communicator) conveying a *message* to one or more *receptors*. This is often referred to as the S-M-R theory of communication. The key insights brought by this perspective concern the place of the receptor in the communication process.

All interpersonal communication involves gaps between people and the techniques used to bridge those gaps. Traditional approaches to communication have tended to focus attention either on the source of messages or on the vehicles used to convey them. The primary vehicle, of course, is Language, and much attention has been devoted to the place of language in the communication process, as if words contained the meanings people attempt to communicate. But, as Berlo and others have demonstrated, meanings reside neither in the external world nor in language or other vehicles we use in the communication process. Though we can pass messages from person to person, meanings reside only in persons, never in the vehicles used to convey the messages. Meanings are created by receptors on the basis of their perceptions of what the communicator intends by the messages he or she is sending.

What goes on within the receptor(s) mind is, therefore, the most important part of any communicational interaction. Once the communicator has spoken or written a message, it is up to the receptor(s) to interpret the meaning. And this interpretation is done on the basis of the receptor's own understandings, whether or not these correspond with the understanding of the source. This fact creates difficulties in interpersonal communication, even between people who live in the same culture and speak the same language. It is, however, complicated greatly when the source and the receptor(s) are from different cultures. For people's patterns of perception and interpretation are strongly affected by their culture. Intercultural communication is a form of interpersonal communication, for it always involves one or more communicators attempting to convey messages to one or more receptors from another culture.

This understanding of communication has enormous implications for the communication of the gospel and the Contextualization of Christianity. It means that we need first to learn as much as possible about how our receptors are perceiving the messages we are attempting to communicate. Then we need to do our best to formulate our messages in such a way that the receptors can perceive and interpret what we are saying accurately and reconstruct the meanings appropriately. Failures in this area have led to heretical understandings of Christian doctrines

even though the missionaries were orthodox and doing their best to speak the truth.

Missionary history is full of examples of messages that were spoken accurately in terms of the communicator's perspective but were perceived inaccurately by the receptors. When missionaries to India, for example, invited people to be "born again," they were not heard accurately by people who are seeking to escape from the endless cycle of rebirth. Nor are those in Asia for whom the number "four" is TABOO attracted to a message that focuses on "four spiritual laws." Latin American CHRISTO-PAGANISM, Melanesian CARGO CULTS, many AFRICAN-INITIATED CHURCH MOVEMENT doctrines, and a plethora of other aberrant forms of Christianity are the products of receptor understandings of missionary messages that did not correspond with what was intended by the communicators.

On the other hand, exciting PEOPLE MOVEMENTS have often resulted when messages of God's love and power have been presented in ways that were accurately interpreted by the receptors from within their frame of reference.

CHARLES H. KRAFT.

Bibliography. D. K. Berlo, *The Process of Communication;* J. F. Engel, *Contemporary Christian Communications;* C. H. Kraft, *Communicating the Gospel God's Way;* idem, *Communication Theory for Christian Witness;* E. A. Nida, *Message and Mission;* D. K. Smith, *Creating Understanding;* V. Søgaard, *Media in Church and Mission.*

Leadership. The history of Christian missions is replete with examples of key people appointed by God to carry the gospel to the unreached. It is natural to look for these people in any given period and to consider their leadership as normative. However, the study of leadership in missions has revealed a number of patterns of leadership that go beyond the role of an individual person or group. Leadership is a process in which leaders influence followers in given contexts to achieve the purposes to which they were called. The unique aspect of leadership and mission is the nature of their interaction under the guidance of the Holy Spirit in understanding and obedience to the MISSIO DEI.

History. Beginning with the apostolic leadership at Pentecost (Acts 2), God has raised up people to lead his work "to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8). With authority delegated by the Lord Jesus Christ (Matt. 28:18), the first missions were loosely organized bands, both apostolic and lay, driven by a deep commitment to Jesus and a lifestyle that stood in contrast to the decaying culture around them. Although there are notable examples of individual leaders, no formal leadership structures existed apart from those of the growing church.

With the emergence of monasticism (*see* MONASTIC MOVEMENT) in the fourth century, the majority of missionaries came from the ranks of devout monastics following the patterns of leadership established in the monasteries. Characteristic of these missionaries was their strict vows and obedience, which spread by establishing new monasteries, the dominant form of missions through the seventeenth century. By the eighteenth century, the Protestant REFORMATION had given birth to new patterns of leadership in mission, including a return to an emphasis on the role of laity. Four major types of leadership characterized the emerging Protestant missions: (1) the educated and ordained clergy of the major Protestant church traditions, such as Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational; (2) the eldership or council rule of the pietists and Anabaptists; (3) the new leadership models of the renewal movements such as the Methodists, Baptists, and various independent groups; and (4) visionary individuals whose commitment to the task and charismatic personalities drew others to follow.

The fourth type of leadership often led to another Protestant innovation, the interdenominational missionary society. During the so-called GREAT CENTURY OF MISSION (1792–1914), there was an explosion of voluntary societies that brought together both clergy and laity. The dominant leadership characteristic of the new societies was the pragmatic concern for the spread of the gospel, which stood in contrast to the carefully defined roles of traditional church structures. As the movement grew and new societies emerged, the influential leadership positions were filled by clergy and lay leaders who had previously held no significant positions in their churches. These voluntary societies also set themselves apart from the church structures by the appointment of leaders from specialized fields, such as medicine, or individuals whose strong commitment to the cause distinguished them as proponents. Another departure from the church structures was the openness to women in positions of leadership.

Mission leadership continued to change and adapt during the twentieth century as the end of the colonial era spread. The success of interdenominational missions in the establishment of churches and ministries, particularly in the Southern Hemisphere, created a multiplicity of national church and parachurch leadership roles. Leadership began to transition from the hands of expatriate missionaries to those of the national leaders, leading to an era of integration and nationalization. The shift in the roles of the field councils and field leaders, while often difficult, resulted in the emergence of partnerships between national church leaders and mission liaison officers. A similar trend toward nationaliza-

tion was widespread among parachurch ministries, often leading to increased pressure to recruit leadership from within the national church structures. Finally, denominational and renewal movements have also flourished and moved toward nationalization following the same patterns as their mission counterparts. The result of this shift has been a major focus on global leadership development at the end of the twentieth century.

Mission and Church Leadership. Critical issues emerged as the four major types of missions began to plant churches, especially for the interdenominational societies. The first was the nature of leadership in the church. Denominational missions planted churches based on their home countries, providing both structure and models for leadership. The movement toward seminaries and the recruitment of faculty ensured a direct correspondence with the theological distinctives of the denomination. The second group, those whose polity was based on eldership, were in many ways able to include growing Christian leaders in their fellowships based on a mentoring model supplemented by Bible schools. Their commitment to community gave a rationale for training that included both practical and theological aspects. The groups that emerged from the revivals, such as the Methodists, began with a direct correlation to the selection and training of leadership that grew out of their movements. The churches planted by the interdenominational societies have a variety of leadership models based on both denominational and indigenous traditions. A wide variety of selection and training models have been used; however, Bible schools that served the missions became major contributors to leadership development.

