Ambassador of God. A missionary's task is to represent God and his message to an alien world. This shows the special relationship between the Creator and the messenger, who is dispatched as an envoy, an ambassador of God. An ambassador is an official diplomatic agent of high rank who is sent out by a ruler or government as a public representative. A missionary is one who is sent out to work as a citizen of the KINGDOM OF GOD, representing truth and light in a world of deceit and darkness.

In the Old Testament there are numerous examples of God's ambassadors. Noah represented God's righteousness to unbelievers. Moses proclaimed God's power and justice in pharaoh's court. Joshua showed the might and strength of the Lord before the Canaanites. Both Gideon and Deborah were mediators between God and the rebellious and defeated Israelites. God's special agents, called to proclaim and to direct people to obedience, lived lives that were testimonies of faith and commitment. Daniel and Esther served in alien governments as ambassadors of God through their words and actions.

In the New Testament, Christ tells a parable of a ruler sending an emissary, a select delegation to negotiate peace (Luke 13:32). God's ambassadors are a select, chosen few who challenge the enemy and seek to negotiate eternal peace in the hearts of humanity. The apostle Paul wrote to the church at Corinth stating that "we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were making his appeal through us" (2 Cor. 5:20). To the church at Ephesus he wrote, "I am an ambassador in chains" (Eph. 6:20). This refers to his imprisonment for openly proclaiming the good news of Jesus Christ. Paul measures himself as personally commissioned by Christ to present the gospel to the entire world. The Greek word *presbeuō* literally means a senior, one who is aged. However, Paul brings new meaning to the term. He is an elder statesperson representing the kingdom of God before the rulers and their subjects on this earth.

Missionaries serve as ambassadors of God. They are believers in Jesus Christ to whom God imparts certain spiritual gifts, and calls and sends out to make disciples and preach the good news (Matt. 20:18–20; Rom. 10:15). As citizens of the kingdom of God, they are subject to God's laws and are under the authority of the Lord they represent before the rest of the world.

JOHN EASTERLING

Amillennialism. As a term, amillennialism, like premillennialism and postmillennialism, was not coined until the 1840s. But, in fact, all three views are represented through the long history of the church. And they have shared much in common.

Shared Perspectives. Dominating those common features has been a confidence in the personal, visible, and glorious return of Jesus Christ to consummate his work of redemption and restoration begun with his life, death, and resurrection.

Also shared, with varieties of interpretation, has been the neo-Augustinian perception of this age stretching between the first and the second coming of Christ as a day of divine grace offered to the sinner.

In the years following the sixteenth century, that understanding combined especially with the colonialist expansion of Europe. An expanded knowledge of the world called for an expanded effort to announce that divine word of grace and forgiveness in Christ. And sadly, in that expansion, Western ethnocentrism often had difficulty in extracting "Christianizing" from "civilizing." Eschatology as Christ-centered hope too often began to look strangely like Western-centered progress.

Restraining this tendency toward the nationalization of eschatology were other beliefs shared in common by the three millennial viewpoints. The expectation of a full exhibition of the glorious reign of God on earth with Christ's appearance, of the physical resurrection from death, of the gathering in of "the fullness of the Gentiles" (Rom. 11:25), and the salvation of "all Israel" (Rom. 9:26) have had long standing in the church. These shared perspectives often create difficulties in too sharply dividing pre-nineteenth-century 'millenarianism' into specific schools (Murray, 1971, 48–49).

Missiological Trajectories. What are those particular features of amillennialism (sometimes called realized or inaugurated millennialism) that nurture the accomplishment of the missionary task?

First, the movement remains relatively unencumbered by the elaborate chronological details needed to insert a literal 1000-year period into an eschatological sequence. Its understanding of the millennium as the gospel age separating the first and second coming concentrates more on Christ as the center of history and Christ's return as the ultimate outcome of history. Its eschatological center thus tends to orbit more around Christology than around specific details immediately surrounding the second coming of the Lord.

Second, amillennialism, with postmillennialism, traces many of its theological roots to Puritanism's earlier emphasis on the sovereign rule of God in history. Missions, particularly in its Reformed expression, is then seen as still deeply *MISSIO DEI*.

In common with evangelical thought, late-nineteenth-century mission thinking has impacted this motivation with an additional focus on obedience to the GREAT COMMISSION (Beaver,

1968, 141–142). But the movement still clings to the union, formulated by Jonathan Edwards (1703–1758), of the themes of the divine reign of God and of the demand for regeneration, personal faith, and revival (Beaver, 1959, 67).

Third, this focus on the mission of God has made it somewhat easy for the movement to incorporate the current growing consensus in evangelical circles between missions and the KINGDOM OF GOD. In that consensus the kingdom is seen as the saving reign of God initiated by Christ's coming (the 'already') and to be consummated by his coming again (the 'not yet').

And for the amillennialist the missionary preaching of the kingdom's good news to all becomes a divine requirement given to the Christian community on its way to eschatological fulfillment (1 Cor. 9:16). Empowered by the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8), the church is "under obligation" (Rom. 1:14) to announce that Christ has come to inaugurate the kingdom through his redemptive work (Mark 1:14–15; Luke 4:18–21).

Fourth, amillenialism sees eschatology ("the last days") as initiated by the redeeming work of Christ (1 Cor. 10:11; Heb. 1:2). This pleads for a strong element of continuity between our life in the Spirit in "the present age" and "in the age to come" (Eph. 1:21).

This continuity becomes a powerful incentive for a holistic understanding of missions as both word and deed, evangelism and socio-cultural involvement (Matt. 25:31–46). Because perfect righteousness and peace will characterize the kingdom's future we seek also their beginnings in the kingdom's present, yet imperfect, manifestation (2 Peter 3:11–14; Matt. 6:10).

Fifth, and finally, this same perception of amillennialism as missions "between the times" also underlines a sense of discontinuity. There is still the reality of sin to bar missionary enthusiasm and promote the nations' obstinate refusal of Christ. Over-optimism concerning the course of human history toward the gospel's consummation is restrained by the reality that "many are called but few are chosen" (Matt. 22:14).

History's Modifications. Amillennialism, like its counterparts, has not escaped reshaping in the history of the church. And that reshaping has not always strengthened its missionary dimensions.

Its strong emphasis on continuity and the church's eschatological role "between the times" can sometimes lead its supporters to a kind of church imperialism that blurs the line between the church and the kingdom of God. Its sensitivity to discontinuity can find the church's missionary role reduced to that of guerrilla action within an institutional remnant. In doing so, its understanding of the presence of the kingdom in Christ can become a "world-avertive" shelter instead of a "worldformative" intrusion. And, in common with other millennial viewpoints, it can become so lost in chronological debates with those alternatives that it falls into eschatological paralysis.

HARVIE M. CONN

Bibliography. R. P. Beaver, *Basileia,* pp. 60–75; idem, *Reinterpretation in American Church History,* pp. 113–51; J. DeJong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions, 1640–1810;* A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future;* I. Murray, *The Puritan Hope;* B. Nicholls, *In Word and Deed: Evangelism and Social Responsibility.*

Annihilationism. Proponents of annihilationism maintain that God's JUDGMENT utterly obliterates the wicked. Recently annihilationism has made inroads among evangelicals. These annihilationists dispute the extent of punishment due the sinner. They affirm God's punishment in HELL is eternal in its effects, but not in its length. Sometimes this position is linked with an anthropological view called conditional immortality, which holds that humans have only potential immortality. The issue of annihilationism and hell's extent has occasioned much debate in recent scholarship. Four major points are in contention.

A Punishment with Eternal Results. Some annihilationists argue that when the Greek adjective for eternal, *aiōnios,* is used with nouns of action, it refers to an occurrence with eternal results, not an eternal process (Fudge). So "eternal punishment" denotes a punishment that occurs once with everlasting results. But this argument is weak. For "everlasting salvation" (Heb. 5:9) refers not simply to Christ's work long ago. Scripture describes believers, even in the age to come, as existing "in Christ" (2 Cor. 5:17; Col. 2:6, 7; 2 Tim. 2:10). So *aiōnios sōteria* refers to a salvation that is everlasting in action and its result. Similarly, "everlasting punishment" should be interpreted as everlasting in process and result. Confirming this meaning, Jesus uses the same adjective *(aiōnios)* for eternal life and eternal punishment, indicating that in his mind the extent of each future is identical (Matt. 25:46).

Destruction. Some annihilationists insist that the biblical imagery of destruction and a consuming fire implies the cessation of life (Stott). However, the Greek verb "destroy" *(apollumi)* and its cognates range in meaning from "lost" (Luke 15:8, 24) to "ruined" (Matt. 9:17). Even when referring to physical death, "destroy" does not suggest extinction; for Jesus cautions that those who kill the body cannot kill the soul (Matt. 10:28). Jesus' juxtaposing the two destinies of "life" and "destruction" (Matt 7:13–14; John 3:16) is not contrasting survival and extinction. Rather these are two qualitatively different types of life, one involving a loving communion

with God and another lacking it and in a state of "ruin" (John 8:12; 10:10; 1 John 5:11–12).

The annihilationists' argument that fire totally consumes what it burns ignores that Jesus' portrayal of hell's fires are not literal descriptions. These are metaphors for God's retributive punishment (Luke 17:29) which must cohere with other biblical accounts. Elsewhere Jesus pictures hell as a place where "*their* worm does not die," suggesting that this worm is endlessly linked to the damned as their due; so "their worm" has traditionally been interpreted as the soul's internal torment (Mark 9:48). Other Scriptures explicitly teach that the wicked are punished with "everlasting torment" (Rev. 20:10, 15; 14:10–11).

Justice of God. While acknowledging God's retributive judgment, annihilationists insist that this punishment must be commensurate with the evil deed. Why should sins committed in time require torment throughout eternity? Is not everlasting torment vindictive, and incompatible with the LOVE OF GOD? The punishment due to the sinner is the central challenge of the annihilationists.

Scripture is the norm for delineating the penalty for sin, not our own self-justifying assessments. Scripture identifies Christ's priestly work of ATONEMENT as the penalty necessary for sin. For God in Christ became our substitute to bear the punishment for our sins: "He did this to demonstrate his justice . . . so as to be just and to be the one who justifies those who have faith in Jesus" (Rom. 3:21–26; 2 Cor. 5:21; 1 Peter 2:24). If Christ was only a human, his substitutionary work would suggest that the penalty is simply a finite loss. Suffering a finite penalty as extinction is consistent with that scenario. But Christ was simply not human. God himself was present at the cross establishing this RECONCILIATION by accepting the punishment due us (1 Cor. 2:8). Jesus' priestly work indicates that the penalty for sin against the Infinite is infinite. As Scripture testifies, God's punishment of the damned is infinite, and of everlasting duration.

Annihilationism's Theological Shift. Annihilationism does not simply mute hell's horror, it represents an anthropocentric reading which places in motion decisive theological changes. Denying that sin is an infinite offense against the infinite God requiring an infinite punishment undercuts the gravity of humanity's rebellion as well as God's lordship. Just because we are finite does not entail that sin is finite offense. Rather sin's gravity is established by the one to whom we are accountable, God our Creator (Rom. 2:6–16; 1 Peter 4:5). Moreover, rejecting an everlasting hell disparages the cost of our salvation. It renders the sacrifice of the God-man in and of itself unnecessary. Nor is it accidental that in mainline circles annihilationism has historically gone hand in hand with a denial of Jesus' deity (Socinianism and non-universalist liberals). But ultimately annihilationism's anthropocentric focus fails. For historically the commitment to EVANGELISM of even evangelical annihilationist institutions has faltered after the second or third generation. Underemphasizing the importance of hell tends to diminish the motivation for missions.

TIMOTHY R. PHILLIPS

Bibliography. D. A. Carson, *The Gagging of God: Christianity Confronts Pluralism,* pp. 515–36; D. L. Edwards and J. Stott, *Evangelical Essentials*, pp. 306–31; E. Fudge, *The Fire That Consumes;* S. McKnight, *Through No Fault of Their Own: The Fate of Those Who Have Never Heard*, pp. 147–57; J. I. Packer, *Reformation and Revival* 6:2 (Spring 1997): 37–51; M. R. Talbot, *Reformation and Revival* 5:4 (Fall 1996): 117–34.

Assurance of Salvation. The *subjective confidence* which genuine Christians are privileged to possess that they truly belong to God as his children and heirs of eternal life. Wesleyan-Arminian theology focuses on the reality of the present state of grace of Christians and the assurance that engenders, while Calvinism adds that this assurance includes the confidence that they will continue as believers throughout their life and when they die they will certainly go to be with Christ in heaven forever.

Calvinism closely links assurance to divine election and the perseverance of the saints (or ETERNAL SECURITY). Those whom God has predestined, he also saves, and this includes the initiation, continuation, and consummation of salvation (Rom. 8:28–30). God's persevering work in the lives of all true believers powerfully keeps them through the exercise of their faith for a waiting salvation (1 Peter 1:3–9). Grateful recognition of this results in assurance.

To this may be added Christ's own pledge to protect believers (John 6:37–40; 10:27–30), biblical promises of God's faithfulness and love (Phil. 1:6; Rom. 8:31–39; 2 Tim. 1:12), and assurances that Christians are privileged to *know* that they possess eternal life (1 John 5:13; John 3:36; 5:24). Trust in this testimony of the Word of God produces assurance.

Scripture also speaks of the fruit of transformed lives that may generate confidence. Entitling this the "witness of one's own spirit" (Rom. 8:16), Wesleyan theology points to the biblical descriptions of character qualities and good works which believers are expected to manifest. These include love for one another, obedience, and the fruit of the Spirit. When believers compare their lives with these marks of authentic Christian testimony and a favorable judgment is rendered, this witness of transformed lives gives a measure of assurance. Some forms of Calvinism also embrace this introspective approach.

Romans 8:16 and Galatians 4:6 present the Holy Spirit as another source of assurance of be-

longing to God. Distinguishing the "witness of one's own spirit" from the "witness of the (Holy) Spirit," JOHN WESLEY affirmed this witness to be a direct testimony of the Spirit upon the hearts of believers, attesting to their being children of God.

Despite these several grounds of assurance, many Christians lack a subjective confidence. On the one hand, this may be due to persistent sin, grieving the Holy Spirit, or demonic deception; on the other hand, depression, personal anxiety, inability to appropriate the biblical promises of assurance, or simply ignorance of this scriptural teaching may result in an absence of assurance. Calvin noted that "Satan has no more previous or dangerous temptation to dishearten believers than when he unsettles them with doubt about their election." As Barth affirms, however, "There can be no doubt that the Christian can and should have assurance of his faith and salvation." Believers throughout history who have possessed a strong sense of assurance have stood fearlessly in giving testimony for Christ. Lucian, a pagan (second century), complained that Christians "have persuaded themselves that they will live forever, so they don't despise death." In Calvin's day, Geneva produced a "race of martyrs" spreading the gospel despite the threat of death. Convinced that their eternal destiny is secure, believers will forsake their comfortable and familiar life, cross into unknown cultures, adopt new languages and customs, face overwhelming confusion and stress, and even risk their lives for the sake of proclaiming the gospel of Christ. The history of Protestant mission during the last two hundred years is filled with the stories of thousands of cross-cultural missionaries whose assurance of salvation enabled them to give their lives, literally, for gospel proclamation.

GREGG R. ALLISON

Bibliography. D. Carson, *WmTJ* 54 (1992), pp. 1–29; K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics* IV/3, 565–66; J. Miley, *Systematic Theology* II:339–53.

Atonement. The biblical concept of atonement refers to a God-provided and -approved means of paying the penalty for human violations of God's law; a means which alleviates individuals from assuming that responsibility themselves. The need for atonement arises as a result of human sinfulness. Scripture teaches that all have sinned (Rom. 3:23). For that reason, human culpability is universal (Rom. 2:1). No one can claim exemption, regardless of culture, tradition, previous religious activities, or commitments. As a result, every individual ought to be made to pay the full price of her or his own sin, which is death and eternal separation from God (Rom. 6:23). However, Scripture also teaches that God has provided a way to fulfill the demands of divine justice which is reasonable and effective, but does not demand that the penalty be exacted from the individual.

The way in which God has chosen to resolve the problem of sin is by providing an alternative means of payment. In the Old Testament this was achieved primarily by means of animal sacrifice. The substitutes which will be accepted include the burnt offering (Lev. 1:4), the sin offering (Lev. 4:20; 7:7), and the offerings made on the Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:1–34). The clear teaching of the Old Testament is that unless some God-approved means of atonement is provided, individual sinners will themselves be required to pay the penalty.

In the New Testament the idea of atonement is focused on the person of Christ (Rom. 5:10). Reconciliation between God and humans is no longer achieved by animal sacrifice (Heb. 9:26; 10:4), but by the death of Christ (2 Cor. 5:19). The death of Christ was a reasonable and effective solution to the problem of human guilt because Christ was fully human and fully divine (Mark 10:45; 2 Cor. 5:21). Because Christ was fully human he was able to fully identify with the human state, was tested in every way as we are, yet without sin (Heb. 4:14–16). Because he was fully God, he was able to provide a payment (Rom. 3:25–26) of sufficient value to cover the transgression of all humanity (Heb. 10:5–10). The two poles of God's salvific method are most evident on the cross. There he suffered death as any of us would have suffered it, and at the same time experienced a suffering of immeasurable intensity, since he, the Son of God, had never sinned, but was separated from the Father by voluntarily taking upon himself the sins of the many and turning away the wrath of God (Rom. 3:25).

There is relatively little disagreement concerning the basic principles outlined above. Any individual who expresses faith in Christ is covered by this payment. However, since Scripture does not clearly specify the scope or extent of the atonement, this issue has precipitated considerable debate. The basic question is whether the atonement should be viewed as limited to a certain subset of the human race, the elect, or whether it should be viewed as a provision intended for all of humankind.

Those who suggest that the atonement is limited do so on the basis of a combination of biblical passages and the use of logical arguments. They point out that there are some passages which do define a limited group of recipients. Christ died for his own people (Matt. 1:21), his sheep (John 10:11), the church bought with his own blood (Acts 20:28), and those whom God predestined and called (Rom. 8:28–35). Further, they argue that since God's will can never be countermanded, if he had intended for all to be

saved, all would be saved. In addition, they point out that Christ did not die simply to make salvation possible, but to actually save certain individuals (Eph. 1:7; 2:8). They also fear that any other understanding of the atonement necessitates UNIVERSALISM.

The case for general atonement is made by appealing to Scripture passages and the history of doctrine. Scripture clearly states that Christ died for all and for the whole world (Isa. 53:6; 1 John 1:29; 2:2; 1 Tim. 2:1–6; 4:10, Heb. 2:4). There are no exegetical reasons for ascribing to these passages meanings other than the plain and inclusive sense they communicate. Proponents of general atonement also seek to demonstrate that it is the traditional position of the church. From the early church until today most of the fathers, reformers, exegetes, and theologians believed that Christ died for all. As for the danger of universalism, since salvation is only effective for those who express faith, suggesting that Christ made salvation possible for all in no way implies that all will be saved (John 3:16).

Whichever position is taken on the extent of the atonement, the evangelical understanding of the general principles of atonement have two significant implications for missions. First, if the problem of sin is universal then the message of atonement should be addressed to all. This presents no problem to the defenders of general atonement, but some have suggested that one of the consequences of a limited atonement would be to discourage the universal, urgent proclamation of the gospel. However, since there is no way for us to identify the elect ahead of time, the gospel message should still be addressed to all. If that is the case, we are under obligation to proclaim the message of Christ's atoning work without reservation. It is to be proclaimed to all, in all places, and at all times.

Second, the method God chose to provide atonement will cause some to stumble. The message of the cross will lead to opposition, cause offense, and even be ridiculed (1 Cor. 1:18–29). The messengers will, of course, experience resistance. Blinded by sin, many will find the notion of a substitutionary death on the cross either offensive or foolish. That cannot be avoided. No manner of CONTEXTUALIZATION, effective communication, or marketing techniques can remove the offense of the cross. However, care should be given so that any offense occasioned by the person or the work of the messenger be kept to a minimum.

EDWARD ROMMEN

Bibliography. H. Berkhof, *Christian Faith;* D. G. Bloesch, *A Theology of Word and Spirit;* G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence;* T. N. Finger, *Christian Theology: An Eschatological Approach;* S. J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God;* S. J. Grenz, *Revisioning Evangelical Theology;* P. K. Jewett, *God, Creation, and Revelation;* G. R. Lewis and B. A. Demarest, *Integrative Theology III;* A. E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction;* O. Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics.*

Baptism. Christian rite of initiation using water. The origin of its practice is usually traced specifically to John the Baptist and through him to Jewish practices of ceremonial washings, Qumran purification rites (initiates into the Essene sect of Judaism underwent a ritual washing), and proselyte baptism (Gentile converts to Judaism). It is almost universally practiced by Christians based on the precedent set by Christ in his own baptism (Matt. 3:11), his command to baptize (Matt. 28:19), and testimony in the Acts of the Apostles and the New Testament Epistles of its practice by the early Christian community.

Although reckoned by almost all branches of Christianity as a sacrament, its mode, subjects, and significance have historically been issues of sharp doctrinal controversy.

While some practice affusion (pouring of water) or aspersion (sprinkling), the Baptist position has generally called for immersion. This is primarily defended on the grounds that (1) the Greek word transliterated "baptize" in the New Testament means "to dip, immerse"; (2) immersion best illustrates the significance given to baptism by the apostle Paul (Rom. 6:1–11)—the believer's identification with the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and (3) immersion was practiced by the Jews, John the Baptist, and the early church.

However, the primary dispute of the Anabaptists with the other Reformation traditions concerned who was to be baptized. Calvin and Luther continued the Roman Catholic practice of infant baptism (although certainly with different theological justification), whereas the Anabaptists rejected this in favor of believer's baptism, that is, that personal confession of faith was a prerequisite for the one to be baptized. Thus the Baptist tradition has generally reserved this rite for individuals old enough to express conscious faith in Christ. The Reformers argued that baptism is analogous to infants receiving circumcision in the Old Testament. It is a sign of God's covenant promise and grace administered to Abraham and climaxing in the new covenant. It is not primarily a sign of faith/repentance on the part of the believer (as the Baptist position); rather it is a seal of the work of God that precedes and makes possible the person's response.

Protestants as a whole have disagreed with the sacramental significance assigned to baptism by Roman Catholics. Protestants view baptism as being an outward, visible manifestation of inward spiritual reality. For Catholics, baptism does not simply illustrate, but it actually effects that spiritual reality through its very operation.

Thus, baptism infuses the grace of the new birth (hence, baptismal regeneration) even in infants.

The spiritual reality signified by baptism is itself variously interpreted and nuanced by Protestants. However, the following ideas are generally included: the cleansing from sin; union with Christ in death and resurrection and thus the death of the old self and its way of life and the rising to new life in Christ; and incorporation of the Christian into the Body of Christ.

Missionaries often must deal not only with the spiritual dimensions of baptism but also the social implications. In many societies where Christians are a distinct minority baptism is viewed with greater significance by Christians and non-Christians alike as it publicly marks the convert's decision to associate with the Christian community.

The practice of baptism has given rise to special difficulties in contexts where great value is given to family relationships and societal unity and where baptism by the established church has come to signify in practical terms the convert's repudiation of his or her previous social, political, and cultural loyalties. This misconception of the spiritual significance of baptism, it is said, has arisen from a perceived association of Christianity with Western culture as well as misguided efforts in winning individual converts even at the expense of separating them from their communities. Some missiologists have therefore suggested in view of such a misunderstanding of the true meaning of baptism by the non-Christian society that the insistence of baptism by the new convert be dispensed with in order to minimize his or her cultural dislocation and to allow the Christian to remain within his or her community while continuing to discreetly share Christ by life and witness from within it.

While recognizing the biblical mandate to baptize but in view of the difficulties of baptism as it is normally practiced, missionaries in Muslim fields have considered variations, such as the delay of baptism until a number of converts can be baptized together; secret baptism with a limited audience; self-baptism; or the substitution of a contextually appropriate initiation ceremony that would retain the biblical meaning of baptism but have a different form and thus reduce offense to the onlooking Muslim community.

SCOTT CUNNINGHAM

Bibliography. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament;* A. Gilmore, ed., *Christian Baptism;* M. Green, *Baptism: Its Purpose, Practice and Power;* P. Parshall, *New Paths in Muslim Evangelism: Evangelical Approaches to Contextualization.*

Biblical Theology of Mission. The only rule of faith and practice that God has given is the Bible. It has the force of law. Because mission embraces "the totality of the task he sent his church to do in the world" (Bosch, 1978), we must select a theme that is prominent in both Testaments.

That theme is the KINGDOM OF GOD. It dominated the ministry of Jesus and provides linkage to all "the many and various ways" by which God had earlier spoken to his people by the prophets (Heb. 1:1). "Missiology is more and more coming to see the Kingdom of God as the hub around which all of mission work revolves; one can almost speak of a consensus developing on this point" (Verkuyl, 1978). In our day evangelicals are finding that the biblical base for mission is far more complex than previous generations envisioned. Gone is the single focus of an overwhelming concern for the spiritual condition of "the HEATHEN." Nor can credibility be gained by supplementing this concern with appeals to the GREAT COMMISSION (e.g., Matt. 28:18–20; etc.), or by prooftexts supporting such related themes as the sending character of God, the compassionate compulsion of the Spirit, the example of the apostolic church, and the relation between missionary obedience and the second coming of Christ. These themes are important, but one cannot build a comprehensive biblical theology of mission on them. The kingdom or "rule" of God must be the dominant motif since by it God touches every aspect of the human condition: past, present, and future (*see* KINGDOM OF GOD).

When we explore the relationship of the kingdom of God to world mission, we begin with the reminder that God's kingship is both universal and covenantal. When God created the heavens and the earth by his Word and created the first human couple in his own image and likeness, it was inevitable that he would exercise a loving and preserving control over his creation and particularly over the human race. This can be described as his universal kingship. Both Old and New Testaments teach this universal kingship, but in the Old Testament we also find God's kingly rule identified with Israel, a people with whom he established a covenant relationship.

The Old Testament Contribution (*see also* OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY OF MISSION). In the opening chapters of the Old Testament we find the first reference to mission as defined above. God said to the first man and woman: "Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it" (Gen. 1:26–30; 2:15, 18–25; Ps. 8:5, 6). This command is frequently termed "the CULTURAL MANDATE." By it God called Adam and Eve to accept responsibility for this world as his vice-regents, to serve and control it under his direction and for his glory. Its details pertained to their social existence, and mark the beginning of a stream of obligation—a mandate for family and community, culture and civilization—that widens and deepens as it courses throughout

Scripture. We are not surprised to find that in the messianic age that Christ will later inaugurate, these many obligations will be made even more explicit as part of his missionary mandate that the church proclaim and demonstrate "the good news of the Kingdom" to the nations (Matt. 24:14). And such has proved to be the case. We might regard the cultural mandate as the prelude to the "Great Commission."

At the outset the expectation was that because God is sovereign, he will be obeyed. But this was not to be. Early on God imposed a moral test on Adam and Eve (the "trees"—2:16, 17). In granting them freedom of choice, God was running a great risk. Would they freely choose to remain under God's control or would they seek an existence separate from God? Sadly, they chose the latter and their fall (3:1–7) brought them under the dominance of "the tempter" and forged linkage with his hostile spirit-power and open opposition to the rule of God (*see also* Fall of Humankind). More was involved. Although they continued to carry out the cultural mandate, their obedience was now shaped by selfish impulses arising from their abdication of responsibility for the world and their surrender to the one who had now gained control of the world ("the god of this world"—John 12:21 and 2 Cor. 4:4; see also Satan). Subsequent chapters (Gen. 4–11) record the effects of the Fall, ranging from fatricidal murder to worldwide violence; from God's judgment of all antedeluvians to the tragedy that came to the one family that was delivered (Noah's); and from human arrogance attempting to establish a universal kingdom with its defiant tower to further judgment, the linguistic confusion and scattering of the people (Babel).

Since the cultural mandate was no longer being carried out under God's direction, God then began via Divine Election and covenant to unfold a redemptive purpose that would deal with the problem of human rebellion and alienation from his fellowship. He called a man named Abram out of Ur within the complex of Babel, and began to train him to live by faith that through his seed (Israel), "all peoples on earth" would "be blessed" (Gen. 12:1–3; *see also* Abrahamic Covenant). His gracious desire was via Israel to bring fallen people "by repentance and faith" to break with Satan's control (1 John 5:19; Acts 26:18, etc.) as co-laborers with their Messiah, to regain control of the world and those within it who would respond to his love.

But Old Testament history records repeated failure on Israel's part. Actually, over the years only a remnant within Israel believed and obeyed God. At the same time, however, their prophets predicted that God would ultimately realize the covenant goal he had set for a believing remnant in the nation: "to restore the tribes of Jacob" and to become "a light for the gentiles" so that his "salvation" might be taken "to the ends of the earth" (Isa. 49:5, 6). The key to this total restoration will be "the Redeemer and Holy One of Israel"—strangely, the One "who was despised and abhorred by the nation" (49:7). Despite this, Israel went ever deeper into spiritual infidelity, open rebellion, and prolonged captivity, with only infrequent periods when through national repentance the blessing of God became partly evident in the life and worship of his people. The tragedy is that in the end the various contending parties within Judaism, though often at loggerheads with one another, united to participate in the final tragedy of standing against the One who came as the self-confessed "Son of Man" of Daniel, the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah, and the "Smitten Shepherd-King" of Zechariah.

Old Testament Axioms of Mission. Five major axioms in the Old Testament are inherent in the New Testament unfolding of the kingdom of God in relation to the church's mission to the nations. They can be traced within this tragic history of Israel's experience with God.

1. God is sovereign in his kingship. His rule over individuals and nations is always righteous and just. He is the moral Governor of the universe (Ps. 22:27, 28; Dan. 4:34, 35; *see also* Sovereignty of God).
2. God seeks the personal commitment of his people. God's Holiness demands righteousness on the part of all Israelites who would be in covenantal relationship with him (Isa. 55:6, 7).
3. God's people are to constitute a "serving" community among the nations by example and through personal outreach. They are to oppose "by word and deed" all that demeans people (Mic. 6:8).
4. God's purpose through his people is relentlessly opposed by the inveteracy of human evil and the implacable hostility of Satan and his hosts (Job 1, 2; 2 Chron. 36:15, 16).
5. God's purpose for Israel and the nations always moves beyond present matters, and is invariably directed toward his future and ultimate triumph in history (Isa. 2:2–4; Zech. 14).

Specific Old Testament Contributions. Within the record of Israel's long history the Old Testament touches on themes that are relevant to mission outreach today: the issue of slavery and political liberation (Exodus and Ezra); the relation of God's people to secular power and secular events (Genesis and the Prophets); the mystery of suffering and redemption (Genesis, Exodus, and the Servant Songs of Isaiah); the lifestyle of God's

people (Leviticus); the perils of religious pluralism (Hosea); the issue of racism and the disease of anti-Semitism (Esther); the basic problems encountered in serving God (Haggai and Zechariah); religious encounter and the non-negotiability of truth (Jeremiah); the pursuit of personal and national spiritual renewal (Nehemiah and Malachi); the role of the believing remnant within Israel (Amos and Isaiah); the possibility of becoming useless to God through ethnocentrism (Jonah); the function of wisdom literature as a bridge to the nations that know not God (Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes); and the missiological implications of Israel as a diasporal people.

Although the Old Testament is replete with insightful material related to issues inherent in mission, on the one crucial issue it is silent. In the Old Testament God has not revealed "the mystery hidden for ages and generations" whereby Gentiles through the gospel would become fellow heirs with the people of God. Biblically informed Jewish people know that their future Golden Age will not take place without a massive ingathering of the nations to the worship of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. But how this would come about remained a mystery until Jesus Christ inaugurated the messianic age (Eph. 3:3–9).

The New Testament Contribution (*see also* NEW TESTMAENT THEOLOGY OF MISSION). The unity of the Bible is nowhere more clearly seen than in the way in which the Old Testament kingdom axioms mentioned above were amplified and increased in the New Testament. With the advent of Jesus Christ these axioms are directly related to world mission.

First, God's sovereignty focuses on Christ's lordship. "We preach Jesus Christ as Lord" (2 Cor. 4:5). This is the heart of the good news of the kingdom (Rom. 10:9, 10). Through the cross he conquered all his foes and obtained salvation for his people. His present rule over the redeemed adumbrates his coming rule when "every knee" bows to him and "every tongue" confesses his lordship (Phil. 2:6–11). The worship of other gods is utterly abhorrent to him.