Churches that grow out of mission societies struggle with the issues of CULTURE and leadership. The more individualistic missionaries tend toward the selection and training of individuals to fill the roles. By initially working under the direction of the missionary, in either practical or church-related work, the local leader is then educated through mission schools and Bible colleges (*see* THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION IN NON-WESTERN CONTEXTS). Due to the affiliation with the expatriate missionary, the ascribed STATUS of the national pastor is often a new form within the culture. The issues of power and function become significant in the growing role of church leadership. Often misunderstandings arise between the local community and the mission and church, based on the lack of credible models within the culture coupled with the external resources provided by the missions. Unwittingly, missions create a powerful new model for leadership, which becomes a much-sought-after role. The irony is that among interdenominational missions particularly, the lay people who brought the gospel end up creating a clergy-dominated church, struggling with the role of the laity.

A concomitant to the issue of culture is the emergence of indigenous forms and functions of church leadership. Collectivist societies have a more contextualized form of leadership involved in all aspects of life. One result of this view of leadership is the involvement of clergy in politics, even to the point of holding elected offices and engaging in business. As churches grow and continue to influence society, leadership either takes on new areas of influence or becomes increasingly irrelevant within the context.

As national churches have worked through the issues of independence and interdependence, a growing realization of the responsibility for world mission has impacted them. Not only have non-Western churches taken the responsibility for selection and training of church workers, but also a growing number have assumed the role of missionary sending churches. The missions vary in leadership approaches, although the movements are often tied to renewal within the church, making the dominant model that of visionary leaders.

Contemporary Issues. The central concern of mission leadership has always been the ability to prayerfully understand and obey the mission of God. It is not surprising that this essentially theological task is at times pressured by the complexities of managing the multicultural organizations that have emerged. The pragmatic concern for the spread of the gospel that led to the creation of mission societies continues to be the dominant characteristic of mission leadership. This raises some of the greatest opportunities and challenges today, especially in the relationships between missions and churches.

It was inevitable that the growth of mission societies would lead to increasing pressures on leadership, both internally and externally. Internal concerns focus primarily on the recruitment, preparation, support, supervision, and care of missionaries. As missions have grown numerically, their structures diversify to cope with the range of issues, establishing a need for expertise in each of these primary areas. In tension with these internal issues are the external concerns of building and maintaining a supportive constituency, locating and establishing ministry with all the concomitant relational and resource issues, and developing strategies appropriate to the political, social, cultural, and spiritual context. A necessary characteristic of mission leadership continues to be the ability to assess the changing world situation and move toward the future while retaining the unique vision God has given.

As the complexities of missions have grown so has the range of solutions, to the point where new specialized roles and organizations have

emerged to cover many of these challenges. The development of leadership to meet the increasing demands, including selection and training, remains a major challenge for missions. Despite the changing times, the need for spiritual leaders remains the same throughout the ages. It is the duty of those in authority to identify people for positions of leadership who have been prepared by God to influence missions with all their complexities, toward the purposes of God. A study of the patterns by which leadership emerges reveals three essential areas of development: the spiritual formation of the individual (*see* SPIRITUAL FORMATION), the formation of knowledge through the education process, and the formation of necessary skills through experiential learning. Both formal and nonformal programs to address these areas proliferated at the end of the twentieth century. Perhaps the most encouraging development has been the rediscovery of the role of mentoring in the development of leadership, a realization with antecedents in the early monastic period.

As has been the case in every major epoch of missions history, the need for innovative leadership is vital. A theologically appropriate response to the challenges of diverse colleagues, constituencies, and contexts remains the task of leadership and missions at the beginning of the twenty-first century.

DOUGLAS MCCONNELL

Bibliography. J. R. Clinton, *The Making of a Leader*; R. L. Hughes, R. C. Ginnett, and G. J. Curphy, *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience;* K. S. Latourette, A *History of Christianity,* 2 vols.; S. Lingenfelter, *Transforming Culture;* S. Neill, *A History of Christian Missions;* D. Robert, *American Women in Mission: A Social History of their Thought and Practice;* J. O. Sanders, *Spiritual Leadership;* H. A. Snyder, *The Radical Wesley and Patterns for Church Renewal*; R. A. Tucker, *Guardians of the Great Commission: The Story of Women in Modern Missions;* A. F. Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History.*

Lifestyle Evangelism. "You're the only Jesus some will ever see." "People don't care how much you know until they know how much you care." "You have to 'earn' the right to be heard." These sample statements help explain the evangelistic strategy known as lifestyle evangelism. Advocates argue that EVANGELISM must be seen as a process of planting the seeds of the gospel through verbal WITNESS, watering and cultivating through Christian example and lifestyle, and finally reaping the harvest of new converts.

Great emphasis is placed on the role of the witness's life in the evangelism process. Proponents point to the incarnation as an illustration of the importance of this approach to ministry. When God wanted to communicate with humans, they argue, God did not send tracts from heaven. Instead, God communicated with us by becoming a person and living among us (John 1:7).

The focus of lifestyle evangelism, then, is using the channels of relationships to share the gospel through both words and deeds. The latest phase of the movement, stimulated by Steve Sjogren's *Conspiracy of Kindness,* emphasizes utilizing acts of service to give an opportunity for verbal witness of salvation in Jesus Christ.

While not the first book to appear on the topic, Joseph Aldrich's book *Lifestyle Evangelism* has popularized the concept of lifestyle evangelism in American evangelicalism. Related terms used by other proponents include friendship evangelism, incarnational evangelism, and relational evangelism. Since the early 1980s numerous books have been written and witnessing programs developed around the basic concept of lifestyle evangelism. Jim Peterson, missionary to Brazil, argued in 1980 for the importance of lifestyle evangelism on the mission field. He emphasized a twofold missionary strategy: (1) the proclamation of the gospel to nonbelievers; (2) the affirmation of the gospel, which involves a process of modeling and further explaining the Christian message. Peterson found that in his mission field context, deeds of love helped clarify the gospel message to those he was trying to reach.

This emphasis on affirming the gospel mirrors the often-practiced strategy of using social ministry as a bridge to share the gospel. Social ministry can help break down suspicion, open doors for ministry in closed countries, and provide a hearing for the gospel. The construction of dams by the Basel missionaries in northern Ghana provided an opportunity for the gospel to be shared to the people there. Other missionary efforts through medicine, agriculture, engineering, nutrition, and education have illustrated this principle.

Proponents cite many benefits to utilizing the approach of lifestyle evangelism. They note there is a greater possibility for on-going follow-up, not only in continually clarifying the gospel message over a period of time but also in discipling persons who trust Christ as their Savior. Lifestyle evangelism advocates also argue that a consistent Christian lifestyle helps break down the accusation of "hypocrisy" and encourages nonbelievers to consider the reality of Christ, noting how recent visible scandals in the Christian community have caused many people to wonder: "Does Christ really make a difference? Is there any substance to all this talk?"

While affirming the benefits of a "lifestyle" approach, some people caution against letting the pendulum swing too far away from an emphasis on verbal witness. They warn against the danger of lifestyle evangelism becoming all lifestyle and no evangelism, all deeds and no

words. They are concerned that Christians following a lifestyle evangelism approach may place great effort in building relationships with nonbelievers but never get around to sharing the gospel verbally. Some are concerned that an overemphasis on deeds could lead in the direction of the social gospel of the 1920s, where an emphasis on repentance and faith might be lost altogether. Perhaps the strongest critique of the lifestyle evangelism movement has come from Mark McCloskey, in *Tell it Often—Tell it Well*. McCloskey notes that while lifestyle evangelism certainly has strengths, the New Testament would seem to point toward a more comprehensive approach to evangelism, including taking the initiative to share the gospel message with persons with whom you have no prior contact. He argues that there are too many lost people to depend primarily on evangelism which is relational in approach. Not everyone has Christian friends or neighbors who can live out the message in deeds as well as share with words. Therefore, he advocates a comprehensive evangelistic strategy that includes witnessing through existing relationships but that goes beyond them to include any person with whom we might come into contact.

To summarize, the lifestyle evangelism movement has reminded the church of the importance of living a Christian life before others, that the walk of believers matters as well as their talk. Concerns raised by friendly critics need to be heard as well, in that Christians should guard against overstressing the walk whereby they become "silent witnesses." Some have taken the principles of lifestyle evangelism to an extreme, saying "I just let my life do the talking." A Christian's life can only reinforce the message; it cannot substitute for it. Verbal witness gives clarity to believers' walk by pointing people past them to their Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ. Christians cannot expect the nonbeliever to know that Christians are a reflection of the good news until they know what the good news is. As Paul affirmed, "For we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake" (2 Cor. 4:5). If believers do not point people toward Christ, they are only calling attention to themselves. Overall, the lifestyle evangelism movement has helped provide an apologetic for Christianity to an increasingly secular world, thus following the command of Christ in Matthew 5:16, "let your light shine before men, that they may see your good deeds and praise your Father in heaven."

Timothy K. Beougher

Bibliography. J. Aldrich, *Life-Style Evangelism;* J. Peterson, *Evangelism as a Lifestyle;* C. Van Engen, *You are My Witnesses.*

Love. Biblical love is often a concept that has been confused with cultural views of "love." In Scripture, love is a description of God, a sacrificial act toward the undeserving, a fulfillment of the Law, and the trademark of a true disciple of Christ. Love should be characteristic of Christian mission. The Old Testament word is *ʾahab*. In the New Testament, two major concepts of love are expressed in two different words: *philos* and *agapē*.

Philos expresses fondness or an attraction to someone or something. It is a highly emotive word which is similar to the English terms fondness or appreciation or affection. Older women are to teach (or train or advise) younger women to be "husband lovers" *(philandrous)* and children lovers *(philoteknous)* indicating that affection toward the husband and children was to be developed and thus was to exceed the conditional type of emotion related to familial relationships. Scripture declares that the Father loved the Son in this way (John 5:20) and believers are to love in this same affectionate manner (John 16:27). *Philos* is not a lesser type of love than *agapē* but is of a different nature. It entails feeling good toward another person or a thing. One may be fond of someone or something and it can be a healthy and wholesome sentiment. It expresses joy in being with or involved with someone or something.

In *agapē* the idea of sacrifically giving oneself on behalf of another is the primary emphasis. This form of love is not an emotional response to a person, place, or thing, but rather a volitional act toward a person or group of persons who may or may not be lovely. This is the word used to describe God's attitude toward the world (John 3:16) and toward the sinners whom he redeemed (1 John 4:9). The love was not simply a verbal expression but a dramatic demonstration of selfless giving on behalf of those who were cut off from God and even declared to be his enemies (Rom. 5:8). This love is beyond human capacity but is to be exhibited by those who call God Father (1 John 4:7). Jesus also indicated that this love would fulfill all the law when exercised toward God with all of one's heart, soul, and mind, and toward one's neighbor (Matt. 22:36–40; Gal. 5:14). The reason for this sweeping statement is that if one is sacrificially giving himself/herself to God and neighbor, then one's acts would not do anything offensive or harmful. This fits within the intent and heart of what the law was all about.

In missions, the declaration of God's love must be demonstrated and not just verbalized. Whether in wholesome affection or sacrificial giving, the message of God's character and action toward sinful humankind must be demonstrated. Those who carry God's love must illustrate this through acts consistent with the loving behavior

of the culture in which the message is being presented.

Since Jesus placed the act of loving one another as living testimony to identify the true disciples, those in ministry must protect the love relationship among fellow workers. Interpersonal relationships among missionaries are certainly observed by those hearing the message of John 3:16 and Romans 5:8. But if those who proclaim the message do not reflect such attitudes among themselves, the verbal witness can be undermined. Since loving one another is a command (John 15:17), it is evident that it is not left to human emotions nor is it merely a good thing. It is a moral obligation to give of oneself to others. To do this is to be a witness of one's connection with Jesus and to verify that one is truly on a mission for Jesus Christ who came as a demonstration of God's love for sinners. This love, however, is not from human effort but flows from a Spirit-filled life (Rom. 5:5; Gal. 5:22).

Ed Glasscock

Bibliography. J. P. Baker, *NDT,* pp. 398–400; W. Günthern and H.-G. Link, *NIDNTT,* 2:538–51; G. B. Funderburk, *ZPEB;* 3:989–96; J. Stott, *The Mark of the Christian;* C. Van Engen, *God's Missionary People*.

Marriage, Marriage Practices. Marriage is a nearly universal cultural institution. Marriage practices, forms, and rituals are also universal concerns. In considering this topic, therefore, it is particularly important to begin with a biblical understanding of marriage.

What Is Biblical Marriage? The creation account culminates in God's creation of human beings in his own image (Gen. 1:27). This initial creation of man and woman together as the embodiment of the Image of God functions as the foundational paradigm of marriage.

God's creation, humankind, is first spoken of singularly and inclusively, "him," this "him" meaning both man and woman. But "him" gives way to "them," a plural which unites and distinguishes "them" as "male" and "female." These few words eloquently describe human beings as creatures made in God's own image, as alike and similar ("him") and as unique and individual ("male" and "female"). A biblical understanding of marriage addresses each of these aspects.

God blesses and provides for the man and woman, and pronounces his work to be "very good." The instruction to be fruitful presupposes the sexual union of the man and the woman and the complementary nature of "maleness" and "femaleness." Alone, neither the man nor the woman accomplishes the apparent intentions of God in creation. It is together that they are blessed and together that they are commissioned for productivity in raising children and working in God's world. This point is reinforced in Genesis 2, where God explicitly pronounces, "It is not good that the man should be alone." The creation of woman completes the creation of humankind and cannot be separated from the creation of the man. The man and woman are joined; they are "one flesh." They are created in relationship and for relationship.

What Went Wrong? God's ideal for a harmonious relationship for man and woman, however, quickly broke down through the fall (*see also* Fall of Humankind). The initial and fundamental sin in Genesis 3, involving a declaration of independence from God, set off a cycle of human power struggles. It resulted in the eviction from an ideal community and the introduction of conflicting hierarchy replacing complementary harmony.

The difficulty of marital relationships, therefore, along with other human relationships, began with the loss of the ultimate community. A marital relationship cannot occur in isolation from the community at large.

Therefore, some missiological questions arise concerning marriage and marriage practices. How can we recover the ideals of marital relationship without the ideal community of Eden? What interplay takes place between the biblical text and culture? How may members of one culture interact meaningfully about marriage practices with members of another culture?

Biblical Marriage in Contemporary Settings. The biblical paradigm of marriage from the creation account is the ideal to which all marriage practices ought to be compared. It is the ideal par excellence. But the ideal was disrupted by the fall. Therefore, against the ideal of relationship, partnership, oneness, and difference, are the real-life crises which confront modern marriages.

Three basic patterns of marriage are recognized by anthropologists: monogamy, polygyny (commonly called polygamy), and polyandry. A fourth pattern is finding acceptance in limited communities, that of same-sex marriage.