Second, Christ's lordship demands personal commitment. The New Testament stresses the necessity of faith, the new birth, the inner witness of the Holy Spirit, and its outward expression in love and kingdom service. Only "new creatures in Christ" shall enter the kingdom of God (John 3:5). Those who possess his lordship but whose lives do not reflect his values and perspectives are challenged to examine themselves to determine whether they are truly his (2 Cor. 13:5).

Third, the community of the King is the Body of Christ. Kingdom people, whether Jews or Gentiles, are custodians of the kingdom and share oneness in the church. Their common life is expressed through corporate WORSHIP, mutual sharing, united confession, and outgoing service. They live by PRAYER and the CONFESSION of sin. Although the CHURCH as Christ's body is of divine creation, its visible, structured presence is a flawed mixture of God's grace, human fallenness, and demonic penetration. Its only glory is the presence of Christ in its midst, realized by faith.

Fourth, the church is called to mission. Only after Christ had completed his redemptive work did he issue the call to world mission: to proclaim and demonstrate "by word and deed" the "good news of the kingdom of God." Its details strikingly endorse but significantly supplement the Old Testament injunction to "do justice, and to love kindness and to walk humbly with God" (Mic. 6:8). After he sent the Holy Spirit upon his disciples, they consciously began to sense that they possessed a universal faith for all nations and began to go beyond the bounds of Israel to Gentile peoples to proclaim this gospel. Mission's central and irreplaceable task is persuading people to become Christ's disciples and gathering them into local congregations (*see also* MISSIONARY TASK).

Fifth, obedience to mission involves SUFFERING. The New Testament is replete with the record of conflict and suffering precipitated by the advent and proclamation of gospel of the kingdom. Jesus himself experienced the world's rejection and the devil's fury, and learned obedience through what he suffered (Heb. 5:8). In much the same way the church, claiming the victory of Christ over the powers (Col. 2:15), will experience the sifting of Satan (Luke 22:31) and fiery trials (1 Peter 1:6–8) that it too might be perfected, the better to perform its mission. This process will continue and even intensify as the age draws to an end.

Sixth, the future remains bright with hope. God's redemptive purpose will be fulfilled (Acts 1:8). What he initiated will be consummated. Through the missionary obedience of his disciples God will call out a completed people from the nations. Then he will "judge the world in righteousness by a Man whom he has appointed, and of this he has given assurance to all by raising him from the dead" (cf. Acts 17:30, 31 with Matt. 25:31, 32). The climax of Christ's redemptive purpose will take place at his second coming "when all things are subjected to God. Then the Son will also be subjected to God who put all things under him that God may be everything to everyone" (1 Cor. 15:28; *see also* PAROUSIA).

Israel Confronts Her Messiah. In the Old Testament God frequently sent prophets to Israel to remind the people of their covenantal relationship to him and the service he expected of them (Jer. 7:25). And yet, God's sending of Jesus was unique. The fallen condition of humanity was so acute and the need for redemption so great that only the INCARNATION of God the Son and the

ATONEMENT of the cross could avail to provide for the redemption of God's people. Previous "sendings" set the stage for this final "sending" of the Messiah to Israel. This event marks the great hinge of salvation history: the end of "the old" and the beginning of "the new."

When Jesus came to Israel he almost immediately began to question the traditional piety of the Pharisees. He also turned to the outcasts of society and set before them a quality of life dominated by the love of God. In this connection Bosch states: "It is remarkable to note how these people to whom Jesus turned are referred to in the Gospels. They are called the poor, the blind, the lame, the lepers, the hungry, sinners, those who weep, the sick, the little ones, the widows, the captives, the persecuted, the downtrodden, the least, the last, those who are weary and heavily burdened, the lost sheep" (1978). In other words he embodied the kingdom of God as a countercultural presence in society and offended the Pharisees who could only sneer and scornfully comment: "This mob that knows nothing of the law—there is a curse on them" (John 7:49). They did not sense the significance of his redemptive purpose despite their study of the Scriptures (John 5:39). The Sadducees also opposed him because they knew neither the Scriptures nor the power of God (Mark 12:24).

This redemptive purpose began with John the Baptist, the Messiah's herald ("Elijah has come!"; Mal. 4:5; Matt. 17:12) and Jesus' incarnation, baptism, and divine attestation by God as to his true identity (Matt. 1:23; 3:7). Then followed his confrontation and triumph over satanic temptation. With the execution of John, their joint ministry of renewal came to an end. From that point onward Jesus began to confront the Jewish people as their Messiah (Luke 4:16–30), gathered a community of disciples around himself (9:23), and inaugurated the kingdom of God in its initial hiddenness. He explained: "The Law and the Prophets were proclaimed until John. Since that time, the good news of the Kingdom of God is being preached, and everyone is forcing his way into it" (16:16).

Jesus' miracles should not be simply regarded as humanitarian acts of compassion. Actually, they were messianic "signs" which Isaiah had predicted (chs. 35, 61) would precede the decisive act of God in redeeming his people. They pointed to the reality of the kingdom of God as "already" in the midst of Israel by virtue of who he was and what he did. On one occasion he said, "If I drive out demons by the finger of God, then the Kingdom of God has come to you" (Luke 11:20). At first the crowds were drawn by the expectations he kindled and by his messianic signs. When he fed the multitudes they wanted to make him their king (John 6:15). But when it became apparent that his kingdom demanded moral transformation, the crowds melted and opposition grew.

After a brief ministry of three years devoted to preaching the kingdom by using parables loaded with mission insights, feeding the hungry, healing the sick, and liberating the demonized, Jesus was seized by the religious establishment, subjected to an unjust trial, condemned to death for blasphemy, and then turned over to the Roman authorities to be crucified. He died as a Redeemer "taking away the sin of the world" (John 1:29) and rose from the dead the third day as Victor over sin and death, as the Old Testament had predicted (Luke 24:44–49). In his post-resurrection ministry Christ stressed four realities: (1) his bodily resurrection (Acts 1:3); (2) himself as the key to understanding the Old Testament (Luke 24:25–27, 32); (3) his missionary mandate (lit. "when you go"—of course, you will go) "make disciples of all nations," incorporating converts into local congregations via baptism; and training them in discipleship, as he had trained them (Matt. 28:18–20); and (4) his order to remain in Jerusalem for the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, without whose power their missionary task would prove impossible to achieve (Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:8). He then ascended into heaven. This act was the final witness to his divine Sonship (Acts 1:9–11).

Mission Begins: Proclaiming the Kingdom. The Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost transformed mission from preoccupation with a particular people (the Jews, Matt. 10:5, 6; 15:24) to all peoples (Acts 2:17, 21, 39). But it took time for the early disciples to sense the full implications of Jesus' messianic Jewish movement being transformed into a universal faith—the beginning of a new era under the NEW COVENANT. At first, believers in Jesus were largely regarded as a messianic sect within Judaism. Their evangelistic method was deeply rooted in the Old Testament (13:14–43). But when Gentiles began to come to faith, the apostles did not feel that they should be transformed into Jews by circumcision and Law observance, according to the older pattern of Jewish proselytism. This produced a crisis that was partially resolved at a special council of "apostles and leaders" (ch. 15). This also influenced their evangelistic approach to non-Jewish people (17:16–34; 26:18). This provoked a growing consciousness, particularly among Jewish believers, that a "parting of the way" was taking place within Jewry between rabbinic Jews and those Jews who upon believing in Jesus were increasingly finding spiritual oneness with the growing number of Gentile believers.

This massive shift precipitated much theological debate. Fortunately, God's gift to the early church was his provision of a "task" theologian, through the conversion of the Apostle Paul (Acts 9; 22; 26, esp. 9:15). From that time onward

Paul's missionary activities and the problem-solving letters they provoked greatly enlarged the movement's awareness of the complexity of the task of worldwide mission (*see also* PAUL AND MISSION). Notable is his letter to the vigorous, largely Gentile church in Rome that he sought to transform into a missionary base for operations in Spain, and throughout the western Mediterranean world. He began with an appalling portrayal of the abounding sinfulness of all people, whether Jews or Gentiles (1:18–3:20). He followed this with a comprehensive presentation of the abounding grace of God to all sinners through "the righteousness of God, the Lord Jesus Christ" (3:21–5:21). Justification is by grace through faith. But Paul could not stop. He had to delineate the amazing grace of God to all who had believed. Victorious living for Christians is gloriously possible through the Cross and the Holy Spirit. These resources are such that although sin is always possible, it is not necessary (6:1–8:39)! Then, Paul reviewed the tragic record of Israel's national experience. The nation was never intended by God to be an end in itself. Rather, Israel was chosen for worldwide ministry, but through its failure had to be set aside—neither totally nor permanently—for Israel shall yet enter its Golden Age through repentance and faith in her Messiah at his second coming (9:1–11:36). The final sections of this letter focused on practical matters related to Paul's concern that the church at Rome be transformed into a missionary-sending community eager to participate in mission outreach, particularly in the evangelization of Spain (12–16).

The Kingdom of God: A Sign of God's Tomorrow. The New Testament deals with many important mission matters such as insight into the validity of mobile mission teams as well as fixed church structures; the essentiality, diversity, and exercise of GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT; the issue of the POWERS in relation to spiritual conflict; the phenomena of ethnic religion and spiritual conversion; the eternal separation between the saved and the lost (*see* HELL); and the end of the age: the ultimate triumph of God.

But what should concern us particularly is to see the full significance of making the kingdom of God the dominant hub about which all mission activities are related. Ours is an age in which people all over the world are losing all sense of hope touching the future. But the reality of the kingdom means that God has a glorious future for Israel and all the nations. There is going to be God's tomorrow. And every Christian is called to be a "sign" of God's tomorrow in the world of today.

It follows then that the Christian community is to be countercultural, not captured by the status quo, by the privileged, the exploiters, the powerful. Its members march to the beat of a different drum, for they seek to embody all of the elements of the kingdom of God in their lives. Like Christ, their concern is the poor, the blind, the disadvantaged, the despised, the captives, the persecuted, the imprisoned, the downtrodden, the bearers of heavy burdens, indeed, all those unaware of God's love. They proclaim Jesus Christ as Liberator, Savior, Friend, and the One who grants forgiveness, newness of life, unspeakable joy, and hope. Their God is the One who makes "all things new." Their yearning for his "new heavens and new earth" constrains them to love and serve others on Christ's behalf. Their concept of the gospel is not confined to proclamation, for it involves both word and deed. Their struggle is to make sure that the good news of Jesus is not denied to any human. This is what mission is all about!

ARTHUR F. GLASSER

Bibliography. D. Bosch, *The Why and How of a True Biblical Foundation for Mission;* F. Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament;* G. W. Peters, *A Biblical Theology of Missions;* D. Senior and C. Stuhlmueller, *The Biblical Foundations for Mission;* H. A. Snyder, *The Community of the King;* C. Van Engen, *The Growth of the True Church;* J. Verkuyl, *Contemporary Missiology.*

Christ and Culture. *The Early Church's Interaction.* During its first sixteen centuries, the Western church's perception of cultures was borrowed from the Roman imperial view of the world. Culture was seen as a single, normative universal, a monocultural ideal to be stamped on the barbarian world outside the empire. With the collapse of Rome and the Western empire in the fifth century, the church became the custodian of that ideal.

In the Byzantine Empire of the East, and still today among the Orthodox family of churches, the pattern was different. The churches assimilated into existing ethnicities and languages: Greek, Coptic, Armenian, or Slavic.

By comparison, the Western church became the architect of a mono-ethnic church and imposed a single language (Latin) to promote it. Christendom's self-understanding as a superior world culture slowly grew to dominate Europe and beyond as the church expanded its reach. The CRUSADES against Islam, and later the brutal conquests of Latin America and the slave trade of Africa, became partial expressions of this cultural ethnocentrism.

In these earliest encounters with cultures, there were other responses. The abortive mission of the Nestorian Christians to China in the seventh and eighth centuries took a much more conciliatory approach in matters cultural and religious (*see* NESTORIAN MISSIONS). Minority voices like those of the Franciscan RAYMON LULL (c. 1235–1315) pled for compassion and educated understanding in dealing with Islam. From

that Muslim world Western Christendom even borrowed ideas in philosophy, science, and mathematics. But these exceptions created no breaches in the prevailing and naive assumption that non-Western culture was largely an inventory of pagan items.

Iberian Expansion and the Counter-Reformation. The colonial advances of Spain and Portugal in the New World (1450–1760) brought Christendom's first large-scale contact with non-Western cultures. Secular power and coercion allied itself with persuasion. The combined motivations of "God, gold, and guns" reinforced earlier Western hostilities to "other cultures" as "HEATHEN," a term carrying sociocultural and political connotations as weighty as theological ones.

Again, there were notable modifications of such attitudes. Bartolomé de las Casas (1474–1566) spent a lifetime protesting the colonialists' treatment of the indigenous peoples of Latin America.

Others were to press for more than compassion and dignity. In China MATTEO RICCI (1552–1610) and his fellow Jesuit missionaries saw the culture not as an obstacle but a door for Christian penetration. His approval of the cult of Confucius and of ancestral rituals represented new ways to accommodate Christianity to the culture. Those accommodations would help stir what came to be called the Rites Controversy in the church (*see* ROMAN CATHOLIC MISSIONS).

The founding of the Sacred Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* in 1622 created a centralized organ for Catholic missionary activity that pled for evangelization by peaceful, not violent, means. It tended to encourage respect for the cultural way of life of other peoples and to oppose wholesale cultural domination. The Congregation introduced a rule-of-thumb distinction between the religious and secular aspects of culture. "Secular culture was not to be touched, but whatever did not conform to Catholic faith and morals was to be uprooted" (Shorter, 1992,144).

The distinction opened the door for those like the Jesuit missionary in south India, ROBERTO DE NOBILI (1577–1656). He sought a measure of legitimacy for Hindu institutions and customs, such as caste. Similar to Ricci, de Nobili could argue such customs were those of secular culture. They were therefore as compatible with the Catholic faith as those of ancient Rome.

Ultimately, however, these experiments were seen as dangerous, especially in view of the earlier COUNTER-REFORMATION decisions of the Catholic Church's Council of Trent (1545–63). In opposing the growing Protestant threat and its commitments to national and cultural pluralism on a formal church level, the Council hardened its monocultural perspectives, tragically at the very time when new cultures were being "discovered." Sweeping and rigid standardization of liturgy and theology closed the door for some time to future efforts like those of de Nobili and Ricci.

The Reformation Interlude. The beginnings of Protestantism in the sixteenth century did little of a practical sort to shift perceptions of culture as a monolith. It lacked the stimulus of global interaction and colonial power that the Catholic Church enjoyed until the end of the eighteenth century. Protestantism's attention was fixed on European Christendom as its mission field and its interests in culture were largely formed around institutional issues of church and state.

At the same time, theological paradigms and practices were being formed that would play a part in later modifications. Both Luther and Calvin rejected the Catholic view of ACCOMMODATION to culture that saw grace building on nature by way of divine modification. They affirmed the radical and extensive impact of SIN on human society while defending the exercise of the Christian's liberty in local political, cultural, or ecclesiastical customs.

They parted company in their perceptions of how the tensions between these two realities of sin and liberty could be resolved. Luther viewed the tension as one of Christ and culture in paradox, enduring one kingdom in the expectation of another more trans-historical kingdom. Calvin saw Christ as the transformer of humanity within culture and society, not apart from it. And, unlike both, the Anabaptist movement saw the community of God's people as more hostile to culture, to humanity's autonomous settings of values.

The Protestant insistence on the translation of the Bible would eventually help to break the monolithic paradigm of culture. Though not always clearly recognized, the genie of cultures was to spring out of its vernacular language bottle. BIBLE TRANSLATION would divinely validate the cultures of later converts throughout the world. It would help to change "culture" from a singular to a plural noun.

Initial Protestant Encounters with Cultures. By the end of the eighteenth century, reversals were taking place in mission history. Catholic mission interest and efforts, after a flourishing century and a half, were in serious decline and Protestant efforts were growing. Protestant England and Holland replaced Catholic Spain and Portugal as colonial powers.

But Europe's sense of racist superiority continued to promote colonial expansion and its right and duty to rule the "inferior" cultures it dominated. Even the United States, though a latecomer to expansionist policies, was infected by its concept of "Manifest Destiny."

Protestantism's newly found vigor did not always free itself from those homeland self-percep-

tions of cultural superiority. In relative innocence, it had few doubts about either the wholesale depravity of cultural life in non-Western societies or Western culture as the culmination of human development.

Humanitarian motives quickly linked evangelization with "civilizing" (understood as Westernization). And the question, debated through much of the nineteenth century, became, Should one precede the other or were the two processes simultaneous?

Though disagreements were intense, either-or choices were rare in the early years (Hutchison, 1987,12). In America JOHN ELIOT (1604–90) withdrew Native American Christians from their cultural connections into Westernizing "praying towns." Fellow Puritan Cotton Mather (1663–1728) would add later, "The best thing we can do for our Indians is to Anglicize them" (Bosch, 1991, 260).

With the expansion of Protestant missions, doors opened for a wide variety of social services. The formation of the China Medical Missionary Society in 1838 gave medical missions a wide legitimacy. In India ALEXANDER DUFF (1806–78) touted the superiority of Western education as preparation for the gospel. His support for the use of English as the medium of instruction flowed from his hopes for an intellectual Anglicization to promote conversions.

Protestant Shifts in Understanding. Not everyone shared completely the simplistic views of "barbaric" indigenous cultures that demanded Westernizing. German missiologist GUSTAV WARNECK (1834–1910), influenced by a national romanticism that glorified the *Volk* (the 'people'), saw cultures as gifts of God to be affirmed and preserved. And missionaries like BRUNO GUTTMANN (1876–1966) in Tanzania and CHRISTIAN KEYSSER (1877–1961) in Papua New Guinea created strategies to implement these convictions. Guttman resisted Western civilizing as an instrument that would destroy the peoplehood of traditional cultural patterns. Keysser supported "tribal conversions" and the building of the structures and leadership of the emerging church on clan and tribal foundations.

Meanwhile, others were questioning the traditional connections of civilizing and Christianizing as a growing "native church" demanded a shift in leadership from mission to national church. The old policies, built on skeptical disregard for human cultures, stood in the way of that transition.

Mission administrators HENRY VENN (1796–1873) of England's CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY and RUFUS ANDERSON (1796–1880) of the AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS led the way in such a shift. They called for "indigenous churches" of self-support, self-propagation, and self-government. And behind it lay their relative confidence that churches built on "native" culture could thrive with integrity and independence.

To that end Venn supported the training of "native clergy" and opposed Duff's promotion of education in the English language. And Anderson questioned repeatedly the legitimacy of "civilizing" or social transformation as an aim of missions. That would come, he argued, as a consequence of gospel impact and the "native" church's leavening of cultures.

Dissenting views also began to appear as a growing theological gulf sharply divided liberal from conservative. The difference widened into the twentieth century, shaping attitudes on evangelization and civilization into an almost either-or choice.

The earlier millennial optimism shared by British and American missions had seen the extension of Anglo-Saxon civilization as the extension of the KINGDOM OF GOD. Under the impact of liberalism, especially in its social gospel forms, millennialism took a revisionist shape. "Civilizing" and social service took priority over evangelization (*see* MILLENNIAL THOUGHT).

On the conservative side, the rise of the interdenominational FAITH MISSIONS from the 1860s and the growth of premillennialism shifted the focus to evangelization. Henry Frost of the CHINA INLAND MISSION wrote, "While it is always true that Christianity civilizes, it is never true that civilization Christianizes." Medicine and education were seen as "supportive" ministries. Cultural adaptations of a superficial sort were promoted for pragmatic reasons (Taber, 1991, 81). The American appearance of fundamentalism in the early twentieth century sharpened the differences even more.

From Culture to Cultures. Missionary optimism regarding the ultimate triumph of "Western civilization" dimmed severely with the participation of the "Christian" West in World War I and the global aftermath of the Great Depression. The political breakup of the Western colonial empires following World War II reinforced a worldwide awareness that culture was plural, not a singular.

Advancing this weariness with culture as a monolith was the growing discovery of SOCIOLOGY and CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY as tools for missions. In earlier decades outstanding ethnographies had been written by missionaries like R. H. CODRINGTON and Henri Junod. The research of Father Wilhelm Schmidt (1868–1954) in the global spread of cultures was an early influence in Catholic circles.

But not until the mid-1930s and the cocreation of Wycliffe Bible Translators, International and the Summer Institute of Linguistics did the full usefulness of these fledgling disciplines begin to impact the church both Protes-

tant and Catholic. Through the early leadership of linguists like Kenneth Pike and Eugene Nida, missions began to see slowly that culture was not an abstract concept.

Under the impact of functionalism, the dominant anthropological school of the day, cultures were seen as discrete, bounded units. In their diverse forms, they became collective shapes of the ideas, values, and meanings of societies and peoples. They provided explanations, stability, and adaptive skills to understand oneself, God, and the world. Missionary anthropology was born.

In the last three decades, these insights have provoked new explorations. Evangelical authors like ALAN TIPPETT, Charles Kraft, and Paul Hiebert and Catholic scholars like LOUIS LUZBETAK have wrestled deeply with the implications of anthropological insights for Christian missions. Others like Robert Schreiter and Charles Taber have joined them in the dialogue over the Christian faith, cultures, and the shaping of theology (labeled CONTEXTUALIZATION among Protestants and INCULTURATION among Catholics).

The bulk of scholarship until now has focused on the missionary impact of Christianity on cultures. The impact of cultures on the formation of Christian theology and missions is still in its developmental stages.

A Summary Review of Historical Paradigms. Using the typology of H. Richard Niebuhr (1956), five paradigms of the Christian attitude to cultures have appeared in the church's history. On opposite ends of the alternatives are the paradigms of *Christ Against Cultures* and *Christ of Cultures*.

The paradigm of *Christ-Against-Cultures* has appeared when one sees culture only as a monolithic whole, without nuance or particulars. Cultures then become largely hostile threats to the gospel, especially when the culture observed is not one's own. Mission dominated by Western ethnocentrism has often moved in this orbit in the past.

The opposite paradigm of *Christ of Cultures* asks us not to fight cultures but to join them. Theological liberalism has been comfortable here. The Laymen's Inquiry, released in a one-volume version titled *Rethinking Missions* (1932), typified this mood. It saw the missionary as an ambassador more than a soldier and called not for evangelization but for social reconstruction.

Within the Roman Catholic Church, the paradigm of *Christ Above Cultures* remains secure. Modifying the earlier view of grace supplementing nature and the examples of Ricci and de Nobili, it has called for building Christianity on the incompleteness of cultures. Since the SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL (1962–65), it has been more aware of the deepening levels in human cultures and of cultural pluralism. The traditional model of ACCOMMODATION is now questioned as too superficial and haphazard, too limited to the institutional. Inculturation is heralded as recognizing more culture's integrative level, culture as a dynamic, systematic whole (Luzbetak, 1988, 76–83). But the two-tiered nature/grace paradigm remains in place.

The paradigm of *Christ and Cultures in Paradox* continues to see a distinction between the two kingdoms of church and cultures, and views culture's many forms and meanings as more neutral items of "adiaphora" than of hostility. This has allowed some like Warneck to commend a long period of toleration before abolishing the Indian caste system and polygamous marriages. For others like Guttmann it has meant seeing Africa's "primordial ties" of clan, neighborhood, and age grouping as ties linked to the creation itself.

Calvin's view of *Christ the Transformer of Cultures* has undergone modifications. But its basic thrust remains that of penetrating and "taking possession of" culture's sin-infected meanings for Christ's glory. Missions theorists like J. H. Bavinck (1895–1964) plead for perceiving the vestiges of God's presence in culture's many-layered diversity while avoiding the fabrication of some international super-culture. Culture is religion made visible but not indivisible. Even under divine judgment, its creational structures and values must be renewed in Christ.

HARVIE M. CONN

Bibliography. J. H. Bavinck, *An Introduction to the Science of Missions;* H. Conn, *Eternal Word and Changing Worlds: Theology, Anthropology, and Mission in Trialogue;* W. Hutchison, *Errand to the World: American Protestant Thought and Foreign Missions;* C. Kraft, *Christianity in Culture;* R. H. Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture;* L. Sanneh, *Translating the Message;* A. Shorter, *Toward a Theology of Inculturation;* C. Taber, *The World is too Much With Us: "Culture" in Modern Protestant Missions.*

Christology. Every facet of biblical Christology could be tied to mission, in that the biblical plotline that sets out God's mission to redeem from a lost race a vast number from every tongue and tribe and people and nation is focused on Jesus Christ, without whom the missionary plotline would be incoherent.

On the basis of John 20:21, a substantial amount of contemporary mission literature conceives of the task of mission in terms of incarnation (*see* INCARNATIONAL MISSION). The Gospel of John is perhaps the clearest in enunciating the doctrine of incarnation, and here too the resurrected Jesus tells his disciples, "As the Father has sent me, I am sending you."

In general terms (i.e., apart from the meaning of this verse), a link between the incarnation and

mission is valuable on two fronts. Christologically, it focuses on the unique humility of the eternal Son in becoming a human being in order to perform his Father's will, accomplish his mission, and rescue God's guilty image bearers from sin and death. Metaphorically, it is a suggestive model of our mission: as the eternal Son entered our world to accomplish his mission, so Christ's disciples in mission must, as it were, "incarnate" themselves into the worlds they are called to serve and evangelize.

On the other hand, it is doubtful that John 20:21 can responsibly be called on to support this emphasis. As Köstenberger has shown in exhaustive exegesis, the analogical argument in that verse draws in a major theme in the Fourth Gospel: the sending of the Son, the sending of the disciples, with entailments in the authority of the "sender" and the obedience of the one sent. John's Gospel does not set forth our going as an "incarnation." The observation is more than a narrow point of picky exegesis: under the guise of the "incarnation" model of Christian mission some now so focus on "presence" and identification with those being served that the proclamatory, kerygmatic, "good news" elements are largely suppressed.

More broadly, the biblical Christology that depicts Christ as both divine and human develops an awareness of the wholeness of Christian mission. This mission is *God's* initiative; it is undertaken with *God's* sovereign authority. Yet this mission signals more than divine presence, more than information graciously provided about this God; it signals the Son's costly adoption of our nature, living our life and dying our death. In this light, the many chapters of the canonical Gospels that describe Jesus' ministry during the days of his flesh betray a daunting concern for the whole human being. Addressed are questions of health, justice, integrity, marriage, generosity, family, priorities, humility, truth-telling, death, compassion, and much more. Nor is this the exclusive preserve of the Gospels. Elsewhere, for instance, Jesus' identity with the human race not only qualifies him to be our priest and our substitute, but ensures that his own strong cries and tears make him uniquely fitted to empathize with ours, and thus also to save to the uttermost all who come to God by him (Hebrews).

Nevertheless, the wide embrace of Jesus' concerns for broken human beings must never obscure the fact that such concerns are set within a plotline that takes him to the cross. His social and humanitarian passions cannot legitimately be given independent standing. They are tied to the dawning of the kingdom, whose consummation awaits his return, and entry into which is finally secured by the new birth (John 3:3, 5), itself predicated on the cross. The Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to *give his life a ransom for many* (Mark 10:45). Moreover, substantial elements in the ethics of Jesus turn on the critical importance of living with eternity's values in view. Thus Christian mission, while properly being wholistic, must focus on the promulgation of the good news that men and women can be accepted by God, both now and forever, because of what God has done in Christ Jesus.

Genuine Christian mission is impossible apart from genuine Christian love, and genuine Christian love is both modeled and impelled by the Father's sending of the Son out of love for this lost world, and by the Son's willing sacrifice on our behalf. If we are all by nature children of wrath (Eph. 2:3), God's love for us is not a function of how lovable we are, but of how loving he is. Insofar as Christians learn to receive that love, and learn to measure their poor love by his great love, so also they begin to learn that the love that impels Christian mission grows from within (cf. 2 Cor. 5:14–15). That is precisely the reason why Paul thought of himself as a debtor to all (Rom. 1:14): always there is the debt of love to be paid, for Christ has paid it for us.

This elementary but fundamental Christology has a direct bearing on Christian mission. This is not sentimentalism, as if the cross of Christ were a symbol of love and nothing more. If Jesus' sacrifice did not in fact aim to achieve something, then far from being an effective example of self-sacrificial love, it reduces to sheer insanity. But in fact it did achieve something: the reconciliation to God their Maker and Redeemer of a vast number of God's image bearers, otherwise lost in pathetic and evil rebellion. In that framework, Christ's self-sacrifice is the most staggering instance of love conceivable, both the means of our redemption and the model for our living. If that model increasingly constrains Jesus' followers, mission is inevitable.

One of the great Christological themes of the New Testament, especially strong in Hebrews 5:7, pictures Jesus as the high priest par excellence. At one level this theme is associated with the story-line of redemptive history. The Levitical priesthood is displaced by the Melchizedekian, and Jesus' priesthood is of the latter order. But if the Levitical priesthood is rendered obsolete, so also is the law-covenant that bases itself upon this priesthood (Heb. 7:11–12; cf. 8:13). Thus there is a forward movement within the biblical narrative itself.

Nevertheless, the structure of priestly service, complete with tabernacle/temple, articulated in the law-covenant is certainly not obsolete in every respect. It serves as a shadow, a model, a type of the heavenly reality (Heb. 10:1ff.). What is required for a guilty people to be acceptable to and enter the presence of a holy God is depicted in gripping, symbol-laden ritual, which in turn

prophetically announces the ultimate fulfillment of the reality to which it points. The priesthood of Jesus is pictured in these transcendent terms. Precisely because it is tied to Melchizedek and not to Levi, however, its relevance is not limited to the people of the Mosaic covenant. It is also in principle open to people from every tribe and tongue.

One of the major strands of New Testament Christology pictures Jesus as the One who emptied himself, humbled himself, served obediently all the way to the ignominy of the cross—and was triumphantly vindicated (e.g. Phil. 2:6–11). The ultimate vindication occurs when Jesus returns at the end of the age. This schema provides a goal, a philosophy of history (with Jesus at the crucial midpoint and returning at the end), a *telos* to which history rushes. Not only is it appointed to us to die and face judgment, but there is a final and irrevocable judgment at the end of the age (Heb. 9:27–28; Acts 17:31; Rev. 22:10–11). History is not simply spinning in circles, nor are we dipping in and out of it in successive cycles of reincarnated existence.

These realities not only lend a certain urgency to the task of mission, they also provide a model: self-denial and willing self-death now, final vindication later. Effective mission can only be sustained when both of these elements prevail.

One of the core Christological confessions is that Jesus is Lord. Regrettably, this may become the merest cliché, with no discernible content to "Jesus" and nothing more than religious sentimentalism connected with "Lord." But in the New Testament, heart-belief in this truth, coupled with oral confession of it, are tied to salvation (Rom. 10:9). To confess that Jesus is Lord is, implicitly, to deny lordship to all others (cf. 1 Cor. 8:4–6; 12:1–3). In the light of Septuagint usage of "Lord," it is also to confess the deity of Jesus Christ. One cannot responsibly confess Jesus as Lord and then deny the uniqueness that he claims for himself and that his earliest followers assigned him. Further, it is a public commitment of covenantal allegiance and loyalty to Jesus and to his teaching (for how can one responsibly call him "Lord! Lord!" and fail to do what he says?), and thus not only to enjoy the salvation he alone graciously gives but also to participate joyfully in his final and GREAT COMMISSION.

DONALD A. CARSON

Bibliography. D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ;* M. J. Erickson, *The Word Became Flesh;* A. Fernando, *The Supremacy of Christ;* A. J. Köstenberger, *Mission in the Fourth Gospel;* P. Lewis, *The Glory of Christ;* G. Mar Osthathios, *Mission Studies* 12 (1995): 79–94; R. J. Schreiter, *Missiology* 18 (1990): 429–37; John R. W. Stott et al., *Christ the Liberator;* D. F. Wells, *The Person of Christ: A Biblical and Historical Analysis of the Incarnation.*

Church. One way to define the church has been to do a word study of *ekklēsia,* the word used at least seventy-three times in the New Testament to refer to the church. "The word is derived from *ek* and *kaleō* and (speaks of) the assembly of free citizens in the Greek city-states who through a herald were 'called out' of their homes to the marketplace. In ordinary usage the word denoted 'the people as assembled,' 'the public meeting'" (Berkhof, 1986, 343). The term *ekklēsia* indicated the self-consciousness of the early Christians, who saw themselves as the continuation of what God had begun in the wilderness with the nation of Israel, called together by the proclamation of the gospel for the purpose of belonging to God through Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit (see, for example, Acts 19:39). Yet a word study of *ekklēsia* tells us little about the reason for which the group is called, the purposes and goals of the group, or the parameters that determine who is part of the group.

A second way to describe the church is by crafting a propositional definition. How we would love to have the confidence of Martin Luther who said, "Thank God a seven-year-old child knows what the church is, namely holy believers and sheep who hear the voice of their shepherd (John 10:3). So children pray, 'I believe in one holy Christian Church.' Its holiness . . . consists of the Word of God and true faith" (*Luther's Works,* vol. xi). Hendrik Kraemer came close to Luther's simple definition: "Where there is a group of baptized Christians, there is the Church" (*The Missionary Obligation of the Church,* 40). However, a purely propositional definition is not enough to show us the church's structure, purpose, destiny, or mission. In fact, the New Testament gives us no formal definition of the church.

A third way to define the church was used by Jesus and the New Testament writers: metaphors of the church. Paul Minear demonstrated that there are at least ninety-six different images of the church in the New Testament. We are familiar with many of these, like body, temple, building, household, family, saints, New Israel, new creation, and branches of the vine. These rich images express what the church is and serve also to show what the church should become. They call the members of the church to see themselves in a new light, challenging them to become more like the pictures offered.

These images are metaphors of the church in mission. Almost all the images of the church in the New Testament are not still photographs but rather moving pictures, dynamic videos of the church living out its witness in the world. For example, the church is the salt of the *earth.* It is the light *of the world.* As the Body of Christ, it is the physical presence of Jesus *in the world.* As a royal priesthood (1 Peter 2) the church is a priest

for the Gentiles, who see the good works of the church and glorify God.

The church soon found that it needed a way to bring all the pictures together in a simple description. Shortly after the apostolic era, the church followed a fourth way to define itself by using three words that appeared in the Apostles' Creed, with a fourth added soon thereafter and institutionalized at Chalcedon. All the subsequent ecumenical creeds adopted these four marks or notes (from the Latin *notae*) about the church. "I believe . . . the holy catholic church, the communion of saints," is accepted by all major Christian traditions, on all continents, in all the languages of the church.

The four creedal marks of the church have tended to be understood as static adjectives modifying the church. As such, they have fostered institutionalization, maintenance, and decline in the church. Hans Küng and G. C. Berkouwer emphasized that the four marks are not only gifts but also tasks facing the church. Moltmann saw the four as descriptive of the church's solidarity with the poor. C. Van Engen and D. Guder have suggested we think of the four marks as adverbs modifying the missionary action of the church. As such, they call the church to be the unifying, sanctifying, reconciling, and proclaiming presence of Jesus Christ in the world, challenging local congregations to a transformed, purpose-driven life of mission in the world, locally and globally.

A fifth method of defining the church involves affirming a series of seemingly contradictory characteristics. When we try to describe the church we are immediately caught in a tension between the sociological and theological views of the church. The church is both divine and human, created by the Holy Spirit yet brought about by gathering human beings. The tension can be illustrated by mentioning five complementary couplets. The church is not either one or the other of these—it is both, simultaneously.

1. The church is both form and essence. What we believe to be the "essence" of the church is not seen in its forms. We believe the church to be one, yet it is divided; to be holy, yet it is the communion of sinners. We believe the essence of discipleship is love, yet we experience actions in the church that are far from loving.

2. The church is both phenomenon and creed. The church is to be believed. But what is believed is not seen. That which is perceived as a phenomenon of the visible world does not present itself as the object of our faith. The church is too often not believable. We could also use the words "Real-Ideal" or "Relevance-Transcendence" to represent this seeming contradiction. We cannot be members of an "ideal" church apart from the "real" one. The real must always be challenged and called by the ideal; the ideal must be understood and lived out in the real world.

3. The church is both institution and community; organization and organism. During the Middle Ages, the exclusively institutional view of the church took on its most extreme form. In reaction, the sixteenth-century Reformers emphasized the church as fellowship and communion. Many people feel today that we need to seek to keep both elements in equal perspective, especially when it comes to missionary cooperation between churches and mission agencies. The church is both institution and community. The community invariably, and necessarily, takes on institutional form; the institution only exists as the concrete expression of the communion of persons.

4. The church is both visible and invisible. The visible-invisible distinction has been used as a way to get around some of the difficulties involved in the first three paradoxes presented above. The visible-invisible distinction, though not explicitly found in the New Testament, was proposed in the early centuries of the church's life. The visible-invisible distinction is with us because of the reality of the church as a mixture of holiness and sinfulness. (For example, see the parable of the tares in Matt. 13:24–30, 36–43.) The distinction is important, but perhaps it must be remembered that there is one church, not two. "The one church, in its essential nature and in its external forms alike, is always at once visible and invisible" (Berkhof, 1986, 399).

5. The church is both imperfect and perfect. Luther spoke of the church as *"simul justus, simul peccator,"* seeing it as simultaneously just and sinful, holy and unrighteous, universal and particular. But the church is not, therefore, justified to remain sinful, divided, and particular. "Faith in the holiness of the church," Moltmann said, "can no more be a justification of its unholy condition than the justification of sinners means a justification of sin" (Moltmann, 1977, 22–23). The local congregation derives its essential nature only as it authentically exhibits the nature and characteristics of the universal church. And, the universal church is experienced by women and men, witnesses to the world who give observable shape to the church only as it is manifested in local churches.

Hendrikus Berkhof called for a special visibility to see and recognize the church. The church, he said, has a threefold character, being related (1) to God as the new covenant community of the Holy Spirit, (2) to the believers as the communion of saints, and (3) simultaneously as the apostolic church sent to the world (Berkhof, 1986, 344–45). The missionary movement has been the arena where this threefold character has been given concrete shape as the church has

spread over the globe, comprising now around one-third of all humanity.

A sixth way to define the church involves the actual shape which the church has taken throughout its missionary expansion around the world. During the last five hundred years there have been four major paradigms of the church in mission: colonial expansion, three-self churches, indigenous national churches, and partner churches in mission.

1. From the early 1500s to the middle of the 1800s the principal paradigm of the church in mission involved the churches of Western Europe and North America "planting" the church in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. With notable exceptions, this era could be described as a colonial competition in church cloning by Western forms of Christendom. GISBERT VOETIUS (1589–1676) described this perspective well when he spoke of the goal of mission being (1) the conversion of people, (2) the planting of the church, and (3) the glory of God. But Voetius was a child of his time. That which was planted was mostly carbon copies of the Western forms of ecclesiastical structures, Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Protestant.

2. A second paradigm emerged around the middle of the 1800s when HENRY VENN and RUFUS ANDERSON proposed the THREE-SELF FORMULA as a way for the church in Africa, Asia, and Latin America to become autonomous and independent. Dominating mission theory and practice for the next hundred years, the formula stated that churches were maturing when they became self-supporting economically, self-governing structurally, and self-propagating locally. With heavy stress on institution and organization, the formula unfortunately tended to produce self-centered, self-preoccupied national churches that often turned in upon themselves and demonstrated little commitment or vision for world evangelization.

3. This tendency toward introversion of three-self churches fueled the search for what became a third major paradigm of the church's self-understanding: indigenous national churches in mission. Beginning with ROLAND ALLEN's call for the spontaneous expansion of the church, churches all around the globe began to see themselves as equal partners whose essential purpose was mission. In the 1920s the term "daughter churches" was used to refer to the churches in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. By 1938 at the INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL (IMC) meeting in Tambaram, Madras, India, the "older" churches and "younger" ones stressed a mission-oriented view of the church. The record of this conference, *The World Mission of the Church,* shows the delegates wrestling with the intimate relationship of church and mission (*see also* TAMBARAM CONFERENCE [1938]). That same year HENDRIK KRAEMER called for churches to move from missionfield to independent church. JOHN NEVIUS, MEL HODGES, DONALD MCGAVRAN, and others began calling for INDIGENOUS CHURCHES, communions, organisms, and fellowships that would be culturally appropriate to their contexts.

Along with indigeneity, the missionary nature of the church was increasingly being emphasized. Those attending the 1952 IMC meeting in Willingen, Germany, affirmed that "there is no participation in Christ without participation in his mission to the world" (*The Missionary Obligation of the Church,* 3 [*see also* WILLINGEN CONFERENCE (1952)]). The most complete development of this view was Johannes Blauw's *The Missionary Nature of the Church,* published in 1962, one year before the newly formed COMMISSION ON WORLD MISSION AND EVANGELISM of the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES met in Mexico City, emphasizing "mission on six continents" (*see also* MEXICO CITY CONFERENCE [1963]). The 1960s was a time of the birth of nations, particularly in Africa, terminating colonial domination by Europe. These movements began to recognize that the "national churches," the churches in each nation, had a responsibility to evangelize their own nations. The church was missionary in its nature and local in its outreach.

4. In the subsequent forty years, the world has changed as has the world church. The fourth paradigm reflects the fact that today over two-thirds of all Christians live south of the equator. Christianity can no longer be considered a Western religion. Western Europe and North America are increasingly seen as mission fields. Nominalism and secularization contributed to these formerly mission-sending areas becoming mostly post-Christian. Meanwhile, mission-sending from the south has been increasing to such an extent that today more cross-cultural missionaries are being sent and supported by the churches in Africa, Asia, and Latin America than from Europe and North America. Thus since the 1970s the missionary nature of the church has meant that churches and mission agencies are called to partner together in a reciprocal flow of world evangelization that crisscrosses the globe. Thus the church's nature and forms of existence have been radically reshaped by mission.

Although we know that the ideas are distinct, it is impossible to understand church without mission. Mission activity is supported by the church, carried out by members of the church, and the fruits of mission are received by the church. On the other hand, the church lives out its calling in the world through mission, finds its essential purpose in its participation in God's mission, and engages in a multitude of activities whose purpose is mission. "Just as we must insist that a church which has ceased to be a mission has lost the essential character of a church, so we must also say that a mission which is not

at the same time truly a church is not a true expression of the divine apostolate. An unchurchly mission is as much a monstrosity as an unmissionary church" (Newbigin, 1954, 169).

CHARLES VAN ENGEN

Bibliography. R. Allen, *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church;* K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* vol. IV; H. Berkhof, *Christian Faith,* 339–422; G. C. Berkouwer, *The Church;* J. Blauw, *The Missionary Nature of the Church;* D. Bonhoeffer, *The Communion of the Saints;* S. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God,* 601–742; D. Guder, ed., *Missional Church;* H. Küng, *The Church;* P. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament;* J. Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit;* S. Neill, *CDCWM,* pp. 109–10; L. Newbigin, *The Household of God;* A. Schmemann, *Church, World, Mission;* C. Van Engen, *The Growth of the True Church;* idem, *God's Missionary People.*

Congress on the Church's Worldwide Mission (Wheaton Congress, 1966). With the merger of the INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL into the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES in 1961, conservative American mission executives, missionaries, and missiologists perceived a need for a distinctly evangelical congress to address ongoing issues of theological and practical concern. Jointly sponsored by the EFMA and IFMA, the congress was held in Wheaton, Illinois, in April of 1966. The seven-day congress comprised five missions-oriented biblical expositions, ten major study papers (on topics like SYNCRETISM, UNIVERSALISM, evangelical unity, PROSELYTISM, changes in the Catholic Church), and area reports. The 938 registered delegates represented some 258 mission boards and agencies, interest groups, and educational institutions from 71 countries in every part of the world.

The conference was framed to respond to the challenges of the conciliar movement by reaffirming fundamental convictions in an atmosphere of evangelical ecumenicity. The precongress statement noted that there was greater missionary strength in the IFMA-EFMA affiliation than in the WCC. Thus it was felt that the time had come for this segment of the total mission force to clearly state its own convictions.

Among the papers that emerged from the congress was the Wheaton Declaration. Initially drafted by ARTHUR GLASSER, it was revised in several committees and finally adopted by the delegates. The declaration begins by affirming the need for certainty, commitment, discernment, hope, and confidence in the midst of the hardening social, religious, and political climates of the times. It confesses the failures of evangelical missions in the light of scriptural standards, and presents an evangelical consensus on the authority of the Bible and the central concern of evangelism in mission. Finally, it addresses selected crucial issues of the day (the issues studied in the major papers).

The Wheaton Congress garnered enough attention to merit the publication of the declaration in *IRM,* though there was relatively little impact in ecumenical circles. Even so, the Wheaton Congress stands as an important evangelical milestone in that it was one of the definitive steps that eventually resulted in the LAUSANNE MOVEMENT.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. H. Lindsell, ed., *The Church's Worldwide Mission.*

Consultation on the Relationship Between Evangelism and Social Responsibility (CRESR '82). CRESR '82 was a gathering of fifty evangelists, mission leaders, theologians, and missiologists at Reformed Bible College in Grand Rapids, Michigan, June 19–26, 1982. It continued the debate within evangelical circles over the broadening of the traditional understanding of mission as evangelism to include social responsibilities. There were five major sections in the discussion: (1) Church history and modern theology of salvation; (2) How broad is salvation in Scripture? (3) The kingdom in relation to the church and the world; (4) History and eschatology; and (5) Conclusions.

Prompted by a shift in John Stott's thinking to include social responsibilities as an integral component of mission between the BERLIN CONGRESS (1966) and the LAUSANNE CONSULTATION (1974) and Arthur Johnston's response to that shift in *The Battle for World Evangelism,* the participants at CRESR '82 also wrestled with the spectrum of social responsibilities in which we might be involved (from relief work to structural change). The resulting consultation statement, *Evangelism and Social Responsibility: An Evangelical Commitment,* has been well received over the years as an evangelical approach to the questions raised during the Consultation. While all agreed that our Christian responsibilities include engagement in meeting social responsibilities, the question as to whether this is integral to mission was not resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. Consultation on the Relationship between Evangelism and Social Responsibility, *Evangelism and Social Responsibility: An Evangelical Commitment;* T. Sine, ed., *The Church in Response to Human Need;* J. R. W. Stott, *Transformation* 1:1 (1984): 21–22; *Trinity World Forum* 8:2 (Winter 1983).

Contextualization. The term "contextualization" first appeared in 1972 in a publication of the Theological Education Fund entitled *Ministry in Context.* This document laid out the principles which would govern the distribution of funds for the Third Mandate of the TEF. The

scholarships were awarded for the graduate education of scholars in the international church. Contextualization was described as "the capacity to respond meaningfully to the gospel within the framework of one's own situation." A precedent for the new term, "contextual theology," resulted from a consultation held in Bossey, Switzerland, in August 1971. The Ecumenical Institute of the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES had sponsored that earlier discussion under the theme "Dogmatic or Contextual Theology."

The lament behind the Third Mandate of the TEF was that "both the approach and content of theological reflection tend to move within the framework of Western questions and cultural presuppositions, failing to vigorously address the gospel of Jesus Christ to the particular situation." Further, it was declared that "Contextualization is not simply a fad or catch-word but a theological necessity demanded by the incarnational nature of the Word."

While the document had a limited purpose, the implications coming from it resulted in a movement which has had an impact on the theory and practice of mission. The contextualization concept was a timely innovation. New nations were struggling for their own life. The mission enterprise needed new symbols to mark a needed separation from the colonialistic, Western-dominated past (*see* COLONIALISM).

There is no single or broadly accepted definition of contextualization. The goal of contextualization perhaps best defines what it is. That goal is to enable, insofar as it is humanly possible, an understanding of what it means that Jesus Christ, the Word, is authentically experienced in each and every human situation. Contextualization means that the Word must dwell among all families of humankind today as truly as Jesus lived among his own kin. The gospel is Good News when it provides answers for a particular people living in a particular place at a particular time. This means the WORLDVIEW of that people provides a framework for communication, the questions and needs of that people are a guide to the emphasis of the message, and the cultural gifts of that people become the medium of expression.

Contextualization in mission is the effort made by a particular church to experience the gospel for its own life in light of the Word of God. In the process of contextualization the church, through the Holy Spirit, continually challenges, incorporates, and transforms elements of the culture in order to bring them under the lordship of Christ. As believers in a particular place reflect upon the Word through their own thoughts, employing their own cultural gifts, they are better able to understand the gospel as incarnation.

The term "contextualization" is most commonly associated with theology, yet given the above definition, it is proper to speak of contextualization in a variety of ways encompassing all the dimensions of religious life. For example, church architecture, worship, preaching, systems of church governance, symbols, and rituals are all areas where the contextualization principle applies. Context, on which the term is based, is not narrowly understood as the artifacts and customs of culture only, but embraces the differences of human realities and experience. These differences are related to cultural histories, societal situations, economics, politics, and ideologies. In this sense contextualization applies as much to the church "at home," with all its variations, as it does to the church "overseas."

In mission practice the more visible aspects of contextualization were closely related to older terms such as ACCOMMODATION, ADAPTION, INCULTURATION, and INDIGENIZATION. Issues such as forms of communication, language, music, styles of dress, and so on had long been associated with the so-called three-self missionary philosophy which was built around the principle of indigenization. Indigeneity often was understood as "nativization," in that the visible cultural forms of a given people would be used in expressing Christianity. In going beyond these more superficial expressions, the new term "contextualization" tended to raise the fear of SYNCRETISM. This would mean the "old religion" would become mixed in with the new biblical faith and that culture would have more authority than revelation. Some felt, therefore, that the older concept of indigenization should not be changed but, rather, broadened to cover more adequately the field of theology.

In addition to giving greater attention to the deeper levels of culture, the new term "contextualization" became distinguished from indigenization in other ways. Indigenization always implied a comparison with the West, whereas contextualization focuses on the resources available from within the context itself. Indigenization was static while contextualization is dynamic, as a still photograph might be compared to a motion picture. The older indigenization was more isolated while contextualization, though locally constructed, interacts with global realities.

The fact that the early documents about contextualization were formulated in offices related to the World Council of Churches also made the concept difficult to accept in the nonconciliar circles. The heavy emphasis on justice and social development left little, it seemed, for evangelism and conversion. Scholars in Latin America were among the earliest to write about what they saw as an appropriate theology for their context. The direction this new theology took alarmed many evangelicals.

LIBERATION THEOLOGY became almost as a household word in the 1970s and 1980s. Evangelicals felt it demonstrated an inadequate use of the Bible and relied too heavily on a Marxist orientation. This was difficult for North American conservatives to accept. Even before his book, *Ministry in Context,* GUSTAVO GUTIÉRREZ had already written his *Theology of Liberation* (1971). Soon afterward J. MIGUEZ BONINO followed with *Doing Theology in a Revolutionary Situation* (1978). These major innovations opened up further thinking on contextualization. They followed closely the volatile 1960s in the United States. Ideas about contextualization in the United States first became associated with the controversial issues raised by the Vietnam War and American racism. "Black Power," as advocated by James Cone (1969), had become a popular application of what contextualization is.

Because of this ferment HERMENEUTICS quickly became the central point of contention among evangelicals. The question was asked whether truth is derived primarily from human experience or from REVELATION. At first there was little consensus among evangelicals about the role of CULTURE and social issues, especially in theology. The contextualization debate made serious new thinking possible, especially with regard to culture and the way in which it connects to the biblical record.

Throughout the 1970s the writing and discussion on contextualization began to clarify directions that evangelicals should take. A Lausanne-sponsored gathering at Willowbank (Bermuda) in 1978 adopted the theme "Gospel and Culture." The conference took seriously the role of the cultural context of the believer as well as the biblical text in defining evangelization and church development. The late 1970s also saw the rise (and demise) of the quarterly, *The Gospel in Context*. The journal's brief life demonstrated how creative and stimulating worldwide contextualization could be.

The decade of the 1970s also brought remarkable progress in finding ways to carry out contextualization. Each of the ways, or "models," as they are called, carries certain epistemological assumptions, as well as philosophical ideas about truth. While the models each have their differences, they also have several features that they share in common. Some are more centered on human experience while others show a greater dependence on widely accepted teachings of the church and the Bible. Thus, the assumptions undergirding some of these models make them less acceptable to evangelicals. Variations exist within a given model and certain features of more than one model may be combined. A brief review of the models will show how diverse the approaches to contextualization are.

Adaptation model: One of the earliest approaches was to make historical-theological concepts fit into each cultural situation. Traditional Western ideas are the norm. These are brought to the local culture. What is irrelevant may be set aside and what must be modified can be changed. The faulty assumption here is that there is one philosophical framework within which all cultures can communicate, assuming that other forms of knowledge are not legitimate.

Anthropological model: The beginning point is to study the people concerned. The key to communication and pathways to the human heart and spirit lies in the culture. The assumption is that people know best their own culture; worldview themes, symbols, myths are repositories of truth for all people. While this is true, unless discernment about a culture is brought to the Word for affirmation or judgment the contextualization exercise can become distorted and misleading.

Critical model: The critical aspect of this approach centers on how features of traditional culture—rituals, songs, stories, customs, music—are brought under the scrutiny of biblical teaching. Here the culture and the Scriptures are evaluated concurrently in the search for new ways to express belief and practice. One must ask who will carry out the process, and how accurate are the meanings derived from both customs and the Scripture.

Semiotic model: Semiotics is the science of "reading a culture" through "signs" (*see* SYMBOL, SYMBOLISM). This comprehensive view of culture interprets symbols, myths, and the like that reveal the past as well as studying "signs" that indicate how the culture is changing. These realities are compared with church tradition in a process of "opening up" both the local culture and Christian practice. To master the complicated method would tend to separate an indigenous researcher from the people and the context.

Synthetic model: Synthesis involves bringing together four components: the gospel, Christian tradition, culture, and social change. These elements are discussed together using insights offered by the local people. Also there must be a recognition of sharing insights with "outsiders." Each contributes to the other, while each maintains its own distinctives. The openness and legitimacy given to all views would tend toward ambiguity and a kind of universalism.

Transcendental model: This model does not concentrate on the impersonal aspect of theology, that is, to prove something "out there," but is primarily concerned with what any truth means to the subject and to members of the subject's community. Likewise revelation is understood as the active perception or encounter with God's truth. Much criticism can be raised. How can one be an authentic believer without objec-

tive context and why is such Western sophistication necessary?

Translation model: Based on translation science, the nearest possible meanings of the original text are sought out in the receiving culture. Exact forms may not be possible, but expressions and forms that are equivalent are introduced. Attempts were made to identify the "kernel" or core of the gospel which then would apply to all cultures. The problem of subjectivity in selecting forms is a risk, as is separating the Word from what is culturally negotiable.

In contextualization, evangelicals have a valuable tool with which to work out the meanings of Scripture in the varieties of mission contexts and in conversations with the churches of the Two-Thirds World. A built-in risk of contextualization is that the human situation and the culture of peoples so dominate the inquiry that God's revelation through the Bible will be diminished. To be aware of this danger is a necessary step in avoiding it. Contextualization cannot take place unless Scripture is read and obeyed by believers. This means that believers will study the Scriptures carefully and respond to their cultural concerns in light of what is in the biblical text. Culture is subject to the God of culture. Culture is important to God and for all its good and bad factors, culture is the framework within which God works out God's purposes. Some indications of the gospel's presence in the soil may be evident, but Scripture is something that is outside and must be brought into the cultural setting to more fully understand what God is doing in culture, and to find parallels between the culture and the Bible.

The strength of contextualization is that if properly carried out, it brings ordinary Christian believers into what is often called the theological process. Contextualization is not primarily the work of professionals, though they are needed. It is making the gospel real to the untrained lay person and the rank-and-file believer. They are the people who know what biblical faith must do if it is to meet everyday problems. The term "incarnational theology" is another way of speaking about contextualization (*see* INCARNATIONAL MISSION). This means that Christian truth is to be understood by Christians in the pews and on the streets. The objective of contextualization is to bring data from the whole of life to real people and to search the Scriptures for a meaningful application of the Word which "dwelt among us" (John 1:14). The missiological significance for contextualization is that all nations must understand the Word as clearly and as accurately as did Jesus' own people in his day.

DEAN GILLILAND

Bibliography. S. B. Bevans, *Models of Contextual Theology;* D. S. Gilliland, *The Word Among Us*: *Contextualizing Theology for Mission Today;* D. J. Hesselgrave and E. Rommen, *Contextualization: Meaning and Methods;* W. A. Dyrness, *Learning About Theology from the Third World;* R. J. Schreiter, *Constructing Local Theologies.*

Controversies in Contemporary Evangelical Mission Theory. In spite of the clarity of New Testament teaching concerning the world mission of the church, controversies have marked the modern missions movement from its inception. Of the many that could be discussed, this essay describes five significant controversies that currently have the attention of evangelical missiologists.

Some missiological controversies relate directly to biblical revelation and the history of the church, while others are procedural in nature as mission is carried out today. While in this article we present opposing perspectives, it should be recognized that they represent positions on spectrums of views rather than the only alternatives seen in evangelical missiology.

The Destiny of the Lost. *Literal View of HELL.* Those who hold to explicit faith in Jesus Christ as Savior as necessary for salvation appeal to the teaching of Scripture, such as Acts 4:12; Romans 10:13, 14; 1 John 5:11, 12; John 14:6, and the general tenor of Christological teaching throughout the Bible.

The traditional position gives credence to progressive revelation throughout both Old and New Testaments as related to the redemptive mandate. This position gives strong urgency to the church's world mission, since the destiny of humankind is dependent on their explicit faith in Christ. The argument is that people are lost because they are sinners, not because they have not heard the gospel.

Four major reasons given for this position are: (1) the universal sinfulness and lostness of all humankind, (2) the necessity of Christ's redemptive work for salvation, (3) the necessity of personal faith in Christ, and (4) the necessity of hearing the gospel in order to be saved. James A. Borland summarizes the position: "To hold out the possibility of any other way of salvation does not add to God's greatness but depreciates his Word and the work of the church through the ages. To teach any other way of salvation for the heathen diminishes missionary zeal and leaves the helpless hopeless" (p. 11).

Alternate Views of Hell. A number of theologians have objected to the teaching of the eternal damnation of the lost. At least three other positions currently vie for attention. The first of these views, prevalent in the Roman Catholic Church, understands purgatory to be "the state, place, or condition in the next world between heaven and hell" where purifying suffering takes place. "Purgatory is understood to continue in

existence until the last judgment, at which time there will be only heaven and hell" (Hayes, 1992, 93).

Second, the metaphorical position holds that "the Bible does not support a literal view of a burning abyss. Hellfire and brimstone are not literal depictions of hell's furnishings, but figurative expressions warning the wicked of impending doom" (Crockett, 1992, 44). Those who hold to the metaphorical view believe in a real hell that is a place of judgment, but that we do not know precisely what that punishment will be like (Crockett, 1992, 49).

The third view of hell in opposition to the literal position is the conditional immortality, or annihilationism (*see* ANNIHILATION). Again this is not a denial of the reality of hell or suffering in it. Clark H. Pinnock states that "it is more scriptural, theologically coherent, and practical to interpret the nature of hell as the destruction rather than the endless torture of the wicked." He holds that the "ultimate result of rejecting God is self-destruction, closure with God, and absolute death in body, soul, and spirit" (Pinnock, 137).

Spiritual Warfare. SPIRITUAL WARFARE is a biblical concept derived from the fall of humankind. The battle was intensified by Christ's first coming that brought into focus the reality of demonization and demon-deliverance. Today there are two major views of spiritual warfare (*see also* POWER ENCOUNTER and TERRITORIAL SPIRITS).

The Classic View. Those who take this position rely on the teachings of the Word of God (Eph. 6:10–20), the power of God, and believing prayer. No biblical evidence can be found that believers can be "demonized" or "have" a demon, terms reserved in Scripture for the unregenerate. Victory in spiritual warfare for the believer centers on claiming Christ's past victory on the cross over Satan and demons (Col. 2:15; Heb. 2:14; 1 John 3:8; Rev. 12:11), claiming the believer's union with Christ (Rom. 6:1–4; Gal. 2:20), claiming the believers' position as believer priests (1 Peter 2:9), claiming the present work of the Holy Spirit (John 16:13; Eph. 5:18), winning back influence from Satan (Eph. 4:27), putting on the whole armor of God (Eph. 6:13–17), praying when we are under pressure (Phil. 4:7–7), presenting our whole being to God (Rom. 6:11–13), and resisting the devil for daily victory (James 4:7; 1 Peter 5:8–9).

The Demon-Deliverance View. This approach to spiritual warfare features actively and directly casting out demons by Christians who have the appropriate gifts for this ministry. It has been described as the "*ekballistic* mode of ministry" or EMM (*ekballō,* meaning to cast out; Powlison, 1995, 28). Those who hold to EMM say that "Christians and non-Christians often require an 'ekballistic encounter' to cast out inhabiting demons that enslave us in sexual lust, anger, low self-esteem, fascination with the occult, unbelief, and other ungodly patterns" (ibid., 29). Adherents of demon-deliverance ministry hold that non-Christians and Christians alike can be demonized and require the ministry of exorcism. Powlison states, "In sum, ekballistic spiritual warfare envisions the warfare of Christians as a battle against invading demons, either to repel them at the gates or eject them after they have taken up residence" (ibid.). A counseling process is then put in place to encounter and cast out the demon(s).

Third Wave Theology. Since the mid-1970s the present-day controversy is heightened with the advent of what some have called the Third Wave of the Holy Spirit, a term used to refer to the rise of non-Pentecostal evangelicals who feel that the whole range of spiritual gifts is still available in the church. This is commonly associated with the Signs and Wonders movement, though the latter also includes Pentecostals and charismatics. Adherents hold the view that our work in ministry is a type of power encounter between Christ's and Satan's kingdoms, which center in healings and exorcisms of demons.

The Church Growth Movement. Church growth concepts find their origin in the New Testament. The last four decades have seen an explosion of interest in church growth thinking initiated by the work and writings of DONALD MCGAVRAN in the 1950s.

Definition of Church Growth. Church growth is "that discipline which seeks to understand, through biblical, sociological, historical, and behavioral study, why churches grow or decline. True church growth takes place when 'Great Commission' disciples are added and are evidenced by responsible church membership" (Rainer, 1993, 21; *see also* CHURCH GROWTH MOVEMENT). This perspective on church growth theory was developed by McGavran in his writings, principally in his best-known work, *Understanding Church Growth.*

Advocates of Church Growth Theory. Supporters of church growth theory hold the following tenets: (1) that numerical church growth is crucial, (2) that the church should concentrate on responsive peoples groups, (3) that people movement conversions should be encouraged, and (4) that anthropological factors should be recognized in determining a people's responsiveness (McQuilkin, 1974, 19–66).

Advocates point out three sources of church growth, namely, biological growth (children born to church members), transfer growth (people moving from one church to another), and conversion growth (when a person commits to Christ as Savior and Lord).

Opposition to Church Growth Theory. While expressing appreciation for the contributions of

church growth thinking, some opponents warn of its shortcomings. Opponents of church growth object to the priority assigned by church growth to numerical growth, resulting in weak support of other goals in mission. Opponents also point to the alleged ecclesio-centrism of church growth, its results-orientation, and its over-emphasis on prioritizing so-called responsive groups.

Again, since church growth theory emphasizes a church-centered theology, some have expressed that the centrality of Christ is eclipsed. Christ-centered theology is foundational to the church's mission.

The flash point of opposition, however, centers on the HOMOGENEOUS UNIT PRINCIPLE advocated by many church growth theorists. McGavran first made the observation that "people like to become Christians without crossing racial, linguistic, or class barriers and that social dislocation should be held to a minimum" (McGavran, 1990, 163). In application, some call for the development of ethnic churches so as to minimize the amount of social dislocation experienced by people coming to Christ. Wagner states that "this principle has become the most controversial of all church growth principles because critics have interpreted it as classist or racist" (ibid., x). Wagner explains, however, that "the homogenous unit principle is an attempt to respect the dignity of individuals and allow their decisions for Christ to be religious rather than social decisions (ibid.).

Western Support of Third World Missions. Should sending money replace sending missionaries from the West? Will sending money rather than missionaries strengthen INDIGENOUS CHURCHES? Does the spread of the gospel depend on money? Will Western support enhance the missionary spirit of national churches? What is the testimony of history to outside support of national churches? Did Paul take financial support to the churches he planted? Discussion flows pro and con along both sides of these questions (*see also* FOREIGN FINANCING OF INDIGENOUS WORKERS).

Proponents of Traditional Missionary Presence. Those who defend the cross-cultural sending of Western missionaries rather than money hold the following positions: (1) that it is a fallacy to assume that the spread of the gospel can be accomplished only with money, that is, the Great Commission should not be held captive to fund raising; (2) that outside funds can create DEPENDENCY in national churches; (3) that a mercenary spirit among national leaders can be created by too strong an influx of Western funds; (4) that employing national workers will not necessarily lead to more effective ministry; (5) that sending money instead of missionaries compromises the Great Commission.