Monogamy, the marriage of one man and one woman, with an exclusive sexual relationship, is the most common idealized form of marriage. Cultural variations of its enactment include religious rituals, civil ceremonies, and common law acceptance. The choice of partner may be up to the individual or at the discretion of the extended family. Monogamy is generally recognized to uphold the creation model of one husband and one wife restated by Jesus (Matt. 19:4–6). Polygamy, one man with two or more wives, is attested to in the Old Testament and continues to be practiced in some cultures today. Polyandry, one woman with two or more husbands, is the least common of the traditional marriage patterns. Same-sex marriages, involving two males or two females, have recently been

suggested as analogous to monogamous relationships, though there is no biblical support for this type of marital union.

Several principles can be offered as foundations for the challenges related to marriage and the diversity of marriage practices found in the world today.

1. An initial acceptance of observed marriage patterns. The monogamous standard of Western culture has not always existed and is currently threatened by high divorce rates and multiple marriages resulting in what some have called serial polygamy. Previously accepted marriage patterns in the West have included polygamy, arranged marriages, common-law marriages, and marriages of convenience. It is important to remember that God works over time in the transformation of all cultures and their practices.

2. Understanding. The marriage practices of a culture have a significance for that culture which must be understood if that culture is to be fully understood. How men and women relate to one another, and the meaning of their interactions provide important insights about individuals as well as cultures (*see* GENDER ROLES). It is likely that some aspects of the relationships we observe will be useful in evaluating and critiquing our own relationships and practices. We must learn before we would be teachers.

3. Issues of justice and mercy. In understanding and appreciating expressions of marital commitment in our culture as well as in other cultures, we must not overlook the critical issues of justice and mercy. We must remain sensitive to the fact that around the world women tend to be oppressed by men. The gospel is liberating good news of God's justice to those who are oppressed.

Mercy recognizes that change is difficult, and often can occur only slowly with much hardship. When practices must be changed in order to conform to the creation ideal, then special care must be taken to protect those who might be injured or experience hardship as a result. Established families should never be divided. Rather, we should enable change to occur over generations and with the full knowledge, consent, and participation of those affected.

Missionaries working within polygamous contexts have learned this lesson over the years, many times through trial and error. For example, when a man with many wives becomes a Christian, what direction does the missionary provide concerning the man's many wives (*see* POLYGAMY AND CHURCH MEMBERSHIP)? The issues are exceedingly complex, and missionaries must be patient and loving in processing these and other related issues.

ADRIENNE FORGETTE AND YOUNG LEE HERTIG

Bibliography. J. Chittister, *There is a Season.*

Second Language Acquisition. From the time that God confounded the languages at Babel (Gen. 11:7–9) there has existed the necessity for people to learn other languages and cultures. Joseph, for example, learned the language of Egypt so well that when his brothers went to Egypt to get grain they did not realize that Joseph could understand them, since he was speaking that language fluently and using an interpreter to talk with them (Gen. 42:23). At the birth of the church God demonstrated the importance of language by communicating through the disciples in such a way that people heard the message each in their own language (Acts 2:6–12).

God's eternal plan is that people from all languages will worship and serve him (Dan. 7:13–14; Rev. 5:9–10). So, he sends his followers to the uttermost parts of the earth (Acts 1:8), to evangelize and disciple and teach all the peoples of the earth (Matt. 28: 19–20). This task that he has given the church necessitates that we be willing to reach people of all languages and that we be able to communicate clearly with the people in a language they understand in order to disciple and train them. Language learning is clearly part of our mandate.

Some, however, might assert that only those people gifted in languages should endeavor the task of learning another language. Although a high level of natural ability enables language learning to be more rapid and easier, lack of such ease in learning does not render a person ineffective in learning another language. Anyone who is motivated to learn and who decides to participate with the people of the language and submit to change can achieve at least functional bilingualism given normal aptitude and sufficient opportunity. Even a learner with low aptitude can achieve a good measure of success in the normal use of the language provided the person is well-motivated and has a good opportunity to learn the language (Larson and Smalley, 1974, 3, 51).

Learners with lower language aptitude need to plan to invest greater time, determination, discipline, and effort in language learning and should seek optimum opportunity and resources for learning. There are classes and training programs designed to help prepare potential learners for entry into another language and culture. These pre-field classes may include training in language learning strategy and tactics, phonetics, grammar, use of resources, applied linguistics, linguistic analysis, interpersonal skills, culture learning skills, and anthropology. While all learners would benefit from such training, it is especially helpful for those who face a challenging situation, whether through lower ability or lack of resources and programs in the language.

One of the key factors in learning a language is the learner's settled decision that he or she wants

and needs to learn the language. For a missionary, this would be predicated upon a prior decision to follow the Lord's call to a particular people and to love the people who speak this language. Effective language learning necessitates a decision to learn the language and to involve oneself with the people of that language. Without such a firm decision it becomes easier to quit than to persevere in language learning.

Willingness to be a learner is a necessary corollary for effective language learning. A learner is one who recognizes a linguistic or cultural need and is willing to be vulnerable enough to expose that lack to others and allow others to help one learn. One who is a learner is willing to make mistakes and learn from them, willing to reach out to people who are different from oneself, willing to step outside one's own culture and begin to enter another's world, and willing to persevere in learning.

If the desire is to reach out to people and enter into life with them then the learner will make any life-style changes necessary to facilitate this involvement. The learner can take the effort to develop friendships with people who speak that language and spend time with them in learning activities as well as in relaxed social times, in order to hear the language, to practice speaking, and to experience the culture. The learner may choose to live in a neighborhood where the language is spoken so that there will be more opportunity to hear the language, to interact with people, and to form friendships. For greater and more intimate contact with the language and culture the learner should consider living for a period of time with a family who speaks that language. This will maximize involvement in the community, increase exposure to the language, enhance language learning, and give greater insights into the culture.

In addition to benefiting from contact with the community, the learner should take advantage of whatever other learning resources are available. In many languages, there are significant resources in the language such as written materials for learners (language text books, grammars, dictionaries, books for early readers, language analyses, dialect surveys), radio and television, tape recordings, videos, and computer programs. Use of these resources will enhance and facilitate learning.

Each learner should also seek a learning situation that corresponds with his or her needs, strengths, and learning style. In many languages there are excellent language schools, in others there are trained teachers or tutors. The learner should make appropriate use of this assistance. Lack of a school or program does not render language learning impossible but it does require more creativity and discipline from the language learner. If resources are scarce or unavailable, it behooves the learner to lean even more heavily on learning through contact with native speakers in the community.

Ideally, the language learner should plan on spending a minimum of a year in intense language learning focus with few if any other activities that would take one away from the language, and then spending at least some time daily on language learning for the next several years. The one who has learned how to learn can continue to learn as a way of life for the rest of his or her years in the language.

ELIZABETH S. BREWSTER

Bibliography. E. T. Brewster and E. S. Brewster, *Language Acquisition Made Practical;* idem, *Bonding and the Missionary Task;* H. D. Brown, *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching;* H. D. Brown, *Teaching by Principles;* L. Dickinson, *Self-Instruction in Language Learning;* D. L. Gradin, *Helping the Missionary Language Learner Succeed,* pp. 51–56; D. N. Larson and W. A. Smalley, *Becoming Bilingual, A Guide to Language Learning;* T. Marshall, *The Whole World Guide to Language Learning;* E. A. Nida, *Learning a Foreign Language;* H. Purnell, *Helping the Missionary Language Learner Succeed,* pp. 105–39; J. Rubin and I. Thompson, *How to be a More Successful Learner,* E. W. Stevick, *Success with Foreign Languages: Seven Who Achieved It and What Worked for Them;* G. Thomson, *Helping the Missionary Language Learner Succeed,* pp. 241–57.