Proponents of Western Monetary Support. Those in favor of Western financial support of Third World missions, rather than sending missionaries, advance their reasoning with the following propositions: (1) Western missionaries are too expensive; (2) Western believers should multiply the effectiveness of their earnings at home by supporting national missionaries in their own countries; (3) Western missionaries spend too much time and money on social ministries; (4) the presence of Western missionaries has a negative effect in poverty-stricken areas; (5) educational preparation for Western missionaries is too time consuming and cost prohibitive.

Holistic Mission. "Holism" as it relates to Christian mission means that the church's mission in the world includes not only gospel proclamation but also sociopolitical, economic, and health dimensions. Those who hold this position believe that mending social ills and alleviating political injustices are integral to Christian mission (*see* HOLISTIC MISSION).

The Holistic View of Mission. A growing number of evangelicals defend holistic mission. JOHN R. W. STOTT articulated this position in his book, *Christian Mission in the Modern World.* Stott holds that John 20:21 is the basic statement of the Great Commission: "As the Father has sent me, I am sending you."

In addition to this position on the GREAT COMMISSION, Stott also champions the GREAT COMMANDMENT, namely, Christ's instruction to "love your neighbor as yourself." According to this view, these two commands constitute the Christian mission in the world. Stott explains that "if we love our neighbor as God made him, we must inevitably be concerned for his total welfare, the good of his soul, his body, and his community" (Stott, 1975, 30). Also according to this view, the Christian mission should include a political dimension in an effort to bring about structural social change.

This concept of mission "describes . . . everything the church is sent into the world to do. 'Mission' embraces the church's double vocation of service to be 'the salt of the earth' and 'the light of the world.' For Christ *sends* his people into the earth to be its salt, and *sends* his people into the world to be its light (Matt. 5:13–16)" (ibid., 30–31, emphasis his). In Stott's expression of this view, evangelism and social action are considered equal partners in mission and mutually integral to each other (*see also* EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY).

The Traditional View of Mission. Those who oppose the concepts of holistic mission distinguish between the CULTURAL MANDATE and the redemptive or evangelistic mandate in Scripture. The traditional view holds that the cultural mandate is addressed to people as persons (Gen. 1:28; 2:15; 9:1, 7), while the redemptive mandate is ad-

dressed to those who become members of the people of God. The cultural mandate is fulfilled by qualitative and quantitative improvement in culture; it is preservative in a fallen world; and it is nonredemptive. The redemptive mandate is fulfilled by obedience in proclaiming the gospel to a lost world; it offers hope to a fallen race; and it is redemptive and transformational.

Some question the use of John 20:21 as the basic statement of the Great Commission. They contend that this violates the hermeneutical principle of using the more complete and less obscure passages to understand the less complete and more obscure passages, in this case Matthew 28:19–28; Luke 24:47 (Hesselgrave, 1990, 3). Also, they argue that the sociopolitical action advocated by proponents of holistic mission is contrary to the examples of Christ and the early church. Opponents to the holistic mission position believe that using the so-called Great Commandment as a part of Christian *mission* is unmerited. Loving one's neighbor is the *duty* of the individual believer (Gal. 6:10) and not a part of Christian *mission* as such (ibid., 4).

In summarizing this position of the twofold mandate, Peters stated, "Only the second mandate [the redemptive mandate] is considered missions in the strict biblical sense. The first mandate [the cultural mandate] is philanthropic and humanitarian service rendered by man to man on the human level and as from members of the same 'family' (Gal. 6:10, Luke 10:25–27)" (Peters, 1972, 170).

PAUL A. BEALS

Bibliography. J. A. Borland, *JETS* (March 1990): 3–11; D. Hesselgrave, *EMQ* 35:3 (1999): 278–84; idem, *Trinity World Forum,* Spring (1990), pp. 1–7; T. Ice and R. Dean, *A Holy Rebellion: Strategy for Spiritual Warfare;* D. McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth;* J. R. McQuilkin, *Measuring the Church Growth Movement;* B. Myers, *EMQ* 35:3 (1999): 284–87; C. Ott, *EMQ* (1993): 286–91; C. Pinnock, *A Wideness in God's Mercy;* R. Powlison, *Power Encounter: Reclaiming Spiritual Warfare;* T. Rainer, *The Book of Church Growth: History, Theology, and Principles;* J. Sanders, ed., *What About Those Who Have Never Heard?;* J. Stott, *Christian Mission in the Modern World;* J. Walvoord, W. Crockett, Z. Hayes, and C. Pinnock, *Four Views of Hell.*

Conversion. The relationship between conversion and mission is foundational to missiology, because the conversion of sinners is central to the fulfillment of the Great Commission. In one sense, the goal of the mission—conversion—is simple. But understanding the process of conversion is a complex missiological subject. We must analyze the concept of conversion from three perspectives: the biblical, the psychological, and the sociological.

The Biblical Dimension of Conversion. Biblically, the term "conversion" centers around a number of words. *Epistrephō* (turn) and *metanoia* (repentance) are two of the most frequently used terms to describe conversion. The Bible speaks about conversion as turning away from wickedness (2 Tim. 2:19) turning to God from idols (1 Thess. 1:9), or turning from darkness to light and from the dominion of Satan to God (Acts 26:18).

This call to conversion is an important part of gospel proclamation. We not only preach the Good News of Christ's death and resurrection, but we must also persuade persons to repent and believe in the gospel. Evangelicals have rightfully stressed the importance of faith as a key component of conversion but have generally minimized the importance of REPENTANCE.

The call to repentance, however, echoes throughout the New Testament. John the Baptist, Jesus, Peter, and Paul all include repentance in their preaching (Mark 1:4, 15; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 20:21; 26:20). Moreover, the church is commissioned to preach "repentance for forgiveness of sins . . . to all nations" (Luke 24:47; cf. Acts 17:30). Consequently, repentance is a crucial dimension of good missions practice. Perhaps one reason many ministries struggle with ongoing sin in the church is because repentance is not an important element in the original proclamation of the gospel. An initial, watered-down presentation of the Good News will ultimately lead to bad news—unhealthy churches and unholy people.

Therefore, we must call sinners to repentance. Conversion is thus both the duty of the evangelist and the demand of the sinner. This is the humanward aspect of conversion.

But there is also a deeper, more fundamental aspect of conversion. While we call men and women to repentance, only God can bring about conversion. We preach the gospel to people who are dead in their sins (Eph. 2:1–3). Because of this, God's Spirit must bring people to life. This is the Godward dimension of conversion, known as "regeneration" (Titus 3:5) or more popularly known as being "born again" (John 3:1–8). Hence, conversion is not just a duty or a demand. It is a gift—a supernatural and instantaneous work of God.

The Godward and humanward dimensions of conversion are both taught in the New Testament. But the Godward work of God's grace in the human heart through the Holy Spirit is primary. As Peter says in his report to the church in Jerusalem, "God has granted even the Gentiles repentance unto life" (Acts 11:18). Luke's description of Lydia's conversion also underscores the priority of God's gracious initiative in conversion: "The Lord opened her heart to respond to Paul's message" (Acts 16:14).

The Psychological Dimension of Conversion. The psychological dimensions of conversion must be understood if we are to communicate

Christ effectively. The ENGEL SCALE describes a step-by-step process whereby a person who knows nothing about God is led to a true knowledge of God. Engel highlights the fact that conversion is a process, not simply a crisis. While it leads to an event, a climactic turning to Christ, it also usually involves a gradual change in the thinking of the person being converted.

While not a major theme, the psychological dimension of conversion is nevertheless implicit in the Gospels. The conversion of the apostles takes place gradually as they live and interact with Jesus. First they understand him as an authoritative teacher, one who casts out demons with a mere command (Mark 1:27). Next, they see him as a healer, as one who has authority over sickness (Mark 2:1–12). Then, they wrestle with the fact that he has authority over creation. "Who is this? Even the wind and the waves obey him!" (Mark 4:41). Finally, after considerable time, Peter makes his famous confession: "You are the Christ" (Mark 8:29).

People repent and believe in the gospel after hearing and understanding crucial truths about God, sin, and salvation. While the essence of the gospel is unchanging, we proclaim Christ in radically different contexts (*see* CONTEXTUALIZATION). Because of this, certain dimensions of the gospel are more relevant in particular contexts and the process of conversion varies with the people being converted. Muslims must know different things about God than Hindus. A secular American needs to understand different aspects of truth than an African animist. Because of this, we must study the people we are called to reach, so that we can speak to their unique needs and address their particular problems.

The Sociological Dimension of Conversion. The sociological (or cultural) components of conversion must be addressed. Western culture and evangelicals in general have viewed conversion in individual terms. But the Bible describes both individual and group conversions. The baptisms of extended households in the New Testament highlight the more community-oriented nature of Greco-Roman culture (Acts 10:44–48; 16:15, 34; 18:8). Similar to Greco-Roman culture, people in many cultures today do not make decisions as individuals; they make decisions as groups.

Therefore, as Harvie Conn wisely concludes, we "must continue to stress the necessity for a personal relationship to Christ as an essential part of conversion. But it must also be recognized that in the world's cultures such personal relationships are entered into not always by isolated 'individual' decisions in abstraction from the group but more frequently, in multi-personal, infra-group judgments. 'Personal' cannot be equated with 'individual'" (Conn, 1979, 103–4).

Missiologically this means that it is often wise to evangelize people in groups, in their natural social networks rather than as individuals. We should target families and friends in our evangelism. Whenever possible, our goal should be on reaching groups, that will lead ultimately to the establishment of new churches.

This is especially important among unreached peoples where the conversion of an isolated individual can lead to severe social ostracizing or even death in some cases. Understanding this sociological (or cultural) dimension of conversion will make us more sensitive to culture and more fruitful in ministry.

RICHARD D. LOVE

Bibliography. H. M. Conn, *The Gospel and Islam,* pp. 97–111; J. Engel and H. W. Norton, *What's Gone Wrong with the Harvest?;* P. Hiebert, *The Gospel in Context;* C. B. Johnson and H. Newton Malony, *Christian Conversion: Biblical and Psychological Perspectives;* D. McGavran, *Bridges of God.*

Creation. The fact that biblical revelation begins with the creation account demonstrates the foundational importance of the creation doctrine to all other biblical doctrines, including redemption. The divine design and majestic glory of the created order witness to the character, sovereignty, and lordship of the Creator (Ps. 19:1–6), which are critical issues in the outworking and understanding of his mission purpose *(MISSIO DEI)*. Humankind, as male and female, uniquely created in the image of the Creator, is seen to be the apex of creation and focus of this purpose. To humankind is given the right to rule over and subdue the earth and its creatures and to tend and take care of their natural environment, responsibilities for which they are still accountable (Gen. 1:26–30; 2:15; Ps. 8:3–8).

The FALL OF HUMANKIND through the temptation of another created being (Satan) radically impacted all of creation and defined the mission of God for human history. Redemption of elect humanity and the restoration of the Creator's glory in them constitute the ultimate divine purposes, as decreed before the creation itself (Eph. 1:4–14; Rev. 13:8). An age-long conflict with Satan, the rebellious archenemy of his sovereign Creator, is the context for *missio Dei.* In his passionate efforts to steal glory from the Creator, including God's exclusive right to be worshiped, and to usurp God's place of authority over the created order, the enemy seeks to seduce humankind to worship other beings and objects in the created order. Such idolatry and the moral and spiritual perversions which accompany it, are the ultimate manifestation of humanity's depravity and need for the redemption and regeneration offered in the gospel (Rom. 1:18–32; 3:9–31).

The redemptive purposes of God include not only humankind but also the created order.

Cursed as a result of the fall (Gen. 3:17–18), yet still an object of his care and concern (Jon. 4:11), creation is described as groaning and eagerly expecting the final redemption of humankind. The curse will be removed "at the renewal of all things" and creation itself will fulfill its divine purpose (Rom. 8:18–25; Matt. 19:28). Ultimately, the present created order will be cleansed, providing the perfect eternal abode for the redeemed to live in the presence of their Creator and redeemer forever (Isa. 65:17; 66:22; 2 Peter 3:10–13; Rev. 21:1).

An understanding of the biblical doctrines of creation, man and woman, and *missio Dei* is essential to the communication and reception of the gospel of redemption. However, the historical development of distinctive human cultures and worldviews has demonstrated the rejection of revealed truth about God, including the revelation in creation itself (Rom. 1:18–25). The result is evident in a plethora of grossly inaccurate cosmogonies, from fanciful myths about capricious deities to atheistic dialectical materialism.

In some cultural contexts, a good starting point of contact for the gospel is the doctrine of creation. Paul's address to the pagan philosophers in Athens (Acts 17:24–31) is a classic biblical case. Contemporary missionaries working among animistic tribal groups have demonstrated the effectiveness of starting with the creation account in building a foundation for the gospel. The monistic pantheism of the Hindu-Buddhistic worldview and the pantheistic naturalism and world consciousness of the Chinese worldview, especially Taoism, demand a careful explanation and understanding of the nature and purpose of creation and humanity's role and relationship to it and to a personal Creator and Redeemer.

In the latter half of the twentieth century certain exponents of liberation theology sought to integrate creation and mission around an ecological and political agenda leading to a radical redefinition of the church's mission. Rooted in the premise that creation presupposes salvation, the church's task is to seek the liberation of the earth from the oppressive policies of Western industrialization and the liberation of the poor from political oppression and economic deprivation. Creation and salvation have been merged into a struggle for political justice, economic equality, and ecological responsibility.

A comprehensive, biblically informed mission theology will include a clearly defined doctrine of creation, including a doctrine of stewardship of the earth and its resources. But mission is not ultimately informed by or subservient to the creation doctrine. Mission flows from a biblical understanding of the Creator's purposes for his creation and proclaims his sovereign lordship over his creation. The biblical mandate is to preach the good news to all creation (Mark 16:15), resulting in a body of regenerated human beings who are newborn creations in Jesus Christ (Heb. 12:23; 2 Cor. 5:17) and who live in the expectation of a new creation to the glory of the Creator (Rev. 21:1–4).

RICHARD D. CALENBERG

Bibliography. W. A. Dyrness, *Let the Earth Rejoice!: A Biblical Theology of Holistic Mission;* J. J. Kritzinger, *Missionalia* 19:1 (April 1991): 4–19; Choan-Seng Song, *Christian Mission in Reconstruction: An Asian Analysis;* P. M. Steyne, *In Step With the God of the Nations: A Biblical Theology of Missions;* D. C. van Zyl, *Missionalia* 19:3 (November 1991): 203–14.

Cultural Mandate. The expression "cultural mandate" refers to God's command to Adam and Eve to "rule over" creation (Gen. 1:28), meaning to share with God in the management of all that he had made. This mandate was issued before the Fall occurred (Gen. 3), and obviously it predates the missionary mandate (the GREAT COMMISSION; Matt. 28:18–20). The cultural mandate remains in force and its implications for Christian mission are important.

The cultural mandate has several parts. The first is the command to "be fruitful, increase in number, and fill the earth" (Gen. 1:28). This is the basic command to build community with the building blocks of marriage and family (Gen. 2:24). Here lies the foundation of human society.

The second part has to do with the naming of the animals (Gen. 2:19–20), where Adam's mental and aesthetic gifts along with his decision-making capacity were called into action. Implied in the command to name the animals is humankind's responsibility to study the universe, unlock its secrets, use judiciously its potential, and glorify God for the beauty and variety of creation.

The third part of the cultural mandate appears in Genesis 2:15, where Adam and Eve are placed in a bountiful garden and told to "work it and take care of it." Properly tended, the garden would provide amply for their physical needs and those of their descendants. Implied in this command is our responsibility for the natural environment, the air, soil, water, plants, and minerals, which must be diligently cared for and never exploited or misused.

Fourth, the cultural mandate includes the elements of reflection and celebration. This is implied by the fact that when he had finished creating, God evaluated what he had made, declared it to be "good" (Gen. 1:31), and set aside a day to celebrate and enjoy the fruit of his work (Gen. 2:1). So important to God was this element of rest, reflection, and celebration that he explicitly set aside one day in seven in the Ten Commandments given to Israel (Exod. 20:8).

The FALL OF HUMANKIND occurred (Gen. 3), and since that time members of the human race indi-

vidually and collectively have transgressed the cultural mandate in every imaginable way. Yet its basic precepts remain intact, and the consequences of disregarding them are visible everywhere. To a bewildered and suffering world Christian mission points back to Genesis, to our first parents' rebellion and to the transgression of God's original mandate, to explain the source of the evils that now plague humanity.

There is still more to the cultural mandate so far as mission is concerned. Serious reflection on the cultural mandate enlarges the Christian message so that it addresses everything that God made, sin corrupted, and Christ makes new. It propels Christian activity into every area of human life and every corner of the world to combat evil and falsehood and promote mercy, righteousness, and truth.

The cultural mandate calls for an approach to education that begins with the presupposition that the world belongs to God and he has mandated how humans should relate to one another and treat his whole creation. Reflection on the cultural mandate leads Christians to see that their responsibilities before God are not limited to activities in the institutional church, nor to personal and private spirituality. They include all the arenas of life, the social, economic, political and scientific. In each of these arenas they honor God as they promote truth and mercy and apply scriptural principles to the affairs of life.

Tension has sometimes developed between those who stress the cultural mandate with its broad implications for Christian involvement and those who stress the missionary mandate (Matt. 28:18–20) that emphasizes preaching, making disciples, and establishing churches. The following clarifications and distinctions need to be made.

First, in a fallen world, people need to hear the gospel of Jesus Christ more than they need anything else. Therefore the missionary mandate takes precedence over the cultural mandate. But this does not mean that the missionary mandate replaces or swallows up the cultural mandate. Christians are obliged to obey both mandates, though in the order of missionary activity the proclamation of the gospel to the unsaved is primary.

Second, the witness of Christian lives in which Christ is honored as Lord over all affairs is highly important for the advance of the gospel. Likewise, deeds of mercy to the suffering and needy bear eloquent testimony to God's mercy in Christ. But our best works are flawed by imperfections and can never substitute for the word-proclamation of the gospel of God's grace in Christ. The Christian life may give "flesh" to the word, but the Word is always necessary because it points beyond human imperfections to the perfect Savior Jesus Christ.

Third, churches as institutions ought to focus on the task of proclaiming the gospel and discipling believers. Church members, acting in conjunction with the broader Christian community, should be taught and encouraged to apply the teachings of the gospel to social, cultural, and political issues. Even when the Christian community as a whole is derelict in its cultural obligations, it is unwise and inappropriate for organized churches to plunge into matters that are not their primary responsibility, because the specific task of churches is defined by the missionary mandate rather than the cultural mandate.

Christian day schools and colleges play a vital role in educating succeeding generations of children and youth to enter life with a conscious recognition of their calling to be salt and light in all spheres of life (Matt. 5:12–16). Christian education's primary responsibility lies in the area of the cultural mandate. Nevertheless, Christian education takes place in the New Testament age which is dominated by the missionary mandate. For that reason, Christian teachers should impress upon students the missionary claims of the gospel and the urgency of world evangelization.

ROGER S. GREENWAY

Bibliography. J. H. Bavinck, *An Introduction to the Science of Missions;* J. Bolt, *Christian and Reformed Today;* D. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission;* N. Carr, *The Origins and Purpose of Life: Genesis 1–11;* D. J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating the Gospel Cross-Culturally.*

Depravity of Humankind. Depravity refers to the extensiveness, or "depth dimension," of SIN. To the question, How far does the corrupting influence of sin extend to a person's being? the doctrine of *total depravity* responds that such corruption is all-pervasive, affecting every part of a person's nature, including the body, mind/intellect/reason, emotions, will, motivations, and so on. Thus, there is no spiritual good in people at all that could merit God's grace nor any human inclination to make a move toward God for salvation. Contrast this with other views (e.g., semi-Pelagianism) which deny that sin's depravity is total and maintain that some aspect of a person's being (e.g., the will or reason), while weakened by the corrupting influence of sin, retains sufficient ability to set in motion the pursuit after salvation through cooperation with divine grace.

While depravity is pervasive, the IMAGE OF GOD in humanity has not been completely effaced. CONSCIENCE or an innate awareness of good and evil remains, and corrupted people may still demonstrate a sensitivity for right and wrong. Will, the power to choose, continues, and sinful people may still engage in natural, civil, and even externally religious good. Thus, depraved people

are not as evil as they possibly could be, constantly indulging in every kind of sin. They possess both depravity and dignity.

Scriptural support for depravity includes both general statements about the all-pervasive corrupting influence of sin on humanity (Gen. 6:5; Rom. 3:9–18; 7:18; Eph. 2:1–3) as well as specific statements of sin's depraving impact on the various aspects of human nature such as the mind (Eph. 4:17–18; Rom. 8:6–7), the heart (Jer. 17:9), the conscience (Titus 1:15), the "inner being" (Mark 7:20–23), and the body (Rom. 6:12–13; 8:10). The biblical evidence points not only to *deprivation* (the absence of good) but to *depravation* (total corruption resulting in evil) as the thoroughgoing problem of humankind.

The implications of depravity for missions are several: (1) Personal awareness of our own human perversity propels us to seek out the divine solution in Jesus Christ. (2) "The deeper the sense of sin, the more thorough is the moral recovery and the intenser the spiritual life" (Miley). (3) As those rescued from miserable ruin, we express our thankfulness by no longer living for ourselves, but for him who saved us. This entails commitment to the ministry of reconciliation as ambassadors for Christ (2 Cor. 5:14–21). (4) Because of the universal all-pervasiveness of sin, God justly condemns the entire world to eternal punishment (*see also* HELL). This desperate plight of our fellow human beings challenges us to embark on the missionary enterprise. The message of salvation which we carry worldwide is the profound answer corresponding to the depth dimension of human sin. It renews the mind (Rom. 12:1–2), changes the heart (Ezek. 36:26), cleanses the conscience (Heb. 9:14), transforms the "inner being" (Eph. 3:16; Col. 3:10), and redeems the body (Rom. 8:13; 1 Cor. 6:12–20). The fullness of deliverance from our depravity awaits the return of Jesus Christ.

GREGG R. ALLISON

Bibliography. J. Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion,* 2.1.8–11; J. Miley, *Systematic Theology* I:441–533; M. Erickson, *Christian Theology,* 621–39.

Dialogue. The subject of vigorous discussion, dialogue seems to defy definition. Most agree, however, that dialogue includes face-to-face conversations involving persons who have fundamentally different religious convictions for the purpose of understanding and growth. In the debate on religious PLURALISM and dialogue, convictions on its nature and use appear to settle into three positions. The position held by pluralists rejects traditional views on biblical revelation, proclaiming interreligious dialogue as a new epistemology; extreme conservatism calls for the rejection of dialogue in favor of proclamation; a more centrist view affirms dialogue as a means of understanding and communication without rejecting biblical revelation.

Ontological and epistemological relativism form the basis for pluralist dialogue. Within this framework, dialogue is seen as a primary avenue toward universal religious truth. Through interfaith discussion under an attitude of equal respect for person and faith, dialogue may reveal supreme truth that transcends various religious traditions: the ultimate truth behind all cultural expressions of religious experience, whether that experience finds expression through Hinduism, Islam, Buddhism, or Christianity. Important aspects include entering dialogue with little or no predetermined expectations, complete honesty, openness, and willingness to change, even concerning important theological issues. Thus, through interfaith dialogue, the Christian may convert from Christianity, the non-Christian may convert to Christianity, or both may become agnostic. Adherents to this position include John Hick, Paul F. Knitter, John R. Cobb, Raimundo Panikkar, and Leonard Swidler.

This position, however, views RELATIVISM as a universally accepted paradigm, possibly creating a naiveté concerning the willingness of other parties to agree to the relativistic preconditions and the possibility that such dialogues become limited to other pluralists from various faiths. This position also evidences a lack of attention to smaller religious movements in the pluralist literature. Little space is given to dialogue between Christians (even liberal) and Satanists, to give an extreme example.

The opposite view may be called the antidialogue position; it is held by D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, among others. Drawing presuppositions from conservative Christian tradition and nineteenth-century positivism, this position assumes an absolute, complete, and accurate comprehension of biblical truth as expressed in evangelical orthodoxy, forming "an exact correspondence between theology and Scripture" (Hiebert, 1985, 7). Any dialogue that contains the possibility for theological change is often perceived as a threat. Accordingly, as JOHN STOTT points out, proclamation commands the central element of this position. Careful attention is given to the presentation of the message in monologue form with less attention to surrounding beliefs or circumstances. Dialogue with non-Christians is often considered to involve compromise with anti-Christian forces, violating 2 John 7–11. Preaching in monologue style seeks to accurately communicate propositional truth, thus safeguarding the purity and integrity of the biblical message.

Weaknesses include substantial evidence of cultural and subjective bias in biblical interpretation, undermining the presupposition of exact correspondence. Accordingly, adherents may ex-

perience difficulty discerning and respecting differences in conservative biblical interpretation that stem from divergent worldviews. In addition, greater possibilities exist for insensitive presentations that can hinder comprehension of central biblical issues. For example, cultures that value relationships and conversation more than preaching may find difficulty in responding to the message.

The third position seeks to affirm both the understanding and communication aspects of dialogue without surrendering biblical absolutes, the latter being a crucial distinction from the pluralist definition of dialogue. This position, combining critical realism with theological conservatism, is held by (among others) Stott, E. Stanley Jones, Kenneth Cragg, Carl F. H. Henry, and Bishop Stephen Neill. Through interpersonal dialogue, one listens and learns as well as shares scriptural truth. Biblical evidence for this position includes examples from the ministry of Christ (John 3–4; Luke 18:18–29), the ministry of Peter (Acts 10:27–48), Paul (Acts 13:8–18; 17:16–34; 19:8–10; 20:6–7), and the common sense of Proverbs 18:13. Stott summarizes his argument by stating that true biblical dialogue reflects authenticity, humility, integrity, and sensitivity—all without relinquishing essential biblical mandates for salvation. The position calls for careful discernment between people who are valued by Christ and religious systems that oppose him, and it is the position generally practiced by evangelical missionaries.

The weaknesses of this position include possible difficulties in maintaining a balance among interpersonal relationships, biblical truth, and resulting psychological equilibrium. Additionally, losing biblical perspective may also lead toward Syncretism. However, the strengths of this approach far outweigh the weaknesses.

Steven J. Pierson

Bibliography. P. J. Griffiths, *An Apology for Apologetics;* J. Hick and P. F. Knitter, eds., *The Myth of Christian Uniqueness;* P. Hiebert, *Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin* 8 (1985): 5–10; P. F. Knitter, *No Other Name?;* D. M. Lloyd-Jones, *Preaching and Preachers;* T. C. Muck, *JETS* 36 (1993): 517–29; H. A. Netland, *Dissonant Voices: Religious Pluralism and the Question of Truth;* E. Rommen and H. Netland, eds., *Christianity and the Religions: A Biblical Theology of World Religions;* J. R. W. Stott, *Christian Mission in the Modern World;* L. Swidler, *After the Absolute: The Dialogical Future of Religious Reflection.*

Divine Election. Divine election is part of God's work of *predestination,* his decree regarding the eternal destiny of human beings. The issue of *election* is: Does God choose certain individuals out of the entirety of humanity to be recipients of his gift of salvation in Jesus Christ, thereby assuring that they will enjoy eternal life? If so, by what manner? A corollary issue, called reprobation, is this: Does God also pass over certain individuals, in sorrow leaving them in their sins and to their eternal condemnation? If so, by what manner?

Various responses to these questions have been offered and are summarized here in six general categories.

Calvinism affirms divine election and specifies that God's choice of some for eternal life is *unconditional,* not based on any human merit or a positive response of faith to the gospel as foreseen by God. Rather, election was God's sovereign will and good pleasure purposed before the creation of the world (Eph. 1:3–14; Rom. 9:14–18) and is immutable, necessary (given the utter sinfulness of people), and efficacious. The elect will certainly embrace the salvation offered them in Jesus Christ and continue in that faith until the end (Acts 13:48; Rom. 8:28–30).

Some Calvinists, in addition to embracing election, also affirm divine *reprobation.* This view, called *double predestination,* holds that God not only chooses some for eternal salvation, but also passes over others, in sorrow deciding not to save them but to allow the sentence of eternal death to fall upon them. These people are "vessels of wrath made for destruction" (Rom. 9:14–23); the stumbling of the disobedient is the tragic end to which they were appointed (1 Peter 2:6–10; Jude 4).

A compatibilist approach underscores the causal differences between election and reprobation. In the former case, God *causes* the salvation of the elect, mercifully giving to them what they do not deserve: grace leading to salvation. This is not without genuine human response, however: divine election is ordained by God and comes about through the willing appropriation of the gospel by faith (2 Thess. 2:13–14). In the latter case, God *does not cause* the damnation of the reprobate, but justly gives to them what they deserve: condemnation due to sin and willful disobedience to the gospel (2 Thess. 1:6–10).

Pelagianism denies both election and reprobation. Divinely gifted with freedom of choice and the ability to respond to God without a work of grace upon their souls, people do not have a penchant for sin. Thus, there is no need to be predestined in any way, but people are capable of fulfilling God's purposes and are held fully responsible to do so.

Arminianism/Wesleyanism affirms divine election and specifies that such election is *conditional.* Since God does "not wish for any to perish but for all to come to repentance" (2 Peter 3:9; 1 Tim. 2:3–4) and makes universal appeals for all to embrace his offer of salvation (Matt. 11:28; Isa. 55:1), then all people must be able to meet the terms of salvation. This is made possible by *prevenient grace,* a divine work in all peo-

ple everywhere which overcomes the corruption due to sin and which restores the ability to respond positively to the gospel. Election is based on God's *foreknowledge* of this positive response (Rom. 8:28–30; 1 Peter 1:1–2); thus, it is conditioned upon foreseen faith in Jesus Christ. Double predestination is denied.

Karl Barth's doctrine of election focuses attention on Jesus Christ, who is both the *elected man* and the *electing God* (this, for Barth, is double predestination). As the *elected man,* Jesus is central to the work of salvation and demonstrates that God is for humankind in election and not against humankind in reprobation. God's will from all eternity is the election of Jesus Christ. As the *electing God,* Jesus willingly elected to become man and to undergo reprobation for himself so that the entire world would be elect in him. The elect community—the church—preaches to the world, proclaiming to all this universal election by God in Jesus Christ.

A Calvinistic perspective is often seen as a deterrent to missions, for the following reasons. If God has already elected certain individuals to salvation, then why engage in missionary work—praying, going, giving, and preaching the gospel—since those individuals will be saved anyway? This objection overlooks the fact that God not only ordains the salvation of the elect, but also ordains that their salvation will come only through hearing the gospel and appropriating this provision of forgiveness by faith and repentance (2 Thess. 2:13–14). Thus, a human response to the Good News is essential and the MISSIONARY TASK is imperative, being the divinely commanded means of linking the elect with the gospel (Rom.10:5–15). Another key to consider is the fact that divine election is a secret decree and thus not revealed to us; thus, we must engage in missions without the knowledge of whether the individuals to whom we minister are elect or not. Finally, since God's election is efficacious, missionaries may be encouraged that their labors in preaching and teaching Christ will be fruitful (Acts 18:9–10).

From an Arminian/Wesleyan perspective, if election is conditioned upon the response of individuals to the gospel, then it is imperative to engage in the missionary enterprise. Again, God alone foreknows who will respond positively to the Good News, so the gospel must be indiscriminately preached to all who will listen.

Karl Barth does not distinguish between the elect and the reprobate, since all people have been elected. However, not all people live as elect; rather, many live as reprobate. The Christian mission, therefore, consists of proclaiming to all people that they are elected by God in Jesus Christ, enabling those who do not realize this fact to be aware of their election so as to live in the light of this magnificent work.

Whether we are elected unconditionally (Calvinism), conditionally (Arminianism), or universally (Barth), all who are the elect of God have the responsibility of praying, going, giving and proclaiming Jesus Christ as part of the missionary enterprise.

GREGG R. ALLISON

Bibliography. J. Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion,* 3.21–24; J. Arminius, *Examination of Perkins' Pamphlet and Declaration of Sentiments;* K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics* II/2; C. Pinnock, ed., *Grace Unlimited* and *The Grace of God, the Will of Man: A Case for Arminianism;* T. Schreiner and B. Ware, *The Grace of God, the Bondage of the Will: A Case for Calvinism.*

Divine Initiative. The Scriptures present God as the one ultimate and Supreme Being in the universe. Before anything else existed, God eternally "was." It was within the depths of his Being that the idea of what would exist arose and when it pleased him those ideas took concrete external shape at the word of his command. God created the supernatural world and the physical world in which the human race would be placed. This is the import of Genesis 1:1, which says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" and all of this speaks to the question of God's initiative. If God had not taken the initiative there would have been no reality external to himself. He conceived, developed, and executed the plan that gave reality to what we now experience as our universe and our place in it.

The initiative of God did not end when he had accomplished the initial creation of all things. By a continuous act of his power God sustains everything in existence. Created, contingent being has no power to keep itself in existence; were it not for the sustaining word and will of God, all that is would lapse back into its primal nonexistence and be no more. In addition to this God has retained his right to intervene creatively in his universe for the governance and good of his creation. He does this by sometimes working through the orderly structures he has established and sometimes by contravening them for a higher good (*see* MIRACLES). After all, the orderly structures (the so-called natural laws) are all part of a larger moral order and subserve those higher purposes. So God's intervention in his own universe is not a violation of independently functioning laws but rather a rearranging of those orderly structures to serve a higher end. The Deists of the eighteenth century down to and including the liberal theologians of our own day deny that God (if there is a personal God) would do this sort of thing. They assert that after the world was established, God left it to work out its own purposes, especially the purposes of human beings, who now have the ultimate initiative. Scripture does not teach this. It allows that human beings do exercise initiative and may

genuinely act as responsible beings, but it is all within the matrix of God's overall sustenance and management (providence). We may exercise initiative, but not ultimately.

Scripture is replete with examples of God's taking the initiative. God made the world; God said "Let the land produce vegetation" (Gen. 1:11) and it obeyed him. God created the human pair and established his relationship with them, setting limits upon them. God judged them when they failed. The overwhelming number of times God's initiative is spoken of in Scripture has caused some modern theologians actually to *define* God as a "God who acts" (as opposed to the pagan gods who could do nothing) and the Bible as the "Book of the Acts of God" (G. Ernest Wright; R. H. Fuller).

From a missiological point of view, the concept of the divine initiative most directly relates to God's self-disclosure with a view to bringing fallen humans into a redemptive relation with himself. God has called his people to share this good news of redemption with every living soul. God took the initiative in seeking out the lost progenitors of our race and all of their descendants. He established a plan of salvation that we may enter into, he commissions people to proclaim this message, he works on the hearts of the unredeemed to awaken a sense of need, and he regenerates those who believe. The apostle Paul worked out an entire philosophy of history based on this conception of God, as he explained to the Athenian philosophers in Acts 17. God made the world and everything in it (17:24); he needs nothing, "because he himself gives all men life and breath and everything else" (17:25); he made all nations from one person "and determined the times set for them and the exact places where they should live" (17:26); and he "did this so that men would seek him and perhaps reach out for him and find him, though he is not far from each one of us" (17:27). Paul sees the redemptive purposes of God at work everywhere and himself as an Ambassador of God calling everyone, everywhere to repentance and conscious faith in Jesus Christ. He also sees it as the task of the church to share in this ministry and proclaim the saving message of the gospel to those who are lost (*see* Missionary Task).

Those who proclaim the gospel may be sure that God has gone before them. He who made and sustains this universe and who initiated the plan of salvation for lost humanity did not suddenly stop working and leave it all up to human efforts. He certainly includes those efforts, but, thankfully, they are within the context of his own creative involvement and activity. In the end, it is not "he who plants nor he who waters [who] is anything, but only God who made it grow" (1 Cor. 3:7). We are fellow-workers with God (1 Cor. 3:9).

God has gone before us in at least four ways and those who go out to labor in God's field may be certain that God has been there first—and is still there at work (1 Cor. 3:9; Matt. 9:38). First, God has preceded us by making a knowledge of himself available to everyone (Pss. 19:1–4; 22:27, 28; 48:10; John 1:1–5, 9; Rom. 1:18, 19, 28). Second, God has revealed significant aspects of his nature through General Revelation, such as his righteousness (Rom. 1:32), his kindness (Matt. 5:45; Acts 14:17), his power (Ps. 29:3–10; Rom. 1:20), his majesty and glory (Ps. 8:1–4; 19:1), and his truth (Rom. 1:21, 25). Third, God has written his moral requirements into the human heart and no matter how badly they may be distorted by sin, they are still there and may be appealed to. C. S. Lewis called these "the Tao" in *The Abolition of Man* and finds the basis for all natural forms of religion in them. These moral requirements include the need to worship (Acts 17:22, 23), the need to seek God (Acts 17:27), fundamental moral principles (Matt. 5:47; Rom. 2:13–16), and a sense of impending judgment upon wrongdoing (Rom. 1:21–25, 32). Finally, God's *will* to save is also made known, although, rather obviously, the *facts of salvation* are not. They may only be known through special revelation (Acts 17:27; Rom. 2:5–11; Titus 2:11; 2 Peter 3:3; 5:4, 8, 9).

The command to proclaim the gospel is a universal one (Matt. 28:19, 20; Acts 1:8) and we may confidently build upon what we know God has been doing before our arrival. Sometimes it is just a general work that God has been doing and we must labor hard in the face of ridicule and rejection, as Paul did in Athens (Acts 17:32, 33). Sometimes God has been preparing the ground very specifically and our call may be to a specific area (Macedonia, Acts 16:10) or a specific individual (Cornelius, Acts 19:19–22). Either way the divine initiative precedes ours and assures us that our labors will not be in vain.

Walter A. Elwell

Bibliography. A. D. Clarke and B. W. Winter, eds., *One God, One Lord;* B. Demarest, *General Revelation;* C. S. Lewis, *The Abolition of Man;* L. Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society;* B. G. Nicholls, ed., *The Unique Christ in Our Pluralist World;* G. E. Wright and R. H. Fuller, *The Book of the Acts of God.*

Doubt. The mission Christ has given to his church is to disciple the nations (Matt. 28:18–20). This commissioning involves evangelizing the world (Luke 24:47), equipping the saints (Eph. 4:12–16), and training qualified leaders (2 Tim. 2:21). It is to be done in loving obedience to Christ and in faith.

Doubt may be defined as a state of uncertainty regarding God, his Word, and his works. The mission of the church demands faith in God's ability to guide, provide, and protect. It demands

faith in his Word that is displayed by obedience to his commissioning command. It also demands faith in his accomplished work of salvation and his continual works of convicting, regenerating, and empowering. There is clearly a distinction between permanent unbelief as illustrated by Judas and doubts that find resolution in lives such as Job, John the Baptist, Peter, and Thomas. However, since faith involves one's mind, emotions, and will, one may intellectually believe and still be characterized by unbelief (James 2:19).

The lexical basis for the scriptural understanding of doubt revolves around the various negations of *'aman* and *batah* in the Old Testament and *pisteuō* in the New Testament. *Apistos* refers to the faithless and unbelieving. *Apisteō* has the nuance of "to be unfaithful" and "to refuse to believe." *Apistia* means "unfaithfulness" and is closely related to disobedience. *Oligopistos* refers to the lack of faith and occurs exclusively in the Gospels.

Throughout Scripture Satan's warfare tactics are waged against faith (*see* SPIRITUAL WARFARE). In the temptation of Eve, the serpent raises doubt in God's character and his Word (Gen. 3:1–5). In Jesus' interpretation of the parable of the sower, he stated that the devil seeks to hinder belief in God's Word (Luke 8:12). He also told the Pharisees that their unbelief in his Word demonstrated that the devil was their spiritual father (John 8:44–47). The Apostle Paul related Satan's temptation as being aimed at his converts' faith (1 Thess. 3:5). For example, pride is the root cause of sin and was the sin of the devil (1 Tim. 3:6) and Jesus clearly taught that pride hinders faith (John 5:44; 12:42–43). Likewise, Jesus called the devil the father of lies (John 8:44), and it is the acceptance of wrong doctrine that upsets faith (2 Tim. 2:18).

Faith is the means by which one becomes God's child, whereas permanent unbelief results in God's condemnation (John 3:18; 8:24). The unbelieving find their place in the lake of fire (Rev. 21:8), but the one who has placed his faith in Christ has been delivered from this consequence. However, Scripture is clear on the effects of unbelief even in the life of a Christian. Since a lack of trust is seen as the root of sin and rebellion (Deut. 9:23; 2 Kings 17:14), an unbelieving heart is also called a sinful or evil heart (Heb. 3:12).

Unbelief is evidenced in God's people as a hesitancy to act in obedience to God and a lack of conviction (Deut. 1:26–33). Unbelief does not please God (Heb. 11:6); it is sin (Rom. 14:23). It hinders the prayer life of God's people (James 1:6–8; cf. Matt. 21:21; Mark 11:23–24). Whereas faith leads to worship (John 9:38), doubt hinders worship (Matt. 28:17).

The character of unbelief is to turn away from God (Heb. 3:12) and look to something else. To refuse to trust the true God is to commit spiritual adultery (Jer. 3:6, 8) and opens one up to falsehood and deception (2 Thess. 2:11–12). No other object of faith puts one on stable ground whether it be possessions (Prov. 11:28), another person (Jer. 17:5), or oneself (Prov. 28:26). A refusal to believe God dishonors his trustworthy name (1 John 5:10). Unbelief grieves the heart of Christ (Matt. 17:17), who longs to satisfy the thirsts of all who continually look to him (John 6:35; 7:37–39).

God graciously works in response to faith in his truth (Gal. 3:5). While faith opens the door to the release of God's power (Matt. 17:20; Mark 9:23; John 14:12), unbelief hinders the working of God (Matt. 13:58) and quenches God's Spirit. The individual Christian and the life of the church are greatly affected by the sin of unbelief. It opens the door to anxiety (John 14:1; Matt. 6:30) and fear (Matt. 8:26; 14:30–31). It makes one unstable (James 1:6–8) and fails to deliver one from dismay (Isa. 28:16), disappointment (Rom. 9:33), and corruption (Titus 1:15).

Since it is faith in God's revelation that opens the door to true understanding (Heb. 11:3), a lack of faith hinders spiritual discernment (Matt. 16:8). The naive or simple lack discretion in knowing what to believe and are contrasted with the prudent (Prov. 14:15). Since the shield of faith is an important protective piece of the Christian's armor, unbelief makes one vulnerable in spiritual battles (Eph. 6:16).

Unbelief never catches God by surprise (John 6:64); and it cannot and does not alter or change his perfect faithfulness (Rom. 3:3; 2 Tim. 2:13). It is the Holy Spirit's role to convict the world of sin, but the unbelief of the church grieves or quenches this convicting work and invites the Lord's loving discipline (John 16:9). The Scriptures are full of examples of objects of God's discipline such as the nation of Israel (Num. 14:11–23; Ps. 106:24–27; Jude 5), Moses (Num. 20:12), and Zechariah (Luke 1:20).

God desires merciful support to be shown to the doubting (Jude 22). He also desires that his people encourage each other's faith (Rom. 1:12). He uses his servants and trials to strengthen our faith (Acts 16:5; Jon. 11:15). He does not belittle cries for help in our unbelief (Mark 9:24) and gives enabling grace to believe (Acts 18:27; Phil. 1:29). Thomas (John 20:27) and Abraham (Rom. 4:20) are examples of those who received God's aid to believe. As Jesus prayed that Peter's faith would not fail (Luke 22:32), he lives today to intercede for the faith of his church (Heb. 7:25).

While God rebukes unbelief (Mark 16:14), he invites the repentant to return to him (Jer. 3:12) and let him heal their unfaithfulness. In light of the

church's large measure of unresponsiveness to its mission this provision needs to be taken seriously.

WILLIAM D. THRASHER

Bibliography. R. Bultmann, *TDNT,* VI:174–228; O. Becker, *NIDNTT,* I:587–93; O. Michel, *NIDNTT,* I:593–606.

Ecumenical Movement. The word "ecumenical" comes from the New Testament word *oikoumenē,* which meant either the whole world or the Roman Empire. In the fourth century the term was used to describe the whole church, and referred to those church councils recognized as authoritative by the undivided church. Thus the first seven councils, called to resolve doctrinal issues mainly concerning Christology (*see also* CHRISTOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES), are called the ecumenical councils. They took place before the division of the Eastern and Western churches and so included all Christians. The final division of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches in 1054 created the ecumenical problem for all churches, which, up to that point, had understood the church as one.

The Protestant Reformation exacerbated the problem. Even though Luther wished only to reform the Western church with no thought of establishing a different church, the sixteenth century saw massive fragmentation of the Body of Christ in the West, leaving groups ranging from Roman Catholic to Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed, and various Anabaptist communities. Despite the ecumenism of Calvin, Bucer, and others, who longed for the unity of Protestants, most were denouncing each other as apostates by the seventeenth century.

While it is clear in the New Testament that there is only one church and that the unity of all believers is an objective fact based on the work of Christ, the modern ecumenical movement finds its major biblical basis in John 17, where Jesus prayed that all who believed in him would be one so that the world might believe. Thus unity would be linked to mission. And in fact the historical roots of ecumenism are found in movements of renewal and mission beginning with PIETISM and Moravianism in the eighteenth century (*see* MORAVIAN MISSIONS). An example was the correspondence among Francke, the Lutheran Pietist in Germany; Mather, the Congregationalist in New England; Chamberlyne and Newman, the secretaries of the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge; Boehm, the court chaplain at St. James Chapel; and ZIEGENBALG, the Lutheran missionary in India in which they sought greater unity in order to carry out the missionary task. Later, Anglicans cooperated with Lutherans in the mission in India. And because of his desire to work for renewal, unity, and mission together, ZINDZENDORF would be called an "ecumenical pioneer."

The revivals on both sides of the Atlantic brought other manifestations of ecumenism. In North America, GEORGE WHITEFIELD, an Anglican; JONATHAN EDWARDS, a Congregationalist; and Gilbert Tennent, a Presbyterian, cooperated in the first GREAT AWAKENING. And in England the revival saw cooperation among Anglicans and dissenters. Members of different denominations corresponded, encouraged each other, and read each other's works. Carey would be partly motivated in his missionary vocation through reading DAVID BRAINERD and the Moravians. The modern Protestant missionary movement, which stemmed from the revivals, saw further steps in cooperation. Most of the early missionaries of the Anglican CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY were German Lutherans, influenced by pietism. The LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY included Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Anglicans, while the British and Foreign Bible Society and the Religious Tract Society found support among all evangelical groups. In an early and visionary attempt at greater unity, Carey proposed "a general association of all denominations of Christians, from the four quarters of the world," to be held in Capetown in 1810 or 1812, "to enter into one another's views."

While Carey's dream would not become a reality until a century later, missionaries of various denominations began to meet in 1825 in Bombay to promote Christian fellowship and exchange ideas. At a similar meeting in 1858 an Anglican stated that while denominational controversies may elicit truth in the West, elsewhere they produce nothing but evil, adding his hope that God would produce a church in India different in many aspects from those in Europe or America. Western denominational divisions seemed to make no sense in Asia or Africa and were often a scandal. They seemed to deny a basic aspect of the faith. In December 1862, another conference prefaced its report with the prayer, "that they all may be one," and discerned a pattern of "the united action of Christian men who pray, confer, and work together, in order to advance the interests of their Master's kingdom." In the same meeting, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists took Communion together. Similar conferences took place in Japan, China, Africa, Latin America, and the Muslim world.

The most prominent focus in these conferences was UNITY, which was a result of both the common commitment to mission and the experience of working and praying together. Many recognized that their unity was much deeper than differences in CHURCH POLITY or style of worship, and was based on a common devotion to Christ and his mission. But not all took part. The High

Church Anglicans at one extreme, and some FAITH MISSIONS on the other, stayed away. But at this point there was still a broad consensus among the great majority about the nature and purpose of mission.

An additional and related factor was the Evangelical Alliance, formed in 1846. It sought to unite in fellowship all who believed in the full authority of the Bible, the incarnation, atonement, salvation by faith, and the work of the Holy Spirit. Its monthly journal, *Evangelical Christendom,* brought news of missionary work all over the world, and was avidly read by missionaries as well as those at home. This strengthened the vision of missionary cooperation.

Missionary conferences overseas had their counterparts in Europe and North America. In 1854 ALEXANDER DUFF spoke in New York at a meeting open to friends of mission from "all evangelical denominations," to consider eight key questions about world evangelization. Many similar meetings were held during the last half of the century in various parts of Europe as well as the United States. A new and important step was ECUMENICAL MISSIONARY CONFERENCE held in New York in 1900. Nearly two hundred thousand people attended its various sessions, and it was opened with an address by President William McKinley. The word "ecumenical" was used in its title "because the plan of campaign which it proposes covers the whole area of the inhabited globe." Thus the original dimension was brought again to the meaning of the term. Now it referred, not only to the whole church and thus to unity and cooperation, but to the worldwide scope of the missionary task.

Along with the revivals and the missionary movement the nineteenth-century student movements formed a third stream contributing to the ecumenical movement. The Intercollegiate YMCA existed on 181 campuses by 1884, emphasizing Bible study, worship, and personal evangelism. In 1880 the Interseminary Missionary Alliance was formed by students from thirty-two seminaries to encourage focus on the missionary task. Through these two organizations mission became the primary feature of the student movement. The STUDENT VOLUNTEER MOVEMENT, formed in 1886, carried the emphasis further. Student Christian movements were organized in a number of countries, and these were brought together in the World Student Christian Federation in 1895 under the leadership of JOHN R. MOTT. Its founders saw the need for greater unity at home if their goal of world evangelization was to be realized. In England, for example, it brought together Free Church, Evangelical, and Anglo Catholic students to promote missionary zeal. The Federation sought to promote the spirit of unity for which the Lord longed, and to emphasize the efficacy of prayer, the saving work of Christ, and the "energizing power of the Spirit and the Word of God."

These powerful streams came together in the Edinburgh MISSIONARY CONFERENCE in 1910. Many of those who planned it came from the Student Christian movement. A number of them would become leaders in the formation of the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES in midcentury. John R. Mott, the chairman, was the most visible leader of the SVM and probably the most important symbol of the growing ecumenical movement. Three topics of the conference were "Carrying the Gospel to all the World," "The Church on the Mission Field," and "Cooperation and the Promotion of Unity." However, in order to ensure the participation of the High Church Anglicans and continental Lutherans, the conference limited participants to those involved in mission to "non-Christians." Consequently those involved in mission to traditionally Roman Catholic Latin America were excluded. This would create barriers between Latin American evangelicals and the conciliar ecumenical movement later on. On the other hand, neither Roman Catholics nor Orthodox were invited.

Edinburgh's most important achievement was the formation, in 1921, of the INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL (IMC) which promoted international missionary cooperation. However, it was also uniquely responsible for the formation of the World Council of Churches. It did so by bringing the younger churches into the thinking of the older churches, helping to recognize them as an essential part of the world Christian community. Even though the organizers had agreed not to discuss matters of theology and polity, some in attendance saw the need to do so and, as a result, the Faith and Order Movement was initiated in 1927. The influence of the Student Movement and Edinburgh was also important in the formation of the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work, established in 1925. Bishop Soderblom of Sweden who had been influenced by D. L. MOODY and Mott, established the council to seek cooperative action on common problems. Faith and Order and Life and Work would become the parent movements of the World Council of Churches (WCC), organized in 1948 (*see* AMSTERDAM ASSEMBLY). For the older denominations it has been the primary institutional expression of the ecumenical movement.

When the IMC became a part of the WCC in 1961 some hoped it would place mission at the heart of the Council. Others feared the move would result in a decline in mission. The latter proved to be right as a combination of theological liberalism, which seemed to doubt the importance of evangelism and maintained a primary focus on social issues, led to a great decrease in missionary activity by most conciliar churches in Europe and North America. Thus the WCC has

not succeeded in fulfilling the goal of its early proponents, unity so that the world might believe. Its member churches seem to be playing an ever decreasing role in world evangelism. This can be seen in statistics from the United States. In 1918, 82% of the missionary force came from the "mainline" churches, most likely to be members of the WCC today. In 1966, only 6% of American missionaries served under those boards.

Other manifestations of ecumenism are councils of churches in many countries and mergers of various denominational traditions in some nations. The United Church of Canada was formed in 1925 by Methodists, Congregationalists, and some Presbyterians with the hope of more effective outreach in the West. However, the result has been disappointing and decline rather than growth has been the result. The Church of Christ in China was formed in 1927 by Presbyterians, United Brethren, the United Church of Canada, and some Baptists and Congregationalists. Under the communist regime it became the parent body of the current "Three-Self Church," sanctioned by the government. The Church of South India was formed in 1947 and included Anglicans, the first time they had been drawn into communion with Presbyterians, Methodists, and others. In 1941 most Protestants in Japan, under government pressure, formed the Church of Christ in Japan, but Anglicans, Lutherans, and some others withdrew from it after the war. In 1948 the United Church of Christ in the Philippines was established. It appears that most of these united churches, with the exception of the Church in China, are not growing as rapidly as many of the newer groups.

The early ecumenical movement was based on a theological consensus which was solidly evangelical and breathed missionary passion. To the extent that agencies lost either or both of these, they declined. But after midcentury a new evangelical ecumenism arose. This is probably the most important manifestation of the ecumenical movement today. In the first half of this century fundamentalists and evangelicals tended to focus more on the issues which separated them from each other than on their common faith and task. But in 1966 the Congress on the Church's Worldwide Mission at Wheaton and the World Congress on Evangelism in Berlin began to overcome the separatism. Those meetings were succeeded by the International Congress on World Evangelism, held at Lausanne in 1974. The stature of Billy Graham helped greatly in bringing together men and women from diverse traditions and many nations, while the theological insights of John Stott contributed to the formulation of a statement of faith that laid the foundation for a more adequate understanding of mission. The formation of the Lausanne Committee on World Evangelization (LCWE) worked to bring about greater cooperation in the evangelistic task in a number of areas. Those involved included a wider spectrum than ever before, ranging from Anglicans to Pentecostals. At the same time the insights and concerns of Christians from Asia, Africa, and Latin America contributed to deeper understanding of the Gospel and the missionary task by those in the West (*see* Evangelical Movement).

The second congress of the LCWE, held in Manila in 1989, was probably the most inclusive Christian gathering in history up to that time (*see* Lausanne Congress II). Four thousand evangelical Christians from 150 countries gathered for a week. They included over sixty from the former Soviet Union, while others came from obscure countries like Chad in Central Africa. The goal was that half the delegates come from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Pentecostals were included among the speakers. So were women. Thus the whole church was represented to an extent not previously seen. The focus recaptured the ecumenical ideal: the whole church, taking the whole gospel, to the whole world. And while Manila did not contribute the kind of significant theological reformulation done at Lausanne, it seemed to provide additional impetus to the goals of cooperation in mission.

While the LCWE has been the most visible symbol of the new evangelical ecumenism, there are many others. The AD 2000 Movement, led, not by a European or North American, but by an Argentine, the Global Consultation on World Evangelization held in Korea ('95) and South Africa ('97), the Latin American mission conferences (*see* COMIBAM) held in 1987 and 1997, and the internationalization of the missionary movement, are all aspects of ecumenism. While there is still much to be done, the evangelical movement is now more genuinely ecumenical than ever before, as men and women from many races, languages, cultures, and nations seek to discover how they can demonstrate our unity in Christ so that the world might believe.

Paul E. Pierson

Bibliography. J. Hoekstra, *The World Council of Churches and the Demise of Evangelism;* W. R. Hogg, *Ecumenical Foundations;* LCWE; The Lausanne Covenant; K. S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity;* S. Neill and R. Rouse, *A History of the Ecumenical Movement.*

End Times. A primary scriptural impetus for the global missionary enterprise is the Great Commission statement crowning the First Gospel: "go and make disciples of all nations. . . . I am with you to the very end of the age" (Matt. 28:19–20). Jesus makes it clear that the urgent emphasis of mission must not be simply to "disciple" the world, but to continue to do so until the culmination of the end times events.

Relatedly, the Savior had already spoken to the heart of the issue in the Olivet Discourse, Jesus' sermon on the end of the age. Assurance that the global evangelistic task will be completed can be drawn from Matthew 24:14: "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come." Unfortunately, this passage does not elaborate on how this climactic proclamation will come about or who will accomplish it, nor does it address other questions that divide evangelical Bible scholars and missiologists.

Nor are these the only key passages that relate mission to the end times. For example, in Acts 2:17 the apostle Peter relates the phenomena going on around him on the Day of Pentecost to "the last days," citing Joel 2:28–32, which is there linked to the "day of the Lord" (Acts 2:20), a great theme of Old Testament eschatology. These references added urgency to Peter's appeal to his hearers: Call on the name of the Lord and be saved (v. 21) before it is too late for you to do so (v. 20)!

This passage also reveals the balancing perspective that "the last days" actually began in earnest with the inbreaking of the new age of the Spirit at Pentecost. This understanding is shared by the description of Christ being revealed in "these last days" in Hebrews 1:2. Relatedly, Paul speaks of ungodly behavior characterizing "later times," which seems to include his own day (1 Tim. 4:1).

On the other hand, Paul also looks ahead to absolutely "terrible times in the last days" (2 Tim. 3:1), though still times in which the God-breathed Scriptures will bring hearers to salvation (3:15–4:5). Of that latter-day period, Peter reminds his readers that the Lord wants "everyone to come to repentance" (2 Peter 3:9), urging a blameless lifestyle that will be a crucial aspect of attracting unbelievers to salvation (vv. 14–15).

Unfortunately, to this point, evangelicals have not sufficiently probed the Book of Revelation for specifics with regard to the completion of the Great Commission. Recently, however, R. Bauckham's programmatic discussion of the "conversion of the nations" in regard to the Apocalypse has served to stimulate fresh discussion in this area.

For example, it is quite likely that "a great multitude that no one could count, from every nation, tribe, people and language" (Rev. 7:9) standing before the heavenly throne is to be linked to the Matthean Commission. This vast throng from "all the nations" (Matt. 28:19), whether martyrs or not, are the end times fruit of the Great Commission.

Also, the references to "the eternal gospel to proclaim to those who live on the earth, to every nation, tribe, language and people" (Rev. 14:6–7) and the group of martyrs standing on the glassy sea (15:2) apparently are the fulfillment of the promise of the age-concluding preaching of the gospel described in Matthew 24:14. That understanding becomes even more likely when one sees that this use of "gospel" in 14:6 is its lone inclusion in the Book of Revelation.

Further, the two-sided harvest of Revelation 14:14–19 reflects strikingly similar imagery and terminology to Christ's parable of the wheat and the weeds (Matt. 13:24–30, 36–43). Since it speaks of the judgment at the "end of the age" (vv. 39–40), in which the children of the kingdom and the children of the evil one are separated to their ultimate destinies, there are important missiological implications.

So, if nothing else, recent study of the Book of Revelation has located several passages that seem to detail the completion of the Great Commission in the end times. It remains for further exegetical and theological study to clarify important details that will inform the theory and practice of the evangelical missionary enterprise in the crucial time ahead.

With the new millennium, there is great curiosity about the possible arrival of the "end times." From the standpoint of mission, there has been much creative strategizing and sending, including hundreds of strategies aimed toward the goal of completing the global imperative by the turn of the century.

Since there is still much uncertainty attached to the specific impact of these efforts with respect to God's plan and timing, encouragement should be drawn from joyfully remembering the promise of the risen Lord, in the context of the carrying out of the Great Commission: "I am with you always, to the very end of the age" (Matt. 28:20).

On the other hand, God's sovereignty must never be an excuse for irresponsibility or complacency. Employing imagery with overtones of the end times, the apostle Paul laid out the practical urgency of "understanding the present time. The hour has come for you to wake up from your slumber, because our salvation is nearer now than when we first believed. The night is nearly over; the day is almost here" (Rom. 13:11–12).

A. Boyd Luter

Bibliography. R. Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy, The Theology of the Book of Revelation,* BEB, II:1310–11; A. Johnson and R. Webber, *What Christians Believe: A Biblical and Historical Summary;* A. B. Luter and K. McReynolds, *Disciplined Living: What the New Testament Teaches about Recovery and Discipleship.*

Eschatology. One of the striking characteristics of the evangelical missionary enterprise is the optimism with which it is being pursued. There appears to be little, if anything, that can shake its advocates' belief that the Great Commission can and soon will be fulfilled. It has been suggested that the worldwide church is on the threshold of

unprecedented growth. It is said that this will involve a near universal hearing of the gospel accompanied by successful CHURCH PLANTING among every ethnic group. This success will signal the final epoch of missions and inaugurate the end of this age.

This confident outlook is based on an eschatological orientation, in which the inexorable implementation of God's salvific plan is followed from his promise to Abraham (Gen. 12:1–3), through the sending of the Son (Gal. 4:4), and on to the yet outstanding parade of the nations to Zion (Zech. 8:20–22). This air of anticipation is not generated by the calamitous state of the world, but by the present state of missionary advance. Jesus said (Matt. 24:14) that before he would return the gospel would have to be preached to the whole world, to every nation, tribe, and language. For the first time in history this appears to be a real possibility. In light of the progress that has been made and technological advances at our disposal, it is reasonable to believe that every people can hear the gospel and have the church planted in it. We just might be able to complete the task within this generation.

Of course, few dare to suggest particular dates. Neither is there agreement on the details of the eschatological timetable. But that our Lord will return, of that there is little evangelical doubt. This, more than anything, has contributed to an atmosphere of heightened eschatological anticipation. There seems to be a general consensus that we are not only in or near the final stage of history, but that we are also close to reaching the ultimate goal of salvation history, the full reinstatement of the KINGDOM OF GOD.

The key biblical text in this regard is Matthew 24:14. To the degree that this text is accepted as a promise of Christ's return, it yields several consequences of decisive import for the missionary enterprise.

First, it states the content of the missionary message in terms of the gospel of the kingdom of God. The purpose of Jesus' ministry is to announce and offer God's salvation to all of humanity. He does not speak of vengeance, but rather salvation, especially for sinners. It is a message of salvation, peace, and hope, which is offered even to publicans and prostitutes (Mark 2:15ff.). Of course, the availability of salvation both now and in the future depends on an individual's present attitudes (Luke 19:42). Since he offers immediate forgiveness of sin (Mark 21:1–12) it is an announcement of salvation as something already present and operative. However, the reign of which Christ speaks, although inaugurated in the present, will not be completed until the parousia. It will not be fully and perfectly realized until Christ returns. Yet, it does provide the missionary with a message of present significance. We really do have something of immediate benefit to proclaim.

Second, this passage is an eschatologically irrevocable announcement of divine intent. Jesus does make reference to human responsibility. We are to pray for it (Matt. 6:10), implore God for it (Luke 18:7), strive to get in (Luke 12:31), hold ourselves ready for it (Matt. 25:44). But human agency cannot bring it into existence. No more than it can hasten, delay, or hinder it. God alone gives it (Luke 12:32) and disposes it (Luke 22:29). Jesus promises it (Matt. 5:3) and grants or denies admittance (Matt. 8:11). What the kingdom is, is necessarily linked to the person of Christ, who determines its contents in terms of his own sending. He is Savior and Victor. He will bring ultimate victory of truth over all contradicting human ideologies, of justice in the struggle between right and wrong, of healing of all wounds, and love and reconciliation over all revengeful justice. These images portray a kingdom which God alone can and will institute. From this it becomes clear that history is indeed moving toward its God-appointed end. Christ will be victorious over death, sin, and Satan. Knowing that gives the missionary movement the confidence needed for bold and aggressive world evangelization.

Third, the text speaks of a specific commission or task, that is, proclaiming this message to all peoples. Since this is given in the context of the eventual completion of salvation history, this part of it also takes on eschatological significance. The messengers, those converted, and the concrete structures that result, the ever expanding people of God, are a sure sign of the coming kingdom.

Fourth, this text provides a powerful motivation for missions. God has commissioned his people with the implementation of the decisive and final stage of salvation history. Although this does not necessarily mean that the missionary work will hasten the return of Christ, some evangelicals do believe that the timing of Christ's return depends on the pace of our work; the sooner we complete our commission, the sooner he can return.

The most important thing in this text is not the controverted specifics of chronological sequence but rather the motivational value of the delay in Christ's return. How close are we to completing our missionary task? When will Christ return? God alone knows (Acts 1:7). But we do know that he has not yet returned and until he does, our work is not finished. This should cause us to view missionary work with sobriety, realism, and confidence. We will not be spared opposition and disappointment. The last days will be characterized by heightened activity on the part of the forces of darkness. But the end will come. The missionary task will be completed and

therein lies the actual motivation, our confidence. The hope of Jesus' return is an essential element in an evangelical theology of mission.