Sexual Mores. The student of cross-cultural phenomena confronts a bewildering array of ideas about and practices of sexuality. Many of these ideas and practices will conflict with the cross-cultural worker's own socially conditioned beliefs and practices. Some of these ideas and practices may well conflict with biblical revelation.

The dual nature of this conflict sets the stage for missionary involvement in the sexual mores of the receptor culture. The cross-cultural worker may support mores that differ from his or her own socially conditioned views but that do not violate either biblical teachings or principles (i.e., bride price). The missionary may be compelled to advocate to local innovators changes in sexual mores that actually conflict with or violate biblical teachings or principles (i.e., female genital mutilation). In any case, the cross-cultural worker must seek to understand fully the meaning of the cultural practice and the biblical principles involved. Any proposed change in mores will proceed from this dual perspective.

EBBIE C. SMITH

Shame. In order to inculcate and motivate morality in its members, a society may seek to instill GUILT for violating persons or moral rules. Or it may seek to instill *shame* for moral failure.

Rather than motivating by the threat of punishment, such a society motivates by threatening disapproval and shame to those who fail to exemplify desirable virtues, and by offering honor and respect to those who exemplify prescribed character traits.

While most societies cultivate and are attentive to shame, Western societies have tended to be much more attentive to guilt than to shame. Westerners typically see shame as a more superficial response to moral failure than guilt, wrongly assuming that shame is the tendency to feel bad only when caught. In consequence Western missionaries often go to non-Western societies with poorly developed understandings of shame, and with negative attitudes toward the way shame functions in people's lives. They mistakenly believe that their own inclination to stress guilt over shame is simply a reflection of biblical priorities. In fact, shame is the focal emotion in the Genesis creation account, and is a focal emotion throughout the Scriptures.

Shame involves seeing oneself as deficient with reference to certain character ideals. We often become aware of ourselves through the eyes of others. We suddenly see ourselves as others see us. While it is true that shame arises out of, and is in large part caused by, the disapproval of significant others, the source of the shame is our thoughts about our selves. Shame is not fully determined by the negative evaluation of others. What elicits shame is the acceptance of the negative evaluation of others as the correct one. Nor does shame require the presence of others. It is possible while alone to come to some shameful realization about the self which suffuses one with shame.

How then are guilt and shame to be distinguished? Guilt is tied to acts of transgression—acts that merit punishment or require compensation. Guilt is a feeling about one's *actions*. Shame, on the other hand, is a feeling about one's *self*—who one is. It is about not being good enough. I am guilt *for something*. I am ashamed *of myself*. A small lie, if treated as evidence of a person's true character, may trigger intense shame. We treat the guilt with indignation and demand punishment or restitution. We turn from the shameful with contempt. Guilt can be expiated. Shame, apart from transformation of the self, is retained.

Missionaries to those who stress shame would do well to stress relevant biblical imagery (of nakedness, covering, uncleanness, glory), the character of Christ as our model for the self, God as the ultimate significant other whose view of us ought to inform our view of ourselves, sin as falling short of the glory of God, and above all, the possibility of a new beginning (a rebirth, a new identity in Christ) where sins are covered and shame removed. Our end is glory.

Robert J. Priest

Bibliography. L. L. Noble, *Naked and Not Ashamed: An Anthropological, Biblical, and Psychological Study of Shame.*

Sociolinguistics. The study of the many ways people use language in social interaction. Specialists in the discipline often distinguish between two major subdivisions, the *sociolinguistics of society* and the *sociolinguistics of language*. Each focuses primarily on one of the two ends of a continuum, with society at one extreme and language at the other.

The Sociolinguistics of Society. The sociolinguistics of society deals with the ways language and language-related decisions influence or shape groups of people, ranging from small subgroups within a society to entire nations. It includes the study of phenomena such as the attitudes of one group toward their own language and toward the languages of other groups, the survival and death of languages, the roles of individual languages in multilingual countries, and the spread of English as an international language.

Each of these areas of inquiry has practical implications for the members of a society. In multilingual countries, for example, the use of one language in government and/or education, usually elevates the status of its speakers while simultaneously marginalizing the speakers of other languages within the country. Likewise, in many nations the rapid growth of English as an international language has improved the financial status of those who can use it as the common language for conducting business transactions. Furthermore, the unprecedented growth in the number of speakers of English has fostered an increased sharing of ideas by researchers and practitioners in the various subfields of science and technology.

Mission agencies frequently draw on sociolinguistic data when they select the languages their personnel should learn, often encouraging the study of languages with the greatest numbers of speakers of the greatest perceived importance within the country or region. In addition, missionaries do sociolinguistic research when they conduct language surveys in order to make well-informed decisions about translation and literacy needs.

The Sociolinguistics of Language. The sociolinguistics of language addresses the ways various social factors and other variables influence or shape the language of its individual users. These include factors such as the speaker's social status, sex, and level of education, and for a given communicative exchange, the level of for-

mality of the context, and the relationship of the participants.

When interacting with others, speakers who "know a language" employ more than the phonological, grammatical, and semantic patterns of that language. They also know how to produce utterances that are appropriate for a wide variety of social settings. For example, they know how to modify their speech or writing when addressing adults versus children, when addressing family members versus strangers. They generally know when to speak, how long to speak, and when it is more appropriate to remain silent. This often intuitive knowledge is part of their sociolinguistic competence (Savignon, 1983, 41–42).

Sociolinguistic competence refers to a person's knowledge of and ability to use the verbal and nonverbal social rules of language. That is, it includes the ability to produce language that is within a culturally acceptable range and to interpret the intended meaning from the language used for various *speech acts* (e.g., greetings, small talk, persuading, apologizing, complaining, sympathizing), *relationships or social roles* (e.g., friend/friend, stranger/stranger, insider/outsider, older person/younger person, person of higher status/person of lower status), *situations* (e.g., lady buying food in the market, elementary teacher telling a Bible story to children, doctor examining a patient, traveler inquiring about lost luggage at the airport), and *psychological roles* (e.g., formal/informal, happy/unhappy, patient/impatient, sensitive/insensitive, caring/indifferent, courteous/discourteous) (Canale and Swain; Dickerson; Larson).

This branch of sociolinguistics is highly relevant for missionary language learners. As Kindell (1995, 171) points out, "The missionary who wishes to communicate the Gospel effectively must learn . . . a range of appropriate [linguistic] behaviors for that society." She notes that for adults who are learning to represent Christ in a linguistically different and culturally distant society, the acquisition of sociolinguistic norms is one of the most important tasks of the language learner, as well as one of the most difficult.

LONNA J. DICKERSON

Bibliography. M. Canale and M. M. Swain, *Applied Linguistics,* 1 (1980): 1–47; L. J. Dickerson, *Helping the Missionary Language Learner Succeed;* R. Fasold, *The Sociolinguistics of Society;* idem, *The Sociolinguistics of Language;* G. Kindell, *Helping the Missionary Language Learner Succeed;* D. N. Larson, *Guidelines for Barefoot Language Learning;* S. J. Savignon, *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice,* 2nd ed.