EDWARD ROMMEN

Bibliography. H. Berkhof, *Christian Faith;* D. G. Bloesch, *A Theology of Word and Spirit;* G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence;* T. N. Finger, *Christian Theology: An Eschatological Approach;* S. J. Grenz, *Revisioning Evangelical Theology;* idem, *Theology for the Community of God;* P. K. Jewett, *God, Creation, and Revelation;* G. R. Lewis and B. A. Demarest, *Integrative Theology;* A. E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction.*

Eternal Life. The Apostles' Creed closes with the words "I believe . . . in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting." Although anticipated in the Old Testament (Isa. 26:19; Dan. 12:2), the concept of "eternal" or "everlasting" (KJV) life is more fully developed in the New Testament, particularly in the Johannine literature.

Eternal life is more than mere continuing existence. It is qualitative in nature as well as unending in duration (John 10:10). It is the divine life which is present in God and Christ and bestowed as a gift upon the believer through the Holy Spirit (John 1:4; 1 John 1:1–2; 5:11). The life of the Christian is not his or her own life; it is the life of Christ who lives in his followers (Gal. 2:20; Phil. 1:21).

Although unending existence is encompassed within the concept, eternal life is essentially relational. In his high priestly prayer, Jesus describes it as knowing God and having fellowship with him through his Son, Jesus Christ (John 17:3). Christianity is unique among the world's religions in the nature of the claims it makes about its founder, claims derived from the words and actions of Jesus himself (John 11:25; 14:6; *see also* UNIQUENESS OF CHRIST).

Because it is imparted at the moment of regeneration, eternal life begins in the present life and is not affected by physical death. Those possessing eternal life are declared to be saved and are promised that they shall never perish (John 3:15–16, 18, 36; 5:24; 10:9). To be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (2 Cor. 5:8). The gift of eternal life is received by faith so that those who believe have already passed from death to life (John 5:24; 1 John 3:14) and have the life which is in the Son (1 John 5:12), a life which expresses itself in victory (1 John 3:8–9), love (John 15:9–17), and joy (John 16:20–24).

The New Testament uses the figures of new birth and spiritual resurrection to describe eternal life. First, the new birth (John 1:12, 13; 3:3) relates the believer to the family of God. Second, the reception of eternal life is described as spiritual resurrection. Having been "raised together with Christ" (Col. 3:1), the believer now enjoys being "alive from the dead" (Rom. 6:13). The concept of spiritual resurrection, however, does not negate the New Testament teaching regarding physical resurrection, developed most fully in 1 Corinthians 15.

Because the biblical teaching regarding eternal life stands in stark contrast with the teaching of other major world religions regarding life after death, it has received great emphasis in missionary proclamation, particularly among Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists.

Like the Bible, Islam teaches eternal personal existence (Sura 3:103; 9:21; 15:48; 18:2; 56:31, 32) in heaven (Sura 55:26–27) or hell (Sura 37:22–23; 55:44; 67:7–10). Hell is the abode of the wicked (Sura 70:15). Allah will fill Gehenna with men and "jinn" (Sura 11:120).

Islam views death not as a punishment for sin, but the natural termination of life. It is to be followed on the Day of Resurrection by judgment resulting in admission to Paradise or assignment to hell based upon the works done in this life (Sura 3:185). However, ultimately, it is Allah's will which determines one's eternal destiny. Muslims have no assurance of ultimate salvation (*see also* SOTERIOLOGY IN NON-CHRISTIAN RELIGIONS).

Although the primary purpose of life is to walk in God's path, abide by his laws, and secure his pleasure, Islam is devoid of the concept of eternal life as a present reality during this life. Rather the Qur'an contrasts sharply this life with the life to come (Sura 4:77).

In its description of heaven, the Qur'an says little about the worship of God or relationship with him. Rather, heaven is depicted as physical and sensual, as a beautiful garden filled with tasty fruits (Sura 55:48–60). Men are promised unending opportunity to consort with multiple beautiful, wide-eyed maidens. Little is said about the women apart from those who serve in the role of physical partners for men. This stands in sharp contradiction to Jesus' teaching that men and women will neither marry nor be given in marriage in the hereafter (Matt. 22:30).

Christian proclamation to Muslims with regard to eternal life, while affirming the continuity of personality beyond the grave and the reality of heaven and hell, stresses the present reality of eternal life, the assurance of salvation, the relational and spiritual character of heaven, and the equal status of men and women before God.

Since Hinduism does not distinguish between the Creator and the creation, the concept of absorption into the Divine implies the ultimate loss of personal identity. The self is viewed as uncreated and distinct from the physical body. Salvation, likened to a drop of water merging into the sea, comes at the conclusion of a long series of reincarnations, sometimes referred to as "the wheel of existence" (*see also* REINCARNATION AND TRANSMIGRATION). This cycle of multiple births and deaths continues until a true understanding of the self brings it to an end. Inherently con-

nected to the belief in reincarnation is the doctrine of karma, the accumulation of merit and demerit, whereby each person experiences the consequences of his or her past and present lives.

With reference to eternal life, Christian proclamation in Hindu contexts has emphasized the continuing personal identity of the believer in relationship with a truly compassionate personal God, the assured hope of salvation, the reality of a qualitatively superior life in the present, and the experience of forgiveness that brings freedom from bad karma and escape from the wheel of existence. Christians, referring to Hebrews 9:27, testify with assurance that this is their first and last earthly lifetime!

The Buddhist understanding of eternal life is conditioned by the experience of Buddha Gautama, who set out on a spiritual journey for the purpose of overcoming and transcending the old age and sickness that lead to the agony of dying. Although Buddhism adopted many of the Hindu views regarding karma and reincarnation, it developed many of its own unique concepts as found in the four noble truths, the eightfold path, and the twelve steps of interdependency. Since suffering is caused by desire, freedom from desire leads to Nirvana, a state which is in essence nonbeing. Buddhists do not hold to the permanence of the self.

The concept of karma leads to the desire to acquire merit in order to improve one's position in future lives. The fatalism implicit in the Buddhist concept of karma leaves no room for the possibility of divine forgiveness.

Christian proclamation in Buddhist contexts emphasizes continuing personal identity that transcends death, the legitimate desire for and reality of eternal fellowship with a personal God, eternal life as a gift from a loving and gracious Heavenly Father to be received by faith, and a lifestyle of love as a response to God's forgiveness and his gift of the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ.

KENNETH B. MULHOLLAND

Bibliography: H. Cower, ed., *Life after Death in World Religions.*

Eternal Security. Eternal security, also known as the *perseverance of the saints,* refers to the *continuation* of the work of God in the life of a true believer. To the question "Will the operation of divine grace begun in a true believer's life certainly continue and be brought to completion such that a genuine Christian can never completely fall away from Christ and fail to obtain eternal salvation?", two different answers—one positive, one negative—have historically been offered, by Calvinism and Arminianism respectively.

The Calvinist doctrine of perseverance is expressed by the *Westminster Confession of Faith* (17.1): "They, whom God has accepted in his Beloved, effectually called, and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved." Key points include: (1) This does not apply to everyone who professes faith, but only to those whom God has elected and saved. (2) These true believers, though they may fall into sin temporarily, will certainly persist in exercising faith and engaging in good works in the midst of temptations and attacks. This refutes "a common caricature of this doctrine which describes it as teaching that believers are certain to be saved no matter how they live" (Hoekema). (3) Perseverance is a continuing work of God and hence the security of these true believers does not ultimately rest on their ability to withstand assaults and maintain themselves in Christ. But this persevering power does not operate apart from the believers' faith which is the means by which God preserves them. (4) This faith includes perseverance as a constitutive element: "genuine faith, by definition, perseveres; where there is no perseverance, by definition the faith cannot be genuine" (Carson).

Scriptural support for the Calvinist position includes promises stressing divine power and faithfulness to protect believers (1 Peter 1:3–9; Phil. 1:6; Rom. 8:31–39; 1 Cor. 1:8–9; 1 Thess. 5:23–24), passages presenting God's purposes for believers as being all of a piece (Rom. 8:28–30), Christ's own pledges to guard believers (John 6:37–40; 10:27–30), and assurances of eternal life (John 3:36; 5:24; 1 John 5:13). The Spirit's ministry of regenerating and sealing people (John 3:3–8; Eph. 1:13–14; 4:30) is the guarantee of their ultimate salvation. The intercessory work of Christ ensures complete salvation (Heb. 7:23–25; John 17:24). The reality of being part of the New Covenant—providing believers with a new heart (Ezek. 36:25–27), transforming power (2 Cor. 3), and union with Christ (1 Cor. 1:30; Eph. 1:1–12)—enables them to persevere in faith and holiness. Perseverance is also linked with divine election and irresistible grace. This theological outlook has meant that Calvinist missions have tended to emphasize personal conversion, the organization and structure/development of the church, and the transformation of society, especially through education, health, and agriculture. Once people come to faith, since their salvation is secure, they are to live in ways that contribute positively to changing their context.

Contrast this with Arminian theology. While stressing that provision of persevering grace has been made for the church, it considers this grace to be conditional with respect to each individual Christian. The believer is protected by God's

power, but this grace can be resisted. Ultimate salvation is thus contingent on the believer persevering in the faith. Thus, "there is no way of telling whether a given person in the Church will persevere to the end; the fact of his perseverance at any given moment is shown in the fact that he is persevering" (Marshall). Although some Arminians consider apostasy by true believers only a possibility, others affirm that falling away does occur.

Scriptural support for the conditionality of individual salvation includes warnings against apostasy (Heb. 2: 1–3; 3:12; 10:26–31; 2 Peter 3:17) and exhortations to remain firm in the faith until the end (Col. 1:21–23; Heb. 3:14–15; John 15:1–7; Matt. 10:22) Such instructions would appear superfluous if true believers could not fall away but are guaranteed eternal salvation. Also, cases of actual apostasy are presented as evidence that falling away does indeed occur (Heb. 6:4–6; 1 John 2:18–19; 2 Peter 2:1–2; Judas; Acts 5:1–11; 1 Tim. 1:19–20; 2 Tim. 2:16–18; 4:10). Objecting to the Calvinist viewpoint, Arminianism finds eternal security to be inconsistent with human free will and claims that it leads to complacency and moral laxity.

This outlook has generally worked itself out in Arminian missions through an emphasis on personal conversion followed by Christian discipleship, growth in spiritual maturity, and continual need for revival and increased holiness of the converts. Education, health, agriculture, and other social emphases have tended to be downplayed, compared with the importance of growth in the personal and corporate holiness, worship, spirituality, and devotion of the churches and their leaders.

A compatibalist approach to this doctrine encourages responsible integration of the passages stressing God's continuing work of preservation with those emphasizing the believer's responsibility to persevere in the faith. Acknowledging the difficulty of knowing if some people are genuine believers, it admits that some non-believers give startling evidence of conversion (Heb. 6:4–6; Mark 4:1–20; 1 John 2:18–19; Matt. 7:21–23) yet turn away, not from saving faith, but from the religious position they once held. True believers, however, always continue in grace until ultimate salvation, and the ground of this perseverance is God's sustaining power which works through their persistent faith. One means of encouraging such abiding faith is the above-mentioned scriptural warnings and exhortations.

Assurance of Salvation is the legitimate and comforting result of this doctrine. This subjective confidence paves the way for believers to face difficulties, persecutions, and even threats of death without fear of being separated from God. This engenders boldness and dedication to the cause of Christ worldwide.

Gregg R. Allison

Bibliography. J. Calvin, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion,* 3.24.6–11; G. C. Berkouwer, *Faith and Perseverance;* D. Carson, *WmTJ* 54 (1992): 1–29; A. Hoekema, *Saved by Grace,* pp. 234–56; W. Pope, *A Compendium of Christian Theology,* 3.131–47; I. H. Marshall, *Kept By the Power of God.*

Evangelism. Evangelism announces that salvation has come. The verb "evangelize" literally means to bear good news. In the noun form, it translates "gospel" or "evangel." The angels' proclamation of Christ's birth is typical of the more than 130 times the term in its various forms occurs in the New Testament: "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For there is born to you this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord" (Luke 2:10–11).

The Hebrew term translated in the Septuagint by the same word appears in the writings of Isaiah: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that brings good news . . ." (Isa. 52:7). Again, speaking of the ministry of the coming Messiah, the prophet writes, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon Me; because the Lord has anointed Me to preach good tidings . . ." (Isa. 61:1, 2).

Jesus interpreted his mission as fulfillment of this promise (Luke 4:18, 19). He saw himself as an evangelist, announcing the coming of the Kingdom of God. This message was to be proclaimed in the context of demonstrated compassion for the bruised and forgotten people of the world.

At this point, there is often confusion among Christians today. Some contend that evangelism involves only the gospel declaration, while others identify it essentially with establishing a caring presence in society or seeking to rectify injustice.

It should be clear that both are necessary. One without the other leaves a distorted impression of the good news. If Jesus had not borne the sorrows of people and performed deeds of mercy among them, we might question his concern. On the other hand, if he had not articulated the gospel, we would not have known why he came, nor how we could be saved. To bind up the wounds of the dying, while withholding the message that could bring deliverance to their souls, would leave them still in bondage. Mere social concern does not address the ultimate need of a lost world (*see also* Evangelism and Social Responsibility).

A Revelation of God. What makes the announcement so compelling is its divine source. Contrary to the opinion of popular humanism, evangelism does not originate in the valiant groping of persons seeking a higher life. Rather,

it comes as a revelation of God who is ever seeking to make a people to display his glory.

The deposit of this divine quest is the canon of inspired Scripture. As the Word of God, "without error in all that it affirms" (The Lausanne Covenant, Section 2) the BIBLE is the objective authority for the gospel. To be sure, it does not pretend to answer every curious question of humankind, but what is written does show God's way of salvation to an honest heart. Not surprisingly, then, theological systems that compromise Scriptural verities do not produce evangelism.

The revelation makes us see how we have all turned to our own way. Such arrogance cannot be ignored by a just God, since it is an affront to his holiness. Inevitably, then, the sinner must be separated from God. Furthermore, his wrath upon iniquity cannot be annulled as long as the cause of evil remains. Since life is unending, all the spiritual consequences of sin continue on forever in HELL.

Knowing, therefore, what is at stake, evangelism strikes at the heart of SIN. Though the disclosure of human rebellion and its result may be bad news, still the gospel shines through it all, for God judges so that he might save.

Incarnate in Christ. The redeeming work of the Trinity focuses in the person of the Son. In Jesus Christ evangelism becomes incarnate. Jesus is not God apart from the human, nor the human apart from God; he is God and mankind united in one Personality. In this perfect union of eternal consciousness, Christ becomes the reconciling center of the gospel. All that took place in salvation before his coming was in anticipation of him. All that has taken place since his coming is accomplished in his Name—the only "Name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12).

The apostolic gospel does not minimize the exclusive claims of Christ. He alone is Lord, and with "all authority" (Matt. 28:18), he stands among us, and says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me" (John 14:6).

His mission reaches its climax on the hill of Calvary. There in the fullness of time Jesus bore our sins in his own body on the cross, suffering in our stead, "the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God" (1 Peter 3:18).

Christ's bodily resurrection and subsequent ascension into heaven bring the cross forcibly to our attention. For when one dies who has the power to rise from the grave, in all honesty we must ask why he died in the first place. To this penetrating question the gospel unequivocally answers, "Jesus . . . was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our purification" (Rom. 4:24, 25).

Experiencing Grace. In confronting the reality of the cross, we are made supremely aware of God's love. It is "not that we loved God, but that he loved us," and "gave himself" for us (1 John 4:10; Gal. 2:20). Perhaps we could understand one giving his life for a righteous person, or for a friend, but "God demonstrates his own love toward us, in that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8).

Heaven is the wonder of the gospel. Nothing deserved! Nothing earned! In our complete helplessness, bankrupt of all natural goodness, God moved in and did for us what we could not do for ourselves. It is all of GRACE—unmerited love. From beginning to end, salvation is the "gift of God" (Eph. 2:8).

The invitation is to all. "Whosoever will may come" (Rev. 22:17). Though the enabling power to believe is entirely of grace, the responsibility to respond to God's word rests upon the sinner. We must receive the gift in true repentance and faith. It means that we choose to turn from the pretense of self-righteousness, and with a broken and contrite spirit, trust ourselves unto the loving arms of Jesus. Until there is such a CONVERSION, no one can enter the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 18:3).

Through this commitment, the believer is introduced to a life of forgiveness, love and true freedom. "Old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new" (2 Cor. 5:17). There is an actual partaking of the divine nature, so that a regenerated person begins to live in the Savior. It is this inward dynamic of sanctification that makes Christianity a saving force for holiness in the world. Out of it flows compassionate deeds of mercy and bold evangelistic outreach.

A Ministering Church. Faithful witness of the gospel calls forth the church. All who heed the call and live by faith in the Son of God—past, present, and future—become part of this communion of the saints.

As the church is created by evangelism, so it becomes the agent of God in dispensing the gospel to others. Unfortunately, our mission to the whole world may be forgotten, and we accept the same delusion as did the self-serving religious community of Jesus' day. Their attitude was seen in bold relief at the cross when they said in derision, "He saved others; himself he cannot save" (Mark 15:31). What they failed to realize was that Jesus had not come to save himself; he came to save us; "The Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:4); he came "to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19:10).

Those who take up his cross, as we are bidden, enter into this mission. In this service, whatever our gifts, every person in the church is "sent" from God, even as we are called into Christ's ministry (John 17:18; 20:21).

Underscoring this mission, before returning to the Father in heaven, Jesus commanded his church to "go and make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:18). The GREAT COMMISSION is not some special assignment for a few clerical workers; it is a way of life; it is the way Jesus directed his life with a few disciples while he was among us, and now the way he expects his church to follow.

Wrapped up in this lifestyle is his plan to evangelize the world. For disciples—learners of Christ—will follow him, and as they learn more of him, they will grow in his likeness, while also becoming involved in his ministry. So they, too, will begin to make disciples, teaching them in turn to do the same, until, through the process of multiplication, the whole world will hear the gospel.

Bringing people to Christ is not the only expression of the church's ministry, of course. But it is the most crucial, for it makes possible every other church activity. Without evangelism the church would soon become extinct.

The Way of the Spirit. Let it be understood, however, that this work is not contrived by human ingenuity. God the Holy Spirit is the enabler. What God administers as the Father and reveals as the Son, he accomplishes as the Third Member of the Trinity. So the mission of Christ through the church becomes the acts of the Spirit. He lifts up the Word, and as Jesus is glorified, convicted men and women cry out to be saved. Evangelism is finally God's work, not ours. We are merely the channel through which the Spirit of Christ makes disciples.

That is why even to begin the Christian life one must be "born again" (John 3:3). "It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh profits nothing" (John 6:63). Likewise, it is the Spirit who sustains and nourishes the developing relationship. He calls the church to ministry. He leads us in prayer. He dispenses gifts for service. Through the Spirit's strength faith comes alive in obedience and by his impartation of grace, we are being conformed to the image of our Lord.

Everything, then, depends upon the Spirit's possession of the sent ones, the church. Just as those first disciples were told to tarry until they received the promised power, so must we (Luke 24:49; Acts 2:4). The spiritual inducement at Pentecost, by whatever name is called, must be a reality in our lives, not as a distant memory, but as a present experience of the reigning Christ. Hindrances that obstruct his dominion must be confessed, and our hearts cleansed so that the Spirit of holiness can fill us with the love of God. Though we can never contain all of him, he wants all of us—to love and adore him with all that we are and all that we hope to be. Any evangelistic effort that circumvents this provision will be as lifeless as it is barren. The secret of New Testament evangelism is to let the Holy Spirit have his way in our lives.

The Glorious Consummation. Whatever may be our method of presenting the gospel, and wherever God may place us in his service, we labor in the confidence that his world mission will be finished. Evangelism, as the heartbeat of Christian ministry, simply directs our energy to that goal toward which history is moving, when the completed church will be presented "faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy" (Jude 24).

Indeed, in Christ the KINGDOM OF GOD is already present in the hearts of those that worship him, and the day is hastening when his kingdom will come to fruition in the new Jerusalem. The church militant, like an ever-advancing army, will at last shatter the principalities of Satan and storm the gates of hell. In the councils of eternity the celebration has already begun (Rev. 7:9, 10: 11:15). Anything we do which does not contribute to that destiny is an exercise in futility.

Our work now on earth may seem slow, and sometimes discouraging, but we may be sure that God's program will not suffer defeat. Someday the trumpet will sound, and the Son of Man, with his legions, shall descend from heaven in trailing clouds of glory, and he will reign over his people gathered from every tongue, every tribe, every nation. This is the reality which always rings through evangelism.

The King is coming! While it does not yet appear what we shall be, "we know that, when he is revealed, we shall be like him" (1 John 3:2). And before him every knee shall bow and "every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:11).

ROBERT E. COLEMAN

Bibliography. R. E. Coleman, *The Master Plan of Evangelism;* J. I. Packer, *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God;* E. L. Towns, *Evangelism and Church Growth: A Practical Encyclopedia*; *Equipping for Evangelism.*

Evangelism and Social Responsibility. Over the past two centuries the modern Protestant movement has planted vibrant churches around the world. Today, the center of Christianity is moving to these younger churches. But this growth is not without its problems. One area of deep concern in many evangelical circles is the division between evangelism and social concerns. Despite many efforts to present a whole gospel, the effects of this dualism in missions and churches are still apparent.

The roots of this division go back to medieval Europe, where churches and monasteries were centers of worship, evangelism, literacy, relief, medicine, and agriculture. The WORLDVIEW of the Middle Ages, rooted in biblical thought, divided

reality between the Creator and the creation. In this view God was intimately involved in all of his creation, and all creation, including both heavenly and earthly concerns, was one. That same unity is evident in the ministry of Jesus, which reflects a wholism that does not seem natural today.

By the eighteenth century, the church felt called to worship and to mission, but education, medicine, and agriculture became the domains of science and the modern nation-state. The shift was due mainly to the rediscovery of Greek thought, especially Greek dualism, which separated spirit and matter, supernatural and natural, and heavenly and earthly affairs. The absorption of dualism theologically was formalized by Thomas Aquinas. The result was the increasingly sharp distinction between religion and science, or between eternal and earthly needs.

On the surface, the modern mission movement began in the nineteenth century with a whole gospel. Missionaries planted churches, and established schools, hospitals, handicraft projects, and agricultural centers. They cared for the starving during times of famine, and called for social justice. Underneath these activities, however, the dualistic perspective persisted. It did not help that missionaries often cooperated with the colonial agenda, the goal of which was "civilizing" their new territories. Evangelism and church planting were seen as the marks of Christianity. Education, medicine, and agriculture were signs of civilization. In many cases, however, people accepted science, technology, and other manifestations of modern rational thought introduced by the missionaries, but rejected the gospel they proclaimed. That is why some observers conclude that Christian missionaries have unwittingly been a force for SECULARIZATION worldwide.

A second consequence of this dualism was that missions organized schools, hospitals, and agricultural projects based on Western models that did not fit local contexts. The operation of these institutions reflected the division between evangelism and social concern. Specialists provided services in a compartmentalized way that communicated something less than an integrated gospel. Furthermore, these institutions required large amounts of money and Western-style organizational skill, most of which had to be imported from outside. Later, when missions began handing over the administration of the institutions to local churches, local leaders often saw them as heavy burdens which their churches could not easily sustain.

The division between evangelism and social concern reached its peak in the early twentieth century in the battles between liberals and fundamentalists over the emerging Social Gospel movement. Liberal churches virtually abandoned aggressive evangelism in favor of relief and development ministries of all kinds. Conservative churches increasingly focused their attention on evangelism and church planting, and left relief and development tasks to parachurch agencies. That emphasis has created the impression in many parts of the world that the church deals with ultimate concerns, but has little to contribute to the urgent needs of the contemporary world.

In recent years there have been efforts in evangelical circles to restore a holistic understanding of the gospel. In 1966 the CONGRESS ON THE CHURCH'S WORLDWIDE MISSION was held at Wheaton, Illinois, sponsored by the Evangelical Foreign Mission Association (now the EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF MISSION AGENCIES) and the INTERDENOMINATIONAL FOREIGN MISSION ASSOCIATION, agencies that represented at that time 102 mission boards and 30,000 missionaries. The congress, which was comprised of nearly 1,000 delegates from 71 countries, wrote *The Wheaton Declaration,* in which they called on the church to address contemporary issues such as racism, war, the population explosion, poverty, and the disintegration of the family. This growing concern for a Christian response to social problems was due, in part, to the influence of the large number of participants from outside the United States whose churches could not ignore the social evils around them. Also in 1966, the WORLD CONGRESS ON EVANGELISM gathered in Berlin, sponsored by *Christianity Today.* That congress reaffirmed the importance of proclaiming the gospel, but in the closing statement condemned racism and called for repentance and unity among Christians in addressing the world's desperate needs. In the regional congresses that followed (Singapore, Minneapolis, Bogota), the involvement of the church in social issues was a recurring theme. In 1973, the Workshop on Evangelicals and Social Concern drafted the *Chicago Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern* which represented another attempt to transcend the traditional dichotomy between evangelism and social responsibility.

The LAUSANNE CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION (1974) took a major step toward resolving the tension between these two concerns by affirming that both evangelism and social responsibility are essential to the mission of the church. The Lausanne Covenant stated that "The message of salvation also implies a message of judgment upon every form of alienation, oppression, and discrimination, and we should not be afraid to denounce evil and injustice wherever they exist" (section 5). The plea to keep evangelism and social concerns together was strengthened by a statement of support that was signed by some five hundred Lausanne participants. This effort to bring evangelism and social responsibil-

ity together generated sharp criticisms on the part of some mission leaders in North America. But, particularly for those in the Two-Thirds World, it was an invitation to proclaim a whole gospel. That conviction was validated again at the All India Conference on Evangelical Social Action (1979), the Second Latin American Congress on Evangelism (1979), and the Consultation on Simple Lifestyle (1980) sponsored by the Lausanne Committee and the WORLD EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP. Although attempts were made at the WORLD CONSULTATION ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION (Pattaya, 1980) to focus exclusively on world evangelism, many delegates called for the inclusion of social issues in the conference statement.

The need to clarify the relationship between evangelism and social responsibility led to the CONSULTATION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (Grand Rapids, 1982) sponsored by the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization, and the CONSULTATION ON THE CHURCH IN RESPONSE TO HUMAN NEED (Wheaton, 1983) sponsored by the World Evangelical Fellowship. Both affirmed that evangelism cannot be divorced from meaningful involvement with people in all their needs. In recent years, Christian agencies such as World Vision International, Food for the Hungry, the Mennonite Central Committee, and the Adventist Development and Relief Agency have initiated theological and administrative reflections on how to implement the proclamation of the whole gospel (*see also* HOLISM, BIBLICAL).

It is clear that as long as evangelism and social concern are seen as two separate entities that need to be integrated, the dualism that has weakened missions will remain. Some will reduce one to the other: conservatives will see social ministries as means to evangelistic ends and liberals will see social ministries as ends in themselves. Others will try to balance the two by claiming that one is more important than the other, with many conservatives arguing that evangelism is the top priority while liberals counter that the church must concentrate on other, more pressing needs. Both approaches fail to integrate the different strands of the gospel into a single whole.

We will proclaim a whole gospel only when we reject the dualism between supernatural and natural realities, religion and science, and evangelism and social concerns. Many young churches in other cultures have taken a step in this direction by making no distinction between the spiritual and the material, or between supernatural and natural realms. Many of them model integrated ministries to whole persons and societies. Evangelical mission agencies and churches are catching on as well. In partnership with younger churches, they are beginning to focus on people more than tasks, on holistic development more than relief, on transformation more than the simple delivery of services (*see also* TRANSFORMATIONAL DEVELOPMENT), and on the formation of living communities of faith rather than bureaucratic institutions. Some agencies are backing away from the overspecialization that characterizes Western approaches to life and are offering a more generalized sort of training with holistic ministry in mind (*see also* HOLISTIC MISSION).

The push for holism draws strength from the rediscovery of the church as a healing community where Christians gather to WORSHIP, to bear WITNESS to the world, and to minister healing, in the fullest sense of the term, to people. It is also fueled by a renewed emphasis on a theology of the kingdom of God, within which evangelism, church, ministry, and prophetic witness are parts of the whole. This kingdom, however, cannot be defined by theories of modern utopias, as in Marxism and capitalism. It is defined by Christ, its King. He and his incarnation as a human unite God's concerns for all creation, now and for eternity. His salvation includes not only eternal life in the presence of God, but also a new earth characterized by righteousness, peace, justice, and fullness of life. In a word, Shalom is the ideal to which individual Christians as well as the corporate church aspires. As Dan Fountain points out, "God's plan for the world is this: that all persons everywhere, in every nation, know God's saving health and be delivered from disobedience, disruption, despair, disease and all that would destroy our wholeness."

PAUL G. HIEBERT AND MONTE B. COX

Bibliography. B. Bradshaw, *Bridging the Gap: Evangelism, Development and Shalom;* E. J. Elliston, ed., *Christian Relief and Development: Developing Workers for Effective Ministry;* R. Greenway, *Together Again!;* B. J. Nicholls, *Word and Deed: Evangelism and Social Responsibility;* C. R. Padilla, *Transformation* 2:3 (1985): 27–32; E. Ram, ed., *Transforming Health: Christian Approaches to Healing and Wholeness;* T. Sine, ed., *The Church in Response to Human Need;* C. Van Engen, *Mission on the Way.*

Faith. Faith is both proposition and practice, creed and conduct, belief and behavior. Hebrews 11 describes what faith is and what faith does. James warns that faith that does not work is no faith at all. Throughout Scripture, faith is not only revealed in terms of what to believe, the object of faith, God himself, but it is also that which works in the human mind, heart, and will to bring people to saving trust in the living God.

Although the word "faith" does not stand out boldly in the Old Testament, the stories of God's people are replete with belief, trust, and hope. For example, the deeply introspective psalms reveal how intense personal faith is. To these writers, faith stands out like a life preserver. Trust in

God, rather than self, is proposed as the only way to salvation and wholeness, whether the enemies be internal or external. Old Testament persons did not have the advantage of hearing Jesus or reading Paul, but they clearly understood what God required of them in terms of obedient faith, trust, and hope.

Faith blossoms like a spring rose in the New Testament. Taken together, in its verb, noun, and adjectival forms, the basic Greek word *pistis* occurs more than three hundred times. The object of such faith is God's saving work in his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. Faith is a personal relationship. People of faith relinquish their own efforts to be good enough to please God. Instead, they trust completely in Christ and in him alone for salvation, forgiveness, righteousness, and wholeness (*see also* SHALOM).

Although intimately relational, New Testament faith is rooted in certain historical facts. People who come to faith believe the testimony, or the record, about Christ's life, death, resurrection, and ascension. The only valid repository of faith is the Lord Jesus Christ himself, not a set of facts about him, not the Bible, not the church, but a living person. Saving faith does not require a complete understanding of biblical theology, but it does require knowing why Jesus came to earth, died, and rose again.

Subjective faith begins with a conviction of the mind based on adequate evidence. It grows in the confidence of the heart, or emotions, based on the conviction of the mind. Faith is crowned in the consent of the will, by means of which conviction and confidence are expressed in conduct. The will acts in response to what God has done in Christ. The will says "Yes" to Jesus Christ. This combination of the elements in human personality involves a moral decision, according to Paul (1 Thess. 1:9) and Peter (1 Peter 2:25). Jesus described that "Yes" in many different ways, as receiving him, trusting him, believing in him, welcoming him, drinking of him, eating of him, loving him, and obeying him (*see also* CONVERSION).

New Testament stories and dogma emphasize that the Son of Man who came to redeem people from sin also came to live in them, to direct and control their lives, to be the object of their worship, love, obedience, and service. Therefore, people of faith confess Christ as Savior and Lord. They commit themselves without reservation to do his good and perfect will.

From this obedient faith springs the New Testament pattern for mission. Faith is not a passing phase; it is a continuing walk of obedience to the Lord's commands, including his GREAT COMMISSION.

Church history reveals remarkable exploits of what we call "faith" to evangelize the unbelieving world. Unfortunately, too often these heroines and heroes of faith were loners, isolated from the larger institutional churches because they dared to go against the grain. While church hierarchies and public opinion argued otherwise, these missionary pioneers abandoned their comfort zones to enter uncharted waters, where the name of Jesus was not known or confessed.

These people believed God not for salvation alone but also for overcoming horrendous obstacles. In that sense, they discovered a realm of faith often described by Jesus. For example, he said, "Everything is possible for him who believes" (Mark 9:23). He promised great results from faith that was as small as a grain of mustard seed (Matt. 17:20; Luke 17:6).

The story of the expansion of Christianity is filled with exploits that would qualify for inclusion in Hebrews 11. At the same time, not all of those people were delivered from great tribulation, neither were many missionary pioneers who laid the foundation for the worldwide church today. In fact, missionary martyrs are many, and it is important to recognize not only the obedience of their faith, but also the costliness of it. Having confessed Christ, they put their lives on the line for him (*see* MARTYRDOM).

Mission board archives are crammed with stories showing that for many missionaries faith was defined as obedience, courage, trust, hope, and a willingness to die for the sake of planting the church. Perhaps this quote from LOTTIE MOON, a nineteenth-century missionary to China, says it best: "If I had a thousand lives, I would give them all for the women of China."

To look at mission from the other side, it is safe to say that apart from this kind of faith, the church would never have advanced anywhere. But somehow the mission of the church exploded because a minority of Christians took their cue from the faith they saw exercised by the early believers in the Book of Acts. Those Christians not only confessed personal faith in Christ, but they either went themselves or sent others to declare Christ's lordship throughout the Roman Empire and into Africa and Asia. Their successors took Christ's name throughout Eastern and Western Europe.

Faith is the key to personal salvation and to missionary obedience. Faith links people to God through Jesus Christ; faith engages them wholeheartedly in God's worldwide mission. Faith has been God's instrument for building his universal church.

JIM REAPSOME

Fall of Humankind, The. The biblical teaching concerning the fall of humankind is found in Genesis 3; Romans 5:12–19; 1 Corinthians 15:21–22; and 1 Timothy 2:12–13. Genesis 1 and 2 record the conditions of the "golden age" when humans, created in the image of God with mandates for dominion over and stewardship of

creation (Gen. 1:26–28), were given only one limitation. "You are free to eat from any tree in the garden; but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat of it you will surely die" (Gen 2:16–17). God sets the prohibition in the context of his limitless provision and gives no rationale other than a declaration of the consequences: death.

The narrative of temptation and sin (Gen. 3:1–6) introduces Satan as the "crafty" tempter, the serpent. He leads Eve to doubt God's goodness and truthfulness, to allow her appetites to transgress God's law limits, and to act on her desires in willful rebellion against God. She further compounds her sin by persuading her husband to sin (1 Tim. 2:12–13).

The immediate consequences of sin were entry of sin and guilt into the formerly perfect world. The couple experiences guilt, when their eyes are opened, they know shame, and they hide from the presence of God (Gen. 3:7–11). Immediately they "die" spiritually and in old age they will die physically. In fact, the whole creation becomes subject to frustration and decay (Rom. 8:20–22). As a result, a mitigated but real curse falls on Adam and Eve and all humankind. There is multiplied pain in child bearing and a constant tension in Eve's relation to her husband. She will desire to master him, but his role will be to have the leadership in the home (Gen. 3:16). The man will only by much toil wrest a living from the soil, a task of doubtful meaningfulness, since his end is physical death, in which he returns to the same soil from which he was taken.

The greatest consequence, however, is the introduction of original sin into human history (Rom. 5:12–19; 1 Cor. 15:21–22). Each succeeding generation will be born spiritually dead, lacking original right standing with God, charged with the guilt of the first human's sin, with a sin nature driving them toward a life of sin, and with only one prospect for eternity: eternal condemnation (Gen. 4:1–8, 19; 6:2, 5; Ps. 51:5; Jer. 17:9).

The account of the fall of humankind does offer a glimmer of hope, however. The "seed of the woman" would be final victor in the continuing spiritual battle with the serpent's seed. Addressing the serpent God declares the offspring of the woman will "crush his head" (Gen. 3:15). The rest of biblical revelation reveals that Jesus Christ is that offspring and in his death and resurrection he won the victory everyone who believes may claim as his or her own.

Animism, as well as a number of the world's great religions, have myths of origin that include an account of the fall of humankind. These accounts to a greater or lesser extent agree in detail with the Genesis account. The student of comparative religion may posit "nostalgia for the beginning of things" as a "permanent part of man's collective memory." He or she will conclude that humans in many cultures "once positing it as a golden age" will then have to "explain the accident that produced the present situation" in which there is both physical and moral evil (Ries, 1987, 267). Since Genesis 1–3 presents itself not as a religiously generated myth but as a historical account of beginnings, it is better to explain all the similarities between Genesis and religious mythology as evidence of humankind's common historical memory, which under the influence of the fall yields a variety of versions of what actually happened. The early chapters of Genesis then provide the missionaries with both opportunity and challenges as they approach other cultures and religions with the gospel. The opportunity is "bridge building" to the culture by dealing in the area of origins from Genesis 1–3. The challenge is to effectively correct the religionist's views on these matters so that clearer understanding of the truth of biblical revelation results.

Among animists many narratives of the fall may be found. These often stress the closeness of God and humanity in the "golden age," a theme congruent with that of Genesis. The "accident," which introduces death into the world, though sometimes a sin, in many instances is not. What brings the fall may be disturbing the gods with the noise of grinding millet (the Dogon of Mali) or an accident like falling asleep (Aranda of Australia). It may be a matter of an original archetypal message of immortality being changed in transmission or not passed on by the messenger (Ashanti of Ghana). It may occur because of human frailty. A Maasai myth tells of a package that humans are given by God and forbidden to open. However, their curiosity drives them to open it. In all these instances, biblical revelation's moral and salvation history framework for the fall must be a necessary corrective.

Hinduism knows no definite occasion on which the fall of humankind occurred, only a gradual decline in the second of four ages of humankind's history. The imputation of guilt from the first human to all succeeding generations is similar in principle to the concept of *samsara* and karma, though the difference is very important. In Scripture, it is only the guilt of Adam's sin, not effects of the sinfulness of each succeeding generation, which is imputed to the individual. Neither Buddhism nor Chinese traditional thought contains myths of the fall of humankind. Islam's Koran follows Genesis 1–3 fairly closely. It does provide an explanation for why Satan *(Iblis)* fell: his refusal to bow to Adam. While the guilt for the fall is imputed to the devil, humans only experience the sanctions and consequences. Original sin is minimized to the level of weakness, the habitual.

William J. Larkin Jr.

Bibliography. M. Eliade, *Myths, Dreams, and Mysteries;* J. Ries, *ER,* 5:256–67; G. G. Van Groningen, *EDBT*, pp. 240–41.

Forgiveness of Sins. The forgiveness of sins is at the very heart of the Christian message. It is a profoundly complex doctrine that ultimately includes our idea of God, of God's relation to the world, of the nature of humankind, of sin, of the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus, of the last judgment, and of our eternal state in heaven or hell. The concept of forgiveness was at the core of Israel's worship in both tabernacle and temple, centering upon sacrifices—some even being named sin-offering, trespass-offering, and peace-offering. These offerings dealt with the problem of sin and restored peace with God by affirming the reality of forgiveness through a God-appointed religious practitioner.

But forgiveness of sin is not just a national or a theological issue. It is also a very personal issue, lying deep within the human heart. We all struggle with the realization that something is drastically wrong that we cannot put right. We have offended God and his moral laws and justly deserve judgment. Yet also deep within us we know that God can forgive us our sins, so we cry out to him for that remission. In the New Testament, the message of forgiveness was brought by John the Baptist (Luke 3:3), by Jesus in his earthly life (Mark 2:5, 7, 10) and in his post-resurrection state (Luke 24:45–47), by Peter at Pentecost (Acts 2:38), and by Paul as he traveled on his missionary journeys (Acts 13:38, 39). In the Book of Revelation the redeemed of God are those who conquered through the blood of the Lamb (Rev. 5:9; 7:14; 12:11) and Jesus is symbolically seen as the triumphant slain Lamb who can unfold the destiny of the nations and is worthy of all praise (Rev. 5:6–10). The Christian message is a message of forgiveness and the redeemed who spend their eternity with God are those who have been forgiven of their sins.

The Biblical Doctrine of Forgiveness. Theologically speaking, there are three basic components to the doctrine of forgiveness: the nature of humankind, the nature of God, and the provision that God has made to restore the broken relationship between himself and his fallen world.

The Fallen Nature of Humankind. It is not necessary to consider every aspect of the human person in order to discuss the nature of forgiveness; one alone is necessary, the fact of human sinfulness (*see* Sin). It is this negative quality, oddly enough, that lifts us most clearly above the rest of our earthly, created order and shows us most decisively what we are not to be, even though that is what we are. This is true because sin is a moral category and only moral, responsible beings may sin. And because guilt attends our sin, we are painfully aware that sin ought not to be there even though it is and it is unquestionably ours; we cannot honestly blame anyone else. All the major religions of the world have concepts of morality, sin, guilt, and responsibility (*see also* Human Condition in World Religions). The Bible, in particular, speaks with great force and clarity here, emphasizing the *inherent* nature of our sinfulness, its gravity, and its consequences. Sin is not simply something that we have done wrong or some hurt we have inflicted upon someone else; sin is an offense against God and God's moral requirements, requirements that derive from his very nature. Were the moral nature of the universe simply the result of God's decisions, they would not have ultimate ontic reality and could be changed at will. Rather, the moral categories—the violation of which makes sin sinful—are expressions of the very nature of reality as God has created it, with ourselves as God intended us to be, and with God himself as he eternally is (*see* Divine Attributes of God). Hence, David cries out, "I know my transgressions and my sin is always before me. Against you, you only have I sinned and done what is evil in your sight" (Ps. 51:3, 4). As the contemporary psychologist Karl Menninger puts it, sin is "An implicitly aggressive quality—a ruthlessness, a hurting, a breaking away from God and from the rest of humanity, a partial alienation, or act of rebellion. . . . Sin has a willful, defiant or disloyal quality. *Someone* is defied or offended or hurt" (*Whatever Became of Sin?* p. 19)—and that someone is God. The Bible presents an unremitting picture of universal human sinfulness, surrounded by the apostle Paul in Romans 3:10–18, concluding with "All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23).

Among the many dire consequences of sin, the most devastating is alienation from God, which results in eternal condemnation. The sinful mind is hostile to God (Rom. 8:7), sinners are the enemies of God (Rom. 5:10), we are dead in our trespasses and sins (Eph. 2:1), the wrath of God abides upon us (John 3:36), and sinners will not inherit the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:9) but "will be punished with everlasting destruction and shut out from the presence of the Lord and from the majesty of his power" (2 Thess. 1:8).

The radical nature of our sinfulness renders us incapable of rectifying the situation. We are incapable of bringing anything of sufficient value or ultimacy to God of such a nature as to atone for our sins. We are, in fact, lost in our sins and totally unable to find a way out of our hopeless situation.

The Nature of God. As has already been seen, sin is, in essence, a violation of the nature of God, but what is it in God that is violated? Scripturally speaking, it is the totality of God's infinite perfections or attributes. All that God is recoils from that which is less than morally perfect and

the attempt to single out one attribute or another that is most offended by sin would be to slice God up into categories as though God were some internally unrelated collection of qualities, rather than a unified, personal Being. Having said that, however, the holiness of God does stand out as the quality most obviously violated when human beings sin (Josh. 24:19; Pss. 5:4; 92:15; Hab. 1:13; Rev. 6:10). The Bible is replete with affirmations of God's holiness and of the demand that we be holy (Exod. 15:11; Lev. 11:44, 45; Isa. 6:3; 1 Peter 1:15) and when we fail to live up to God's standards we fall under the just judgment of God. God's justice and impartiality decree that everyone be treated fairly and equally, which translates into everyone being equally under the judgment of God, since every one of us has violated God's commands.

Were this the end of the story, humankind would be in a sorry state, for there could be no such thing as forgiveness. However, God's love and his mercy work alongside his holiness and justice in such a way that all aspects of his being are satisfied. The Scriptures reveal a God, who although he is holy, also delights in mercy and forgiveness (Deut. 4:31; Neh. 9:31; Ps. 78:38; Isa. 55:7; Dan. 9:9; Luke 6:35). "Who is a God like you?" asks Micah, "Who pardons sin and forgives the transgression of the remnant of his inheritance?" Who, indeed? There is no other God who can forgive the sins of lost humanity.

The Provision of God for Forgiveness. There was only one way that the totality of God's being could be satisfied that the demands of his holiness and justice be met while at the same time expressing God's love and mercy. To do that God devised a plan of salvation that met his infinite demands and offered full salvation to the lost, at no cost to them, since they were in no position to pay anything. No human being could do such a thing, yet it had to be done on the human plane, because it was for the sake of human beings. The infinite demands of God could only be met by the infinite God himself. This line of reasoning underlies the New Testament's doctrine of the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. Only God could meet the demands of God, so the second person of the Trinity became one of us in order to pay the price of sin, freeing God up to offer forgiveness of sin to the lost (2 Cor. 5:21). As Paul put it, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5:19). In this way God could be both just and the One who justifies the person who has faith in Jesus, because all the requirements of his holiness, justice, love, and mercy have been met (Rom. 3:25, 26). Specifically, the redemptive work of God is the death of Jesus Christ on the cross. There the punishment due us was paid for by God himself in the person of his Son (Rom. 5:6–10; 1 Cor. 15:3; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 2:13). Jesus ties the forgiveness of sins directly to his coming death, when at the last supper he says, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins" (Matt. 26:28).

The Missiological Implications of Forgiveness. When considering the missiological implications of forgiveness, what stands out most prominently in the New Testament is the Uniqueness of Christ, who he is and what he has done. Because there is only one God, there is only one Son of God, who died for sin once for all. There is only one plan of salvation and one Savior who must be proclaimed to all the earth for "Salvation is found in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given to men by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). The fact of Christ's uniqueness and that forgiveness of sin may be found nowhere else lays a moral imperative upon the church to make his name known. There are not many saviors for many people, but only one savior for all peoples and that is the incarnate Son of God who died and rose again. It is this fact that underlies the command of God himself to us that repentance and forgiveness of sins be preached in Jesus' name to all nations (Luke 24:47). Where else can salvation be found except in Jesus? Because of this, those who had experienced the forgiveness of their sins were to be empowered by the Holy Spirit and then become "witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8). Peter began this on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem offering his countrymen forgiveness of their sins in Jesus' name (Acts 2:38), continuing this to the Gentile Cornelius in Caesarea (Acts 10:43), then reaching others in Asia Minor (1 Peter 1:1, 2), ultimately giving his life for the gospel in Rome during the Neronian Persecution. Others went elsewhere. Paul traveled extensively across the Roman world, John went to Ephesus, Titus went to Crete, Mark went to Egypt, and Thomas, according to some records, went to India.

What motivated these early believers was certainly the uniqueness of their message, coupled with the command of God, but they had also experienced the love of God in their own forgiveness and hence wished to share that sense of release with others (2 Cor. 5:14). For whatever reason, the early church realized that the forgiveness of sins must be at the heart of their message (Acts 10:43; 13:38, 39; 26:17, 18), just as it must be today.

Walter A. Elwell

Bibliography. E. M. B. Green, *The Meaning of Salvation;* H. D. McDonald, *The Atonement of the Death of Christ;* H. R. Mackintosh, *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness;* K. Menninger, *Whatever Became of Sin?;* H. Vorländer, *NIDNTT* 1:697–703; J. R. W. Stott, *The Cross of Christ,* pp. 87–110; V. Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation;* W. Telfer, *The Forgiveness of Sins.*

Frankfurt Declaration on the Fundamental Crisis in Christian Mission. Among evangelical efforts to redress the significant shifts in mission theology seen in the ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT was the Frankfurt Declaration. The flash point was the preconference document "Renewal in Mission," prepared for the WCC Uppsala Assembly in 1968. PETER BEYERHAUS felt that the document represented a serious disruption of the whole tradition of missiological thinking. DONALD MCGAVRAN's parallel response led to correspondence between the two in which McGavran urged Beyerhaus to pen a statement similar to the Wheaton Declaration (*see* CONGRESS ON THE CHURCH'S WORLDWIDE MISSION), but dealing with the recent WCC documents and thinking. The Theological Convention, a group of fifteen German theologians, echoed McGavran's urging. Beyerhaus drafted the declaration, and after discussion and revision the group signed it on March 4, 1970.

The single goal of the Frankfurt Declaration was to reaffirm the biblical basis of mission. Beyerhaus listed seven indispensable elements of mission, each of which specifically refuted a trend seen in the WCC: (1) the foundation for mission is found solely in the New Testament; (2) the primary goal is to glorify and proclaim God's name throughout the world; (3) Jesus alone is the basis, content, and authority of mission; (4) mission is the church's presentation of salvation appropriated through belief and baptism; (5) the primary visible task is to call out from among all people those who are saved and to incorporate them into the church; (6) salvation is found only through faith in Christ; and (7) mission is God's decisive activity that will continue until the return of Christ.

Reaction among German scholars tended to be either strongly in favor of or strongly against the declaration. It received significant attention in American evangelical circles through the efforts of McGavran and Harold Lindsell, who published it in *Christianity Today*. Interestingly enough, ecumenical leadership publicly ignored it in spite of the fact that it received international acceptance within evangelicalism.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. P. Beyerhaus, *Shaken Foundations;* idem, *Missions: Which Way? Humanization or Redemption;* D. McGavran, *Eye of the Storm.*

Fruit of the Spirit. The fruit of the Spirit as found in Galatians 5:22–23 is often contrasted with the gifts of the Spirit and made to say something quite different than originally intended. As Paul argues for a new kind of spirituality, so those who study this text today may find themselves arguing for a spirituality that differs sharply from that found in the church today.

The Context: Particularism or Universalism. The Book of Galatians can be seen as a sustained argument by one missionary for a universalist perspective against other missionaries arguing for a particularist viewpoint. Gentile Christians are being urged to embrace circumcision and the Law as a means of sanctification. Paul argues from his own experience (Gal. 1:1–2:14) and from the Scriptures (2:15–5:12) that God wills salvation for Gentiles and Jews through free grace, apart from the Law. This freedom can only be maintained by the Holy Spirit (5:13–6:10).

Flesh or Spirit. The most pervasive of several antithetical arguments in Galatians is that of flesh/law, related to Spirit. Paul asks: "Did you receive the Spirit by doing the works of the *law* or by believing what you heard? Are you so foolish? Having started with the Spirit, are you now ending with the *flesh?*" (3:2–3, NRSV).

Individual Spirituality or Community Spirituality. Paul accents community spirituality in Galatians. This becomes clear in his "one another" exhortations (5:13, 15, 26; 6:2); "let us" challenges (5:25, 26; 6:9, 10); and warnings about "biting and devouring" and "competing against one another" (5:15, 26). Individually each Christian "lives by the Spirit," having "crucified the flesh," (5:16, 24). Paul views Christians living out this new way of life in community (5:13–15, 26; 6:1, 2, 10). The Spirit empowers relationships in community.

The Meaning of Flesh and Spirit. One's understanding of flesh and Spirit is crucial in interpreting the fruit of the Spirit in Galatians. Interpretations of flesh *(sarx)* vary widely. The NIV translates *sarx* as "human nature" in most places in Galatians while the NRSV retains the word "flesh." The NIV translation conforms to the common evangelical view of the Christian life as a struggle between two entities in the person with the Christian caught in the middle, as in Galatians 5:17. This interpretation must be rejected.

Paul's usage of flesh and Spirit in Galatians is rooted in his eschatological view of salvation history. For Paul salvation history divides between two aeons, with the death of Christ and the coming of the Holy Spirit marking this division. He reminds the Galatians that *"the Lord Jesus Christ . . . gave himself for our sins to rescue us from the present evil age"* (1:3) and recounts their salvation experience with the Holy Spirit (3:2). The flesh and Law dominates one aeon and the Spirit the other. To walk by the Spirit is to experience the empowering age to come (5:16, 18, 25).

Christ and Holy Spirit (two kingdom promises) introduce a new way of salvation. The crucified Christ and the empowering Spirit determine the nature of the universal gospel and the Spirit-empowered nature of the people of God. Particularism (flesh and Law) characterizes the

old aeon. Seeking holiness without the enabling Spirit fulfills the desires of the flesh and puts one under the Law (5:16, 18, 19–21). The Spirit of Christ empowers Christians to experience the "already" of God's kingdom.

Fruit versus Works. The agricultural metaphor of fruit can be found throughout Scripture. Jesus uses this metaphor to show the results of one's relationship to God (John 15). Paul uses the metaphor to describe the life of the Christian (Rom. 6:22; Eph. 5:9; Phil. 1:11; 4:17). Paul contrasts the fruit of the Spirit (5:22–23) with the works of the flesh (5:19–21). Producing fruit through the empowering Spirit is not a passive experience, but a dynamic interaction between being led by the Spirit (the indicative) and walking by the Spirit (the imperative). Fruitbearing calls for disciplined obedience to the Holy Spirit, recognizing his presence in the community.

The word "fruit" may be considered plural or singular. Lists of vice and virtues are common in both biblical and extrabiblical literature. None of these lists are meant to be exhaustive. For example, this list leaves out such virtues as forgiveness and compassion. This list is guided by the personal needs of the church. That the vice list includes enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, quarrels, dissensions, factions, and envy points toward community needs (5:15, 26). The virtues listed almost uniformly apply to community life.

The Fruit. *Love*—Christ, Paul, and John stress love as the foundational virtue. God is love. Christ's love for marginals in society distinguished him. Love calls us to place priority on people. Love fulfills the Law (5:14).

Joy—Joy is the keynote of Christianity. The Spirit's manifest presence in the church will be evidenced by joy.

Peace—Modern life brings deep personal anxieties, robbing people of peace. Personal peace flows from and into community. The Holy Spirit can enable diverse people to experience and maintain peace.

Patience—Also translated longsuffering. Living in community calls for an ability to put up with the foibles and idiosyncrasies of others. Without Spirit-produced longsuffering there will be anger and quarrels (5:20).

Kindness—Kindness manifests itself in the words we speak and the acts we engage in when in community. Kindness manifested strengthens those benefited.

Goodness—Not found in extrabiblical literature. Being generous or good is a quality of moral excellence. This word is used for God (Luke 18:18–19). It is the opposite of envy.

Faithfulness—This word *pistis* occurs twenty-two times in Galatians, normally translated faith. Faithfulness is perhaps correct here. The spiritual quality of loyalty, commitment, and steadfastness in our relationships in the body of Christ is the idea.

Gentleness—Perhaps the most difficult of the virtues to translate into English. At one time the English word "meekness" was a good translation. Because many people are opinionated, gentleness will curb inclinations to run roughshod over others.

Self-control—This could be one of the virtues whose primary application is individual, although certainly needed in relationships. Our passions must be brought under the control of the Spirit. Self-control is needed to avoid such sins as fornication, impurity, and drunkenness (5:19–21).

Application. Spirituality is determined by the empowering presence of the eschatological gift of the Spirit. Never before in the history of Christianity has this message been more needed than today. Missionaries establishing churches by preaching a gospel of grace may be tempted to introduce "law" for daily Christian living. For instance, missionaries in Africa confronted by polygamous marriages are tempted to lay down the law of monogamy. Dependence on anything except the Spirit leads to walking in the flesh. "Those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires" (5:24). Christianity as a way of life calls for the enabling power of the Holy Spirit.

For Western Christians this message is especially applicable. Modern evangelicalism, influenced by a highly technological society, is advocating a "technique" spirituality. Self-help and "how to" advice dominates. This new legalism characterizes Western spirituality. Paul calls for an abandonment of the flesh in all of its forms. Walk by the Spirit. Love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control characterize the community of faith when the crucified Christ and the empowering Spirit are present.

HAROLD G. DOLLAR

Bibliography. J. M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians;* J. D. G. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians;* G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul,* pp. 367–471; R. Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians;* G. W. Hansen, *Galatians;* W. Russell, *WmTJ* 57 (1995): 333–57; S. F. Winward, *Fruit of the Spirit.*

Gifts of the Spirit. The twentieth century witnessed an explosion of interest in the person and work of the Holy Spirit. The impact of this upon the growth and expansion of the church, especially in the non-Western world, has been almost universally acknowledged. The phenomenal growth of churches which have emphasized the Spirit's work in their worship and witness has drawn attention to the many ways the Holy Spirit influences the quality of life and the

growth of the church. Although a considerable output of literature dealing with the gifts of the Spirit in recent years has emphasized its importance, confusion continues regarding this subject.

Of the several terms used to indicate the gifts of the Spirit in the New Testament, the two words of most significance are *pneumatika* and *charismata*, both distinctively Pauline terms. As used by Paul (Rom. 15:27; 1 Cor. 2:13; 9:11; 12:1; 14:1), the term *pneumatika* denotes that which belongs to, or pertains to, spirit. Since the word *pneuma* in Paul primarily refers to the Holy Spirit, *pneumatika* refers literally to the things of the Spirit, which in certain contexts is appropriately rendered spiritual gifts (1 Cor. 12:1; 14:1). The word *charismata* is also frequently translated spiritual gifts, although the term itself lacks any direct reference as such to the Spirit. Derived from *charis* (grace), *charismata* broadly signifies the various expressions of God's grace concretely manifested in the form of gracious bestowals. It is only by its application in specific contexts (Rom. 1:11; 1 Cor. 1:4–7; 12:4, 9, 28–31) that the term *charismata* acquires the meaning "gifts of the Spirit"—gracious manifestations of the Spirit in the life of the Christian community.

The key texts concerning spiritual gifts are 1 Corinthians 12–14, Romans 12:6–8, Ephesians 4:11, and 1 Peter 4:10–11. A major difficulty in any effort to define or categorize the gifts of the Spirit is that nowhere in the New Testament do we find systematic instruction on the gifts. This difficulty is further compounded by the realization that no New Testament lists are identical, with no exhaustive listing of the gifts. While some scholars have distinguished a cumulative total of twenty gifts in these passages (apostles, prophets/prophecy, evangelists, pastors, teachers/teaching, service, exhortation, giving, leadership, mercy, wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, distinguishing of spirits, tongues, interpretation of tongues, helpers, and administrators), others have added to this list from references or allusions in other New Testament texts (celibacy, voluntary poverty, martyrdom, hospitality, missionary, intercession, and exorcism), arriving at a total of twenty-seven spiritual gifts.

Among the various attempts to classify the gifts, the most plausible analysis distinguishes three categories: service gifts, miraculous gifts, and utterance gifts. *Service gifts* include a broad range of Spirit-inspired activity, such as giving, showing mercy, serving, helping, leading, and administering, designed to strengthen and deepen interpersonal relationships within the church community. *Miraculous gifts,* such as faith, healings, and miracles, are associated with manifestations of the Spirit's power. *Utterance gifts,* which include the message of wisdom, the message of knowledge, prophecy, teaching, tongues, interpretation of tongues, and exhortation, are forms of oral expression inspired by the Holy Spirit. While the significance and value of the gifts specifically mentioned in Scripture must not be undermined, the lack of any exhaustive listing indicates the possibility that the Spirit may supply other gifts in response to specific needs at any given time and place.

While research has proved that charismatic gifts have never been altogether absent through the history of the church, there has perhaps never been a time in the postapostolic period when the exercise of spiritual gifts has been as widespread and as integral a part of the church's experience as today, although not without controversy. One question concerns the relationship of the gifts to an important Pentecostal distinctive: Are the gifts of the Spirit contingent on and a consequence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, a special endowment of the Spirit subsequent to conversion? A significant segment of charismatic Christians remain convinced that the gifts can be appropriated apart from the Pentecostal belief in a subsequent experience. This view has gained increasing acceptance and popularity among evangelicals, largely as a result of the influence of a relatively small but influential movement of so-called THIRD WAVE evangelicals.

Another issue stems from a cessationist view of the *charismata* that limits supernatural manifestations of the Spirit to the apostolic age. Although the cessationist view is no longer widely held, it is nonetheless influential, due to its impressive theological pedigree and sophistication. In continuity with the position adopted by the Protestant Reformers, and essentially rehearsing the theological position of the great Princeton theologian, B. B. Warfield, a significant group of dispensationalist and Reformed evangelicals maintain that the spiritual gifts had only temporary significance and purpose: to authenticate the apostles as trustworthy authors of Scripture. Now that we have a complete and closed canon of Scripture, the gifts have fulfilled their function, and are no longer necessary nor to be found in the postapostolic age. In recent years, however, some persuasive scholarly responses have challenged the cessationist position. The debate continues.

A third question has to do with whether the gifts of the Spirit are to be understood in essentially natural or supernatural terms. Thus while some view the gifts primarily as natural abilities or talents dedicated to the Lord, others have emphasized the supernatural element to an extreme, denying the role of human faculties in the exercise of gifts. The biblical teaching seems to point toward a balanced incarnational understanding of the gifts, with an interpenetration of the divine and the human, the supernatural and the natural. The gifts of the Spirit are not just the wise stewardship of natural gifts and abilities,

but the result of the immediate working of the Spirit in the life of the believer. A natural talent only becomes a gift of the Spirit when it is yielded to the Holy Spirit and used by the Spirit.

The New Testament clearly witnesses to the close relationship between Pentecost and the missionary witness of the church, a fact made particularly explicit in the Book of Acts (John 15:26–27; 20:19–23; Acts 1:8; 2:4ff; 11:28; 13:2, 4; 19:6; 21:4, 11). For the first-century church, the Spirit was the fulfilled eschatological promise of God, experienced personally and corporately in powerful and visible ways, especially through the Spirit's gifts. In contrast to the experience of the church through most of its history, the New Testament seems to treat the manifestation of spiritual gifts as part of the normal life of the Christian community. The life and growth of the early church can be properly understood only when viewed in terms of a community of Spirit-filled Christians exercising their spiritual gifts.

The gifts of the Spirit impact the mission of the church in at least two significant ways. The first and less obvious way in which the gifts of the Spirit facilitate the church's mission is by equipping the believer for ministry within and to the church, strengthening the church, deepening its fellowship, and enriching the quality of its life. Effective Christian witness is only possible when there is a healthy church base experiencing genuine *koinonia* and manifesting authentic signs of kingdom life. The gifts of the Spirit constitute the basic divine equipment for mission and service. The New Testament promises of spiritual power and spiritual gifts are frequently linked to the worldwide mission mandate of the church (Mark 16:15–17; Luke 24:47–49; Acts 1:8).

Apart from specific gifts such as that of the evangelist or missionary, several other power gifts have been used in various evangelism and church planting efforts in recent years, especially in Two-Thirds World contexts such as Africa, Latin America, and Asia. Called Power Encounter by many, this process signifies the use of different miraculous gifts, such as exorcism, healing and prophetic revelation to visibly demonstrate the power of Jesus Christ over spirits, powers, or false gods which hold the allegiance of an individual or people group. Exercise of the gifts of the Spirit thus announces the reality of the kingdom's arrival in Christ, and confirms the truth of the gospel message proclaimed.

The gifts of the Spirit are not to be viewed as optional appendages to the life of the church. They are neither temporally nor culturally bound, and their cross-cultural validity makes their presence a vital and necessary component of the church's cross-cultural witness.

Ivan Satyavrata

Bibliography. D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit;* J. Deere, *Surprised by the Power of the Spirit;* G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul;* M. Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit;* D. Lim, *Spiritual Gifts: A Fresh Look;* J. R. Michaels, *DPCM,* pp. 332–34; E. F. Murphy, *Spiritual Gifts and the Great Commission;* H. A. Snyder, *The Problem of Wine Skins,* J. G. S. S. Thomson and W. A. Elwell, *EDT,* pp. 1042–46; C. P. Wagner, *Your Spiritual Gifts Can Help Your Church Grow;* J. R. Williams, *Renewal Theology,* vol. 2.

God. The relationship between the Christian doctrine of God and mission is best explored within the context of salvation history. By tracing that path we see that mission is in fact God's gracious, loving response to the problem of human Sin. Every cardinal attribute of God is brought to bear on the problem of sin (*see also* Divine Attributes of God).

We begin with an attempt to assess the range or scope of God's salvific desire. Using only the New Testament, we would have no difficulty concluding that God's desire is universal (1 Tim. 2:1–6). He has acted to reconcile the world to himself (2 Cor. 5:19) and has gathered a people for himself from among the Gentiles, that is, from all nations (Acts 15:14). Most of the Old Testament, however, seems to be the history of God's dealings with but one special people, Israel. Nevertheless, God's desire to save all people of all nations can be argued from several Old Testament perspectives (*see also* Old Testament Theology of Mission).

First, it should be noted that God's involvement in human affairs has not been limited to any one part of the race. This unlimited scope of God's interaction with humankind is evident in several aspects of Creation. Scripture clearly portrays God as the Creator and Sustainer of the world and in particular the human race (Gen. 1:1–2:19; 14:19; Isa. 40:28). The intent of the command to be fruitful and multiply (Gen. 1:28; 9:1) is obviously universal as were the results of obedience. Thus, the repeated affirmation of his ownership of creation is justified (1 Sam. 2: 1–10; Ps. 24:1; Ps. 50). All peoples are his. All depend upon his custodial activity, that which sustains existence as we know it (Ps. 104:14).