Sociological Barriers. Jesus succeeded in breaking through social and economic barriers in order to reach people with the gospel. Huge crowds followed him. He accepted invitations from people from every strata of society, and ministered to the sick, the demonized, Gentiles, women, children, and other groups awarded little or no status in his day. Yet Jesus' approach was not merely a method; it reflected a genuine attitude of the heart that all creatures are equally precious in the sight of God. Paul, likewise, was concerned to remove legitimate obstacles in order to maximize people's opportunity to hear the gospel. While being careful never to compromise the offense of the cross itself, Paul sought to "become all things to all men" in order to at least "save some" (1 Cor. 9:19–23).

To this day, economic and sociological factors loom large in missionary proclamation. The CHURCH GROWTH MOVEMENT has advocated the HOMOGENOUS UNIT PRINCIPLE as well as a focus on receptive, responsive people groups to enhance the influx of new believers into the church (*see* RECEPTIVITY). Betty Sue Brewster has urged missionaries to bond with nationals rather than being submerged in a missionary subculture (*see* BONDING). Jonathan Bonk has recently examined disparities in living standards between Western missionaries and nationals. Roger Greenway and others have advocated a simpler lifestyle for missionaries. Proponents of the Church Growth Movement have alerted the missions world to the need to pay attention to sociological factors within the societies in which missionaries work. Mission work will be more effective if attention is paid to social stratification, homogeneous units, and webs of relationships. Homogeneous units are sections of society in which all the members have some characteristic in common, such as language or dialect, ways of life, standards, level of education, self-image, places of residence, and other characteristics. This insight has led later missiologists to define people groups as significantly large sociological groupings of individuals who perceive themselves to have a common affinity for one another (Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization).

DONALD MCGAVRAN observed that people like to become Christians without crossing racial, linguistic, or class barriers. He concluded that church planters who enable people to become Christians without crossing such barriers are significantly more effective than those who place them in people's way. Not merely rational, denominational, and theological elements play a significant role in conversion, but also environmental factors, be they economic (*see* ECONOMICS) or sociological. McGavran also noted that Americans are accustomed to a unified society and consequently do not like to face the fact that most human societies are stratified along socioeconomic and other class lines. Some contend that church growth advocates assess people's receptivity too optimistically and that its methods are largely products of West-

ern pragmatism and utilitarianism. The rise of seeker-oriented churches in North America and elsewhere has demonstrated how the removal of socioeconomic obstacles and the targeting of specific segments of society with the gospel may lead to significant, even explosive, church growth. It has been objected, however, that even *necessary* obstacles to conversion and Christian growth, such as adequate instruction on the cost of discipleship, have occasionally been removed. Indeed, care must be taken not to sanction capitalistic, self-serving lifestyles and aspirations with the blessing of the gospel. Jesus' message to a similar audience may have been more confrontational and radical, rather than being directed primarily to meet people's needs while deemphasizing certain offensive elements of the Christian message.

Today mission has frequently become, not merely a calling from God, but a career. North American missionaries have grown more concerned about having incomes, health insurance, and retirement benefits comparable to professionals in their home country. Moreover, it has become increasingly common for missionaries not to serve for a lifetime but merely for a term, so that provision is made for circumstances conducive to their return home even before departure. Together with their dependence on foreign support while on the field and the frequent requirement for them not to engage in formal employment while serving with a missions agency, barriers are erected that set many missionaries up for failure from the very outset. This is not to minimize legal requirements for residency in the respective countries where missionaries serve or to belittle the needs of missionaries. It does, however, call for a conscious return to the attitudes modeled by Jesus, Paul, and the early church, and for a conscious effort to legitimately remove economic and social barriers for the sake of those who are to be reached with the gospel.

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER

Bibliography. D. McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth;* G. W. Peters, *A Theology of Church Growth;* C. P. Wagner, *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel.*

Status and Role. When social scientists refer to status, the term is less freighted with implications of value than in more popular usage. Status, in SOCIOLOGY, refers to the position an individual occupies in a group or society. It is based on the common recognition within the group that the individual occupies the position, not the perceived value of the position. Status is distinguished from roles in sociological theory in that individuals occupy a status and play a role. Roles define the rights, functions, obligations, and interactions of persons. Status refers to the position from which individuals act out their roles.

A status will have wide recognition and group consensus over its definition. There are two types of status, ascribed and achieved. Social scientists define ascribed status as one that is given by society and over which we exercise little if any control, such as age, gender, or ETHNICITY. An achieved status is the result of some action on the part of the individual, such as teacher, student, shopkeeper, consumer, church member, or police officer.

Understanding status and role is significant in missions studies because they are important keys to understanding CULTURE. The statuses of parent, laborer, minister, and athlete all point to certain images of how we expect people to behave in a given social interaction. Sometimes these images are less clear than others, but it is the general consensus of the society or group around these images that enables us to understand them as statuses within a society. It is the action carried out by the person in a particular status that we call a role. For example, consumers in some cultures interact with the marketplace through bargaining over prices. Shopkeepers are expected to enter into a process of negotiation over prices. In other countries, such as the United States, prices generally are attached to goods, and consumers are expected to pay the marked price. In some cultures, university students are expected to learn by synthesizing and analyzing material, and then produce a relatively original final paper. In other cultures, students are expected to master the thought of the instructor and, in deference to the teacher's wisdom, replicate his or her thought as the mark of educational accountability. In all cultures, people learn the roles—specific behaviors, values, and skills—that are appropriate to a given status.

Also, making the distinction between achieved and ascribed status helps us in CROSS-CULTURAL MINISTRY. For example, many cultures have rituals that make adulthood an achieved status (called RITES OF PASSAGE), whereas others follow laws that make adulthood ascribed (such as an eighteen-year-old voting age or individuals being tried in court as adults at a selected age). Knowing the difference can be crucial in developing cross-cultural ministries to adolescents and young adults.

What most people call status, social scientists call "social status." This refers to rank, honor, and esteem. Max Weber called it "social honor." In virtually all societies, relative prestige becomes a measuring stick for ranking individuals. In some societies, economic resources determine social status. In others, personal resources such as courage, intelligence, and leadership ability serve to determine social rank. In complex societies, a combination of ascribed (race, ethnicity, gender, age, even ancestry) and achieved (wealth,

education, income) statuses determine social ranking.

HAROLD DEAN TRULEAR

Bibliography. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology;* R. Merton, *Social Theory and Social Structure.*

Symbol, Symbolism. A symbol is something used to stand for something, such as an olive branch representing peace. Recent studies in human cognition have demonstrated that when we categorize objects in a taxonomy, there is one level that is more basic than the others. This "basic level" is the most abstract level at which we can form images. We can form an image of a *dog* or a *cat,* but not of the more abstract concept of an *animal.* The basic level is also the level at which we experience life. We interact with our pets as *dogs* and *cats,* not as *animals.* That we experience life at the basic level underlies our need to use the imagery of symbols to express more abstract concepts.

This need to use symbols for abstract concepts also makes us prone to IDOLATRY. We have a propensity to visualize the object of our worship, to create images of our gods. It is quite possible, therefore, that when God responded to Moses' request for a name to give to the idolatrous Egyptians, he gave Moses "I AM" so as to preclude them from representing him by an image (Rom. 1:23). Therefore, we need to keep in mind that the symbols we use to represent gospel truths have the potential of replacing those truths.

When people create a symbol to represent an object, the symbol usually bears a resemblance to that object. When a symbol closely resembles an object, however, it is a small step to the belief that the symbol mirrors the real world, that it exists apart from human creativity, and that it has inherent meaning.

The belief that symbols have inherent meanings that must be discovered underlies the practice of magic, divination, numerology, and astrology. It may also underlie the behavior of those who forbid others to use certain symbols because they regard those symbols as inherently evil. A recent example in the United States is the public pressure put on Procter and Gamble to drop their logo of the woman and the stars.

Many people regard symbols as having assigned meanings agreed on by a given society. The fact that the meanings are assigned by a given community not only allows a symbol to serve in communication within a society but also militates against the casual use of symbols for INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION. In one case, the introduction of baptismal names to symbolize new life in Christ was reinterpreted as a ruse to elude Satan, because Satan recognized people only by their prebaptismal names, but their new, baptismal names were the secret ones written in the Lamb's book of life (Rev. 2:17; 3:5). Therefore, we need to exercise care in using symbols to communicate gospel truths interculturally.

That the swastika arouses strong emotions points out that symbols are powerful because they are interpreted holistically as a gestalt. The sight of a swastika by a victim of the Holocaust transcends anti-Semitism to invoke the gestalt of the Holocaust with all the experiences and emotions of the perpetrators, the victims, and the complacent third parties. The viewers' emotional responses are grounded in the associations the symbol brings to their minds. Therefore, we need to keep in mind that simple symbols can represent very complex gestalts.

KENNETH A. MCELHANON

Bibliography. J. Heisig, *ER,* 13:198–208*;* P. G. Hiebert, *Cultural Anthropology;* G. Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind.*

Taboo. The word "taboo" is of Tongan origin *(tabu)* and designates a person, thing, or action that is forbidden due to its sacred or supernatural character. The primary function of the category of taboo is that of protection, and this usually occurs on three levels: social, economic, and religious. Taboos possess functional purpose rather than moral value.

On the social level, chiefs and rulers, along with their property, are designated taboo to protect the monolithic social structure of the tribe or group. Economically, certain animals are designated taboo to protect them from misuse by the people (conservation). For instance, the Maori of New Zealand declared digging up sweet potatoes before they were ready to be cooked and eaten a taboo to counter greed and waste. On the other hand, certain foods (pork and shellfish) have been declared taboo to protect people from disease through improper preparation of the foods.

Religiously, taboos have often been created to accommodate fear of the unknown, such as the birth of twins in animistic settings (namely, only animals have multiple offspring). A dualistic worldview is often characteristic of a taboo-oriented belief system. Thus, taboo is not so much concerned with what is morally right or wrong but rather with what functions to keep away offense. Such worldviews are often related to ancestor or spirit worship, and the offense associated with the taboo can extend to the non-physical spirit world as well. While unquestioning loyalty with respect to the taboo is required of the tribal members, great responsibility rests with the SHAMAN or religious leader not to lead the group into error that might result in the neg-

ative effects of the offense upon the group. "Salvation" then consists in maintaining a healthy balance (tension) between "good" and "bad" taboos.

It is essential that missionaries working in cultures in which taboos are prominent understand the nature and function of the taboos. Such understanding and sensitivity will not only prevent unnecessary offense, but it will provide valuable insights into the basic values and fears of the culture. Biblical answers to the fears underlying taboos can then be suggested.

CLINT AKINS

Bibliography. S. Ruud, *Taboo.*

Translation. Transmission of a message from one language to another whether in written or oral (interpretation) form. Nida and Taber define translation as "reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style." Translation seeks to accurately convey the meaning of the original message via clear and natural linguistic forms in the receptor language. Translation is thus based on a correct understanding of the original message set as it is in particular forms in the source language; it is also subject to the available structures of the receptor language. Translation does not occur unless the original meaning is communicated. A translation can then be evaluated in terms of how faithfully it conveys the original message, how clearly it conveys that message to speakers or hearers in the receptor language, and how naturally the message is expressed in the receptor language. Accurately conveying the meaning of the original message is paramount, style secondary.

Translation is based on the premise that every language is capable of expressing human thought. A speaker or an author expresses a given message in a given social and physical context using particular words and phrases based on his or her intent (e.g., to inform, to persuade), assumptions about what the hearer or reader will understand, couched in the linguistic and rhetorical tools he or she controls (e.g., rhetorical questions, metaphors). The translator must understand this original message before beginning translation. Thus, language analysis or exegesis is an initial step in the translation process. Since languages are distinct and have different ways of expressing meaning, a particular word or phrase in a language may have numerous meanings. "Chris's house" expresses a different relationship between Chris and the house than "Chris's spouse" or "Chris's hand." A "hand" on an arm is different than a "hand" on a clock or a "hand" of bananas. To "give someone a hand" may involve physical assistance or applause, depending on the context. Linguistic forms convey different meanings in different contexts.

In addition to the referential sense of words, translation must also consider connotative meaning. A speaker or author may choose words with strong negative or positive connotations. These meanings must be understood in their temporal and cultural context.

Transferring the message from the source language to another language involves determining which forms in the receptor language will adequately convey the original meaning. Very rarely will the same form be appropriate for the multiple senses of a word in the source language. The source language may have multiple senses for a particular word that demand separate forms in the receptor language (the English noun "key" is translated *llave* in Spanish if it is for a lock, *clave* if it is for a code, and *tecla* if it is on a keyboard). Conversely, the source language may have separate lexical items that are appropriately translated with one word in the receptor language, (Indonesian *padi, beras,* and *nasi* are all "rice" in English.) The lack of simple one-to-one correspondences between languages motivates the translator to seek the most appropriate way to express the meaning of the receptor language in words and phrases understood well in the receptor language.

The receptor language also determines the grammatical form of the translation; if words are simply translated one by one from the source language the result is merely a glossed text, not a translation. Interlinear translations of texts provide helpful insights about the source language. but are not properly called translations as such.

Translation and interpretation are one task with two modes of expression. In both tasks, the meaning of an original message must be conveyed accurately, clearly, and naturally in another language. Interpreters provide oral expression of the original message within moments of hearing it. Translators typically have a relatively extended period of time to study the original message before providing a written form in the receptor language. In Bible translation especially translators enjoy the benefit of detailed studies of the original message to aid them in their analysis.

Translation is modeled in Scripture as a means to convey a message to people who do not understand the language of the original message (Mark 5:41; 15:34; John 1:38). The postexilic Jews may have used interpreters to bridge the gap from the classical Hebrew of the Torah to the Aramaic of the audience (Neh. 8:8).

Agencies such as the United Bible Societies and the WYCLIFFE BIBLE TRANSLATORS (along with the Summer Institute of Linguistics) have focused on translation as a missionary tool, specifically for Bible translation. Translation theory

has been advanced by Christian authors; Eugene A. Nida wrote several seminal works on the theory and practice of translation. Countless other agencies around the world rely heavily on interpreters and translators to convey their message to people who speak a language not mastered by their missionaries. Mission interpreters and translators need to be well trained to translate accurately, clearly, and naturally.

Peter James Silzer

Bibliography. M. L. Larson, *Meaning Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence;* E. A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating;* E. A. Nida and C. R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation.*

Worldview. In popular usage the expression "worldview" often refers to nothing more than a particular point of view, a way of looking at something. But a worldview represents much more; it represents a whole constellation of assumptions and beliefs about what is real, how things fit together, and how things happen. Before considering a definition, however, it is useful to recognize two traditions in our understanding of worldview: the philosophical/theological and the cultural/societal.

The expression "worldview" (from *Weltanschauung*) has its origins in eighteenth-century German philosophy in the sense of ideology or system of thought, and this is the sense in which contemporary theologians use it. For most evangelical theologians a worldview constitutes a systematic approach to theology. Their focus is on the fundamental beliefs about the nature of God as Creator and Redeemer and the nature of humanity in its fallen state in need of a redeemer. They regard the Christian (biblical) worldview as in opposition to such ideologies as empiricism, humanism, naturalism, positivism, scientism, and secularism, as well as world religions such as Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam. The religions of technologically primitive societies are often regarded collectively under labels such as Animism or Primal Religions.

In contrast, those who study the world's cultures use worldview to refer to how the peoples of different cultures conceive of the world, how they categorize the things in the world and structure their knowledge, and how they interpret life experience so as to live fulfilling lives.

No one cultural group can claim to have the correct worldview; rather, each group's worldview stands on its own. Consequently, we can only speak of particular worldviews such as those of the Amish, Navaho, Sioux, or Maasai societies.

A definition that satisfies both of these approaches is that of Nash (1992): "A worldview, then, is a conceptual scheme by which we consciously or unconsciously place or fit everything we believe and by which we interpret and judge reality." Nevertheless, the philosophical/theological and cultural/societal traditions differ substantially in what they include in the concept of worldview and in how they apply it.

Worldview as a Corrective Concept. Those who adopt theological approaches begin with a single, unifying principle which structures the rest of the worldview. Nash (1992) reduces the principle to a single statement: "Human beings and the universe in which they reside are the creation of the God who has revealed himself in [the Christian] Scripture." Working out a single principle, however, results in a "whole range of systematic theology" (Holmes).

Evangelical theologians generally present the Christian worldview as a systematic theology for the defense of the Christian faith or as an instrument to confront and dismantle opposing worldviews. In so doing they use philosophical and logical argumentation, and their approach is more corrective than interpretive. Those who adopt such an approach regard the Contextualization of the gospel as a method for discovering the weaknesses of opposing worldviews and convincing their proponents of the superiority of the Christian faith.

Worldview as an Interpretive Concept. On the other hand, many evangelical Christian missionaries who adopt cultural approaches begin with both the Bible and the language and culture of the people they wish to reach. Because a command of the language is the key to understanding a worldview, they learn the language, how the people use the language to categorize the things they regard as important, and how they use it to interpret their life experiences. Thus their approach is more interpretive than corrective. They regard the contextualization of the gospel as an expression of the Christian faith through culturally appropriate concepts which are compatible with biblical truth. Accordingly, they speak of societal worldviews which have a Christian basis: thus American Christian, Navaho Christian, Maasai Christian or Zulu Christian worldviews. When, however, such Christian societal worldviews express biblical truth with categories which are unusual in comparison to those of the European languages, Western theologians often suspect that those categories represent a fusion of Christian and heathen concepts (*see* Syncretism).

Overview of Worldview. A worldview may be thought of as having four integrated components: words, categories, patterned life experiences (i.e., schemas), and themes. Each of these contributes to the distinctiveness of a worldview and to how that worldview governs people as they live out their lives.

People generally do not think about their worldview; in fact most assume that peoples of

other cultures think and reason in much the same way (*see* ETHNOCENTRISM). However, when they encounter another worldview with different assumptions and values they become aware of worldview differences.

To illustrate how a worldview integrates various concepts, we will consider some aspects of the worldview of the Selepet people of Papua New Guinea, a worldview which is radically different from those of Western societies, but which is typical of Melanesian societies. The Selepet people use the word *tosa* for a wide range of behavior. If a person steals someone's chicken, she or he acquires a tosa, which may be translated as "sin." To become free of the *tosa* requires that she or he give something of equivalent value to the chicken's owner. This item is known as a *matnge* and serves as restitution. A person may also acquire a *tosa* by destroying another person's property or physically abusing a person. The offender may remove the *tosa* with a *matnge* which serves as compensation. Or the offended party may exact their own *matnge* by an act of vengeance or by a demand for retributive punishment. To borrow something also incurs a *tosa*, and the repayment serves as the *matnge.* Finally, the acceptance of a gift incurs a *tosa,* which is best translated as "obligation," because one is obliged to remove the *tosa* by giving a *matnge* in the form of a comparable gift. What unifies all these examples is a dominant Selepet worldview theme that people have to maintain balance and harmony in their interpersonal relationships. Every *tosa* creates an imbalance which has to be rectified by a *matnge.*

Rather than focusing on the typical Western Christian concept of sin as falling short of God's standard or breaking God's law, this typically Melanesian worldview theme supports an equally Christian concept of sin as any action which disrupts a harmonious relationship. Adam and Eve's fundamental sin was to break their relationship with God by transferring their allegiance to Satan; disobedience was the outcome of that change. Therefore, one could regard the Melanesian Christian concept of sin as the more basic of the two.

If Melanesian Christians were to use their concept of sin to evaluate contemporary American culture, they would regard the development of the social security system and individual retirement accounts as fundamentally unchristian remedies for the elderly having to face retirement without family support. Moreover, they would strongly condemn the removal of the elderly from the family to nursing homes.

Many Western theologies emphasize that salvation is attained through repentance and faith (Acts 20:21) and maintained by an ongoing faith (Acts 13:43; Phil. 2:12). In many Melanesian worldviews, however, the concept of repentance is minimized. Rather, the process of salvation is seen to involve the giving of one's allegiance (John 1:12 NEB) which leads to reconciliation (Rom. 5:10; Col. 1:20) and adoption (Eph. 1:5), and is maintained by harmonious relationships (Eph. 4:30; Heb. 12:14). It is important to recognize that the Melanesian concept of sin and salvation can be consistent with biblical truth. Giving their allegiance to God results in their being adopted and entails that they stop doing those things which would harm that relationship. Thus, they repent even though they do not acknowledge it as such.

Worldview and Morality. The categories which a society creates are relevant to questions of morality. For example, Americans buy matches and regard them as personal property. Anyone who takes another person's matches is guilty of petty theft. However, in some technologically primitive societies fire belongs to everyone, just like water and air. So members of those societies may feel free to help themselves to an American's matches. Just because technology has captured fire, placed it on the end of a stick, and made it available for marketing does not remove matches from their category of things which belong to everyone, things not subject to being stolen. Rather, anyone who claims exclusive rights by withholding such a basic human resource as fire is regarded as morally deviant and exhibiting unchristian behavior.

In conclusion, it is important to recognize that the worldviews of different cultural groups need not be regarded as in opposition to a Christian worldview; rather they can become vehicles to express biblical truth just as did the classical Hebrew and Greek worldviews.

KEN A. MCELHANON

Bibliography. D. J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating Christ Cross-culturally: An Introduction to Missionary Communication.* 2nd rev. ed.; P. G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries;* A. F. Holmes, *Contours of a World View;* C. H. Kraft, *Anthropology for Christian Witness;* R. H. Nash, *Worldviews in Conflict: Choosing Christianity in a World of Ideas;* J. W. Sire, *The Universe Next Door.*