The unlimited scope of God's dealings with humanity can also be seen in his sweeping and universal judgment of sin. The effects of Adam and Eve's fall were not limited to one people or ethnic group. As humankind began to spread out across the face of the earth, the effects of sin were carried with them and intensified (Gen. 3:1–7; 4:1–12; 6:5–8). At each stage of this devolution, God's response in judgment matched the range of sin's pandemic spread. In Genesis 3:14–19 judgment was meted out to each participant: the serpent, Eve, and Adam. Similarly, the flood brought divine wrath to bear on all sinners (Gen.

6:5–6). God's response is no less inclusive when sin once again engulfs humankind, as reported in Genesis 10–11.

But God's promises and implementation of restoration are also universal. In concert with each wave of judgment, God keeps hope alive with the promise of reconciliation. After the fall, in the midst of God's condemnation of the initial sin, there is a promise of the Seed, a descendent of the woman who would "crush the head of the serpent." Many have referred to Genesis 3:15 as the first statement (protevangelium) of God's ultimate answer to sin, anticipating Christ's redemptive work on the cross. After the flood, God reestablishes his relationship to humans by entering into a covenant with the whole of humanity (Gen. 9:9–17). That the covenant with Noah has universal implications can be seen from the inclusive language (*every* living creature, all generations). After the affair at Babel, God calls out Abraham and promises that through him *all* nations will be blessed.

Thus, we see that the pattern established by God's general intercourse with humanity also applies to his judgment of sin. God's concern for reconciliation extends to every people (Pss. 67:4; 82:8; 96:10; Isa. 2:4; Joel 3:12; Mic. 4:3).

God not only desires salvation universally, he has taken concrete, practical steps to accomplish that. From the Old Testament perspective this is reflected primarily in the election of Israel (*see also* Divine Election). God enters a covenant with one person and his descendants. However, these developments alter nothing with respect to God's universal salvific will. In fact, the election of Israel is best viewed as a continuation of God's interaction with all nations. Each of the promises given in response to the first two stages of sin's spread, although universal in scope, do anticipate narrower foci of implementation (Gen. 3:15, the seed; Gen. 9:26, the blessing of Shem).

The *locus classicus* for the concept of election is Deuteronomy 7:6–8 (see also 9:4–6; 10:14ff.; 14:2). Here we see that in being chosen Israel is called a holy people and treasured possession. This description gives us significant insight into the nature of the election.

No human standard was applied and used as the basis for election. We see that Israel is not chosen on the basis of special social characteristics or cultic and moral integrity. In fact, we are told that they were the least among the nations. We know that they were just as vulnerable to the effects of sin as other peoples. So it is wholly because of God's love and grace that Israel is afforded such a privileged position. And yet, they were also not the only people to be favored by God. The nations remain in the purview of election. Deuteronomy 7:8 links election to the promise given to Abraham and with that to the universal scope of God's redemptive purpose.

The purpose of election also rests squarely within the context of God's universal design. The intended result was for Israel to be a blessing and a light for the nations (Gen. 12:3; 18:18; Gal. 3:8). Election does not only imply privilege, but also responsibility. The history of Israel is an extension of God's dealings with the nations to which Israel is to be light (Exod. 19:5–6).

Thus, it comes as no surprise that others were allowed to participate in the benefits of that privilege (Gen. 14:19, Melchizedech; Gen. 16:13, Hagar [Egyptian]; Exod. 12:38, 'mixed multitude'; Deut. 31:12 'foreigner'). In fact, there is so much material of this sort that many have inferred that Israel clearly understood the universal salvific implications of its election.

As we continue to follow the course of salvation history, we recognize that the developments described in the New Testament are largely the result of God having completed his plan of redemption. With the coming of Christ, we have the concretization of salvation, a new covenant, and a new people. Christ fulfills the promise made by God, initiates a new covenant, calls into existence a new people of God, and inaugurates the Christian mission (activation of witness).

In Galatians 4:4 we are told that when the "fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son . . . to redeem those who were under the law." The idea here is not that time has simply run its course, but that an appointed time or the fulfillment of the promise had arrived. God himself initiates the final stage in redemption history by sending his Son into the world.

The context for our understanding of these events is the one already established by the Old Testament, namely, that of the Abrahamic promise, the covenants, and the anticipated blessing of all nations (*see also* Abrahamic Covenant). This is exactly the approach taken by Paul in Galatians 3. In Galatians 3:1–5 he raises the fundamental question of just how they received the gift of redemption (which is now a concrete reality). Their own experience provided an obvious answer. They received the gift of the Spirit as a result of their obedient response to the message of faith. In Galatians 3:6–9 Paul supplements this line of argument by appealing to Scripture (Gen. 15:6), showing that it was Abraham's willingness to have faith in God's plan and not some level of religious performance, which led to God declaring him righteous. That leads to the conclusion that the true children of Abraham are those (any, including the Gentiles) who have faith (Gen. 17:7; Rom. 9:6ff.).

The promise made to Abraham is referred to here as the gospel (Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14). So it is faith, not ethnicity or keeping the law (3:10ff.), which leads to redemption. The law did not change the conditions of the promise (Gal. 3:15), it only revealed sin as sin. The object

of faith is Christ, God's plan, as accomplished by Christ (Gal. 3:10–14), which is precisely what the promise envisioned. This fact is established by highlighting the singular of the word "seed." The promise was not intended to include all the descendants of Abraham, but *the* descendant, Christ (Gal. 3:16) and all those who are in him (Gal. 3:26–29). As in the Old Testament, the scope of the promise is universal (Gal. 3:8).

The Book of Acts picks up the theme of unrestricted mission. In 1:8 we see Jesus diverting attention from the question of time and placing it on the disciples' responsibilities. These included worldwide outreach. Consider the similarities to the GREAT COMMISSION passages.

But not only has God kept his promise by sending the Son, he also enables the new people of God to fulfill their responsibility by sending the Spirit. Even a cursory reading of the Book of Acts impresses one with the prominence and importance of the HOLY SPIRIT. And here we see how the work of the Spirit relates to that of the other members of the Godhead.

The Holy Spirit generates the missionary spirit. The drive toward spontaneous expansion comes only after Pentecost. The missionary spirit is first and foremost the spirit of sacrifice. The early Christians were willing to put their very lives on the line (Acts 15:26), give up everything familiar, family, homes (Acts 13:3), rather than retain the best for themselves, as is often the case today.

The missionary spirit is also a spirit of courage. Consider the way in which the apostles faced imprisonment, beatings, and a host of other dangers. The challenges were, of course, not just physical. They were willing to challenge existing paradigms and power structures (Acts 4:31; 21:3). Are we any less in need of courage?

The missionary spirit is the spirit of love. First Timothy 1:5 teaches that the sum of all teaching is love—unconditional love for all.

The Holy Spirit guides the missionary outreach of the early church. This was done in several ways. First, the Holy Spirit is presented as the initiator of missionary outreach (Acts 13:1ff.). Second, the Spirit inspires the proclamation of the gospel (Acts 10). Third, the Spirit guides the course of missions (Acts 16:9–10).

The Holy Spirit achieves the results. In John 16:8 Jesus teaches that it is the Spirit who opens the eyes of the world to its own sinfulness. There is no natural awareness of guilt. Consider the sermons given in Acts. They reflect a dependence on the Spirit in that (1) they call for a decision (Acts 2:28), (2) they promise forgiveness (Acts 2:28), and (3) they warn about the coming judgment.

Having followed the implementation of God's plan of salvation, we conclude that it is God himself who has been and is engaged in missions. Several decades ago Georg Vicedom popularized the term MISSIO DEI in a book with that title published in 1961. In it he suggested that he was using the phrase in order to underscore the fact that mission is above all God's work, that is, God is the active subject of mission. In that case mission is actually an extension of God's salvific desire and activity. Vicedom goes on to challenge his readers by suggesting that if our assumption that God desires mission because he is himself involved in mission is correct, then the church can be God's instrument and tool only if it allows itself to be used by him (p. 13). This may well be a needed reminder at the beginning of the twenty-first century. God, and not human agencies, is in charge of the mission of the church.

EDWARD ROMMEN

Bibliography. H. Berkhof, *Christian Faith;* D. G. Bloesch, *A Theology of Word and Spirit;* J. Carpenter and W. Shenk, eds., *Earthen Vessels*; G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence;* T. N. Finger, *Christian Theology: An Eschatological Approach;* A. Glasser, *Kingdom and Mission*; S. J. Grenz, *Revisioning Evangelical Theology;* S. J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God;* P. K. Jewett, *God, Creation, and Revelation;* G. R. Lewis and B. A. Demarest, *Integrative Theology;* A. E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction;* C. Van Engen, D. S. Gilliland, and P. Pierson, eds., *The Good News of the Kingdom: Mission Theology for the Third Millennium;* O. Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics.*

Gospel and Culture. The GOSPEL is God's gift to humankind. CULTURE is a human creation. However, the gospel is expressed within culture and communicated through culture. "The Word became flesh [incarnation] and made his dwelling among us [enculturation]" (John 1:14a).

We create cultures because humans are created in God's image (Gen. 1:26–31) (*see* IMAGE OF GOD). God creates; humans make artifacts. God speaks; humans develop languages. God is a covenant being; humans create social institutions. God is righteous; humans develop systems of morés. Religion develops out of human yearning for a relationship with the other dimensions of existence. Artifacts, languages, social institutions, morés, and religion are some dimensions of human culture.

Cultures are organized. Like an artichoke, cultures have a core with layers encircling that core. The WORLDVIEW is the cultural core—the understanding of the meaning of the universe and the person's place within the universe. Moving outward from the core other layers include power, values, practices, and artifacts. The core fundamentally informs each of the other layers.

All cultures possess indications of truth and graciousness. For example, most AFRICAN TRADITIONAL RELIGIONS assumed some form of life after death; there was a hint of gospel-like truth in that perception. Children were valued; the

mother carried the newborn baby on her back for many months. Children grew up secure. Such indications of image-of-God-like truth and goodness are present in all cultures (Rom. 1:20; 10:8; Acts 17:22–23, 28).

All cultures also possess the imprint of evil and distortions of truth (Rom. 1:18–32). When Adam and Eve turned away from God, they did so because they wanted to "be like God" (Gen. 3:1–11). This declaration of independence from our Creator is universal. We ourselves and our cultures become our ultimate loyalty, rather than our Creator. Consequently, the gods we worship become the psychoprojection of our cultures. In various ways religions everywhere are inclined to become the mirror image of respective cultures; the gods of culture rarely call people to repent (Jer. 10:1–16).

The Bible pronounces the gods of culture as false. It is for this reason that repentance is the essential response of all who embrace biblical faith. God the Creator confronts the gods of culture. God calls people to repent, to turn away from the gods of culture they have created and worship rather the God who has created them (Exod. 20:3).

Jesus Christ is the supreme clarification event. As "God With Us," he entered and lived within a particular culture with relevant, disturbing, revolutionary, life-giving power. Jesus is unprecedented. No human culture, religion, philosophy, or speculation ever imagined the possibility of Jesus Christ (Matt. 16:13–18). Jesus is the gospel. He is God's salvation gift to humanity (John 3:16), and transformation gift to culture (Matt. 13:33).

Through the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ seeks to make his home within the worldview and power centers of every culture (Matt. 5, 6, 7, 24:14). Missiologists refer to this as Contextualization. The gospel should become relevant and revolutionary good news within every cultural context. The Dyak of Petussibau in West Kalimantan, who traditionally feared birds as omens of the gods, can discover that Jesus frees from bondage to squawking birds. However, a Harvard University astronomer would be quite amused if a Christian student were to tell him that Christ can free him from the fear of squawking crows. The cultural contexts in Boston and Petussibau are exceedingly different!

The church within every society needs to discern the aspects of the culture that the gospel blesses, and those dimensions that the gospel critiques and transforms. Acts 15 describes a conference in Jerusalem that convened to address such issues. Persons representing Jewish and Greek cultures participated. They heard accounts of what the Holy Spirit was doing in transforming lives, they searched the Scriptures for guidance, they listened to the counsel of the Holy Spirit, and in counsel together they bound some practices and loosened others.

This remarkable Jerusalem council affirmed salvation in Jesus Christ as the center of the church's faith in every culture, but also freed the church to embrace cultural diversity. Consequently the global church can celebrate astonishing cultural diversity while enjoying unity in Christ.

The gospel is always clothed within the idioms of culture. That is the nature of the Bible and the church. Consequently, Christian missionaries carry both their culture and the gospel with them when they move from one culture to another. However, whenever a people receive Jesus Christ, they are empowered and freed by the Holy Spirit and the Scriptures to evaluate and critique both their own culture and that of the missionary. The presence of Jesus Christ within any culture is life-giving empowerment (John 8:31–36).

David W. Shenk

Bibliography. P. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries;* T. Hopler, *A World of Difference;* C. H. Kraft, *Christianity and Culture;* E. A. Nida and W. D. Reyburn, *Meaning Across Cultures;* D. Richardson, *Eternity in Their Hearts;* L. Sanneh, *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture;* D. W. Shenk, *Global Gods, Exploring the Role of Religions in Modern Societies.*

Gospel, The. The gospel *(euangelion)* or "good news" has been entrusted to the church to proclaim to all peoples. It is variously described as an "eternal gospel" (Rev. 14:6), "the gospel of peace" (Eph. 6:15), "the gospel of Christ" (1 Cor. 9:12), "the gospel of the grace of God" (Acts 20:24), and "the gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. 24:14). These different designations do not mean different gospels, for there is only one gospel (Gal. 1:8). This word is also associated with the synonym *kerygma,* a noun used eight times in the New Testament to focus particular attention on the proclamation of the precise content of the gospel. These two words are identical in their definition of the gospel and both stress the fact that in essence the gospel concerns an event of surpassing uniqueness. Prior to the consummation of human history, when God shall "bring all things in heaven and on earth together under one head, even Christ," it is his will that this gospel "must first be preached to all nations" (Eph. 1:10; Mark 13:10).

Although the uniqueness of this gospel event is clearly and frequently referred to in the New Testament as the sum total of the redemptive work of Christ, its full meaning is beyond human comprehension. When he embraced the cross this involved not only taking to his innocency the totality of human Sin and Shame in order to make it his own responsibility, but also included the

curse of sin as well, which is death (2 Cor. 5:21; Gal. 3:13). He had to invalidate the claim and power of sin by entering into the death that is its ultimate penalty. His object thereby was to destroy it, for death is Satan's greatest weapon (Heb. 2:9, 14, 15). In so doing he "disarmed the powers and authorities" under Satan's dominion in order that he might send sin back to its demonic author. He thereby broke its tyranny and destroyed its power, and by this means removed its curse (Col. 2:15). Hence, the gospel is equated with this unique once for-all-time event: the death, burial, and RESURRECTION OF CHRIST, followed by his subsequent exaltation to the right hand of God, where he was gloriously acclaimed and "made both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36). "The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the devil's work" (1 John 3:8).

On this basis the people of God, in response to their Lord's GREAT COMMISSION to "make disciples of all nations," have but one way to demonstrate their obedience to him. They are to confront the human race with the divine command: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins. And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. The promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off—for all whom the Lord our God will call" (2:38, 39). From this it follows that the call to REPENTANCE and FAITH, with its promise of divine intervention, is of the very essence of God's plan for the redemption of his people from the nations of the earth.

When one examines the total usage of the word "gospel" in the Scriptures the impression quickly grows that "preaching the gospel" cannot be confined to the mere recitation of the actual facts of Christ's atoning and saving work. To the apostles all that he did was "in accordance with the Scriptures" (1 Cor. 15:3, 4). This meant nothing less to them than that the coming of Christ into the world ("when the time had fully come" Gal. 4:4) represented the central event in "salvation history." It was almost of the order of an eschatological event at a critical juncture in the biblical record of Israel's long and troubled history. Indeed, it also marked a distinctly new era in the fortunes of the nations, for by the gospel nothing less than "the KINGDOM OF GOD is being preached" (Luke 16:16). Since this would involve the reclamation of this fallen world from Satan's control, the proclamation of the gospel from then on attained the order of something special in God's dealings with not only Israel but with the Gentile world as well. This brought a sense of uniqueness to the calling of those who would go forth to the nations with this gospel. Indeed, Paul would speak of Christ having given to him "the ministry of reconciliation," a ministry so sublime in his eyes that it was nothing less than "God making his appeal through us" (2 Cor. 5:18–20). All those who proclaim this gospel can truthfully though humbly state that they are "God's fellow workers" (6:1). In their preaching of the gospel, what they share is "not the word of men, but as it actually is, the word of God" (1 Thess. 2:13). As a result their preaching was making actual and available to their hearers the very reality of God's salvation.

This brings up another point of far-reaching significance. The apostles unitedly and fiercely opposed any thought that the achievement of the world's reconciliation by Christ alone through his solitary cross was somehow incomplete. How could it be otherwise when at its heart was nothing less than God himself in his Son "reconciling the world to himself" (2 Cor. 5:19). As a result only human arrogance would dare to challenge its perfection by claiming that any human activity was needed to bring it to completion. The Christians at Ephesus were pointedly told: "It is by GRACE you have been saved, through faith—and this not from yourselves, it is the gift of God—not by works, so that no one can boast" (Eph. 2:8, 9). Indeed, no person can make himself or herself fit for God's Presence, much less enter into personal relationship with him. The preaching of the gospel has solely to do with the person of Christ and must be kept free from all reference to legalistic Judaism or any other form of what has been popularly termed "works-righteousness." The followers of Christ in Crete were told: "When the kindness and love of God our Savior appeared, He saved us, not because of the righteous things we had done, but because of His mercy" (Titus 3:4, 5).

When Saul the Pharisee was confronted by the Lord on the road to Damascus, he not only had a vision of the risen, glorified Christ. Through repentance and faith the persecutor of the people of God found himself graciously called to the fellowship and service of the One whom he had so persistently and hatefully opposed (Acts 26:12–18). As the apostle to the Gentiles he was given a fivefold task (v. 18, *see also* PAUL AND MISSION). He was "to open their eyes," for people by nature and satanic influence "cannot see the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" (2 Cor. 4:4). Paul was then to "turn them from darkness to light," for people in their fallenness are not facing this Christ, the Light of the World, who alone can meet their need. But before they can effectually reach out to the Savior, they must turn "from the power of Satan to God." This is absolutely crucial, for it involves the conscious repudiation of all that has previously controlled their lives. The early church encouraged would-be followers of Jesus to renounce by solemn oath "the devil and all his works." It was felt that only then would they be able to commit their lives to the control of the Lord. And once this change of allegiance takes

place they will be able by faith to "receive the forgiveness of sins" and subsequently "a place among those who are sanctified in Christ" (i.e., gain incorporation into a local congregation of fellow believers through baptism). Central in this evangelistic sequence is the fact that the gospel is a Person. To receive him (John 1:11, 12) involves consciously submitting to a new authority over one's life, even to Christ the Lord.

ARTHUR F. GLASSER

Bibliography. E. Bruner, *The Mediator;* L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross;* L. Newbigin, *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society.*

Great Commandment. When considering missions, it is usually not the "Great Commandment" (Mark 12:28–34 par. Matt. 22:34–40; cf. Luke 10:25–28) but the "GREAT COMMISSION" (Matt. 28:16–20; Luke 24:46–49) that takes center stage. Arguably, however, the Great Commandment provides a crucial foundation for the Great Commission, and a unilateral emphasis on the latter creates an imbalance that may render the church's mission ineffective. We will first discuss the scriptural foundation for the Great Commandment and subsequently deal with its contemporary relevance for mission.

Scriptural Foundation. The Great Commandment, according to Jesus, is the Old Testament command to love God with all of one's heart, soul, mind, and strength (Deut. 6:4–5), together with the injunction to love one's neighbor as oneself (cf. Lev. 19:18b; on the question of who is one's "neighbor," cf. Lev. 19:34; Luke 10:25–27; and Matt. 5:43–48). To call this commandment the *Great* Commandment is to follow Matthew's terminology (Matt. 22:36: "great"; 22:38: "great and first"), where "great" is probably used with elative force to denote what is "greatest" or "most important." Mark simply numbers the commandments as "first" and "second" (Mark 12:38, 41; cf. Matt. 22:38). In Luke, the lawyer's question is, "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" (Luke 10:25), raising the question of whether Luke's account refers to a different event altogether, especially since, in Luke, it is not Jesus who is speaking but the lawyer (Luke 10:27).

The question of what constituted the heart of the Law was an issue widely discussed in rabbinic circles in Jesus' day. Jesus' emphatic statement, only found in Matthew, that the entire Law and the Prophets depend on the Great Commandment, is therefore of utmost significance (Matt. 22:40). Unlike the Decalogue, which is mostly given in the form of prohibitions, Jesus states this injunction in a positive way (cf. Matt. 7:12). By expressing the commandment in an absolute and categorical rather than a relative and limited fashion, Jesus stresses the priority of the inward disposition over the outward action. In keeping with Old Testament prophetic tradition, Jesus requires heart religion, not merely formalistic legalism. At the same time, it is not his desire to use this commandment to relegate every other obligation of the believer to the point of irrelevance.

What is the relationship between the Great Commandment and the Great Commission in Matthew's Gospel? Since Matthew presents discipleship as the way of righteousness (cf. Matt. 5:6, 10, 20; 6:33), and since the Great Commission entails the teaching of converts to obey everything Jesus commanded, it is clear that the keeping of the Great Commandment is a prerequisite for the fulfillment of the Great Commission. Moreover, the latter entails, not mere EVANGELISM in modern parlance, where the term usually refers merely to the bringing of a person to the point of conversion, but the grounding of Christian converts in the way of righteousness, including the observance of the Great Commandment (and, ultimately, once again the Great Commission!). Finally, the concept of righteousness in Matthew, while possessing a spiritual core, is not limited to the religious domain but also has social and economic dimensions. In these ways Matthew lays a crucial foundation for the understanding of the relationship between the Great Commandment and the Great Commission in contemporary discussion.

Contemporary Relevance for Mission. Historically, Anglo-Saxon Protestant missionary thought has emphasized the Great Commission, while the latter task never occupied an equally central position among Christians on the European Continent. The issue of the relationship between the Great Commission and the Great Commandment caused considerable discussion at the LAUSANNE CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELISM in 1974. While in the final conference document evangelism was named as the primary mission of the church, this drew the criticism of a significant number of participants, including JOHN STOTT, R. Sider, and others. After a reaffirmation of the primacy of evangelism by the Consultation on World Evangelization (COWE) in Pattaya, Thailand, in June 1980, the question was taken up again by the Consultation on the Relationship between Evangelism and Social Responsibility held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, in June 1982, an effort co-sponsored by the WORLD EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP (WEF) and the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization (LCWE) (*see* LAUSANNE MOVEMENT). This conference identified three kinds of relationships between EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY: (1) social responsibility as a *consequence* of evangelism; (2) social action as a *bridge* to evangelism; and (3) social concern as a *partner* of evangelism. The delegates advocated a holistic approach to mission, since "[s]eldom if ever should we have to choose be-

tween satisfying physical hunger and spiritual hunger, or between healing bodies or saving souls, since an authentic love for our neighbor will lead us to serve him or her as a whole person" (*see* HOLISTIC MISSION).

The key questions addressed at the 1982 consultation were the following: What is mission? How broad is salvation in Scripture? What is the relationship between the church and the kingdom? What is the church's mandate for social justice? R. Sider and J. I. Packer, in contrast to the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES (WCC) at its BANGKOK CONFERENCE (1973), argued for a narrow use of salvation language, restricting salvation "to the sphere of conscious confession of faith in Christ." A. Johnston, D. McGavran, P. Wagner, P. Beyerhaus, K. Bockmühl, and H. Lindsell joined in affirming this position against those who sought to define salvation more broadly. This latter group contended that salvation has not only personal but also social and cosmic dimensions, so that socioeconomic improvements should be described as an aspect of salvation, pointing also to Luke 4:16–21 (cf. Isa. 61:1–2). It was further argued that the lordship of Christ extends over all demonic powers of evil that "possess persons, pervade structures, societies, and the created order."

How does Scripture adjudicate between these two positions? On the one hand, it cautions against a reductionistic focus on people merely as "souls" that need to be saved, so that the church's task should not be conceived in merely "religious" terms. On the other hand, Scripture does affirm the primacy of a person's spiritual dimension, so that the effort of leading unbelievers to a Christian conversion rightly belongs at the heart of the church's mission. As noted, read in the context of Matthew's entire Gospel, the fulfillment of the Great Commission entails a "commitment to both the King and his kingdom, to both righteousness and justice" (Bosch), while the making of disciples also involves teaching them to obey Jesus' teachings which include loving God and one's neighbor. Hence love for God and others ought to be the driving motivation for mission (*see* MOTIVE, MOTIVATION), since, in love, God sent his Son; in love, Jesus gave his life for others; and by our love, the world will know that we are his disciples.

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER

Bibliography. D. J. Bosch, *IRM* 73 (1984): 17–32; D. A. Carson, *EBC,* 8:463–66; P. A. Deiros, *Faith and Mission* 2 (1985): 42–49; R. H. Fuller, *Essays on the Love Commandment*, pp. 97–121; A. P. Williamson, *CT* 26, no. 19 (1982): 32–36.

Great Commission. The term "Great Commission" is commonly assigned to Christ's command to his disciples as found in Matthew 28:18–20, Mark 16:15–16, Luke 24:46–49, John 20:21, and Acts 1:8. It is sometimes referred to as the "Evangelistic Mandate" and distinguished from the "Cultural" and/or "Social Mandate" found in Genesis 1:28–30 and Genesis 9:1–7 (*see* CULTURAL MANDATE). The prominence accorded to the Great Commission in the past two hundred years is not apparent in previous church history. The early church made remarkable progress in spreading the faith throughout the Mediterranean world by virtue of the witness of dispersed Christians and the missionary journeys of the apostle Paul and others. However, there is no clear indication in the Book of Acts that this effort was motivated by explicit appeals to the Great Commission. Rather, after Pentecost the Holy Spirit both motivated and orchestrated the missionary effort in accordance with that Commission. Similarly, throughout the early centuries when both the Eastern and especially Western branches of the church were expanding significantly, the Great Commission as such does not appear to have been a decisive motivating or defining factor.

In REFORMATION times concerns and controversies relating to the Great Commission had to do with its applicability. In 1537 Pope Paul III emphasized the importance of the Great Commission and said that all people are "capable of receiving the doctrines of the Faith." However, sixteenth-century Catholic theology applied the text to the Church with its episcopacy, not to the individual Christians as such. The Reformers generally taught that the Great Commission was entrusted to the apostles and that the apostles fulfilled it by going to the ends of their known world. This is not to say that they had no missionary vision. Hadrian Saravia (1531–1613) and Justinian von Welz (1621–61) found reason enough to write treatises in which they urged Christians to recognize their responsibility to obey the Great Commission and evangelize the world. Nevertheless, it remained for WILLIAM CAREY (1761–1834) to make one of the most compelling cases for the applicability of the Great Commission to all believers. The first section of his treatise *An Inquiry into the Obligations of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathens* (published in 1792) made a concerted argument that individual Christians should join together in an effort to take the gospel to the HEATHEN (at that time the common designation for the unevangelized) in obedience to the Great Commission. Some historians have concluded that *An Inquiry* rivals Luther's Ninety-five Theses in terms of its influence on church history.

By the middle of the nineteenth century a consensus on the *applicability* of the Great Commission had emerged but this consensus paved the way for differences as to its *application,* particu-

larly in America. Not everyone agreed with the interpretation and approach of A. T. Pierson and others who, in the 1880s and 1890s, pressed the completion of world evangelization by the year 1900 "in obedience to the Great Commission." The organizers of the great Edinburgh Conference of 1910 attempted to avoid controversy concerning the requirements of the Great Commission and the nature of mission by taking the position that the Great Commission is "intrinsic" rather than "extrinsic" (James Scherer's words) to the church and its missions. In other words, it is not so much an exterior law that sits in judgment upon the missionary activities of the church, but an inner principle of church faith and life allowing for freedom in the way churches and missions interpret and carry it out.

Subsequent history has revealed how diverse and divisive such interpretations can be. The twentieth century gave rise to a number of significant points of departure in understanding. First, upon a review of history and the biblical text, some (e.g., Harry Boer) have concluded that, in the process of convincing Christians that the Great Commission applied to them, proponents unwittingly contributed to the idea that the validity of Christian mission rested primarily upon that command. This led to a corresponding neglect of the missionary role of the Holy Spirit and the missionary thrust of the whole of biblical revelation. Second, perhaps responding to the emphasis on the social task of the church in the WCC and especially at the 1968 General Assembly in Uppsala, some evangelicals (e.g., John Stott) revised their thinking on the Great Commission and now argue against the generally accepted position that the statement in Matthew 28:16–20, being the most complete, possesses a certain priority. Their revised position is that the statement in John 20:21 ("As the Father has sent me, so send I you") takes priority and makes the Lord Jesus' earthly ministry as outlined in Luke 4:18, 19 a model for modern mission. This interpretation opens the way for sociopolitical action as an integral part of biblical mission. Third, many Pentecostals and charismatics have given a certain priority to the Markan version of the Great Commission with its emphasis on the "signs following" conversion and faith—casting out demons, speaking in new tongues, handling snakes, drinking poisonous liquids without hurt, and healing the sick (Mark 16:17–19). This approach is generally dependent upon a consideration of the manuscript evidence relating to the shorter and longer endings of Mark's Gospel. Fourth, some exegetes (e.g., Robert Culver) point out that the Matthew 28:18–20 text does not support the commonly understood interpretation with its overemphasis on "going" into all the world in obedience to Christ. Rather, the main verb and imperative is "make disciples." The other verbs (in English translations) are actually participles and take their imperitival force from the main verb. In descending order of importance the verbs are "make disciples," "teach," "baptize, and "go." The text would be better translated "Going . . ." or "As you go . . ." and understanding enhanced by giving more attention to the grammatical construction of the original text. Fifth, Donald McGavran held that there is a clear distinction between disciple-making and teaching in fulfilling the Great Commission. The former has to do with people of a culture turning from their old ways, old gods, and old holy books or myths to the missionary's God, the Bible, and a new way of living. The latter has to do with "perfecting" as many as will take instruction and follow the "new way" more closely. In obeying the Great Commission, "discipling" new peoples should never be discontinued in an effort to "perfect" a few. Though comparatively few agreed with McGavran early on, in recent years there has been a somewhat wider acceptance of certain aspects of his thesis. Sixth, Church Growth advocates generally and proponents of the AD 2000 and Beyond Movement especially (e.g., Ralph Winter) have placed great emphasis on the phrase *panta ta ethnē* in Matthew 28:19 and have insisted that this is best understood as having reference to the various "people groups" of the world (*see* Peoples, People Groups). Originally Donald McGavran identified endogamy as a primary characteristic of a "people group" but subsequently other characteristics such as a common worldview, religion, ethnicity, language, social order, and self-identification have been emphasized. This understanding lends itself to a program of world evangelization whereby people groups are identified and "reached" by planting viable, New Testament churches that become the primary means of evangelizing the group socially to the fringes and temporally into the future. Seventh, in recent years a growing number of missiologists (e.g., Trevor McIlwain) have advocated a missionary approach that gives more serious attention to the Great Commission requirement to teach all that Christ commanded. To many missions people this has seemed altogether too encompassing and demanding. They have preferred to communicate basic truths about human spiritual need and the way in which the Lord Jesus has met that need by means of his death and resurrection. In a way the tension between these two approaches reflects a classic missions controversy as to whether missionaries should first communicate truths about the nature of God and his requirements as revealed in the whole of Scripture or are better advised to begin with the New Testament account of Jesus' teaching and ministry. What is distinctive about the recent emphasis, however, is that its proponents usually link "all I

[Christ] have commanded" in Matthew 28:20 with John 5:39 and a chronological teaching of the Bible as redemptive history.

However one may assess the foregoing (among other) responses to the requirements of the Great Commission, it seems apparent that, unlike the first two hundred years of Protestantism, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Great Commission came to play an extremely important role in missions and missiology. In fact, the authors of the FRANKFURT DECLARATION of 1970 placed it first in their list of "seven indispensable basic elements of mission." In a way this growing appreciation for the Great Commission was reflected in the changed thinking of even the early-twentieth-century liberal scholar Adolf von Harnack. At first he concluded that the words of 28:18–20 probably constituted a later addition to the Gospel of Matthew. In later life he found it to be not only a fitting conclusion to that Gospel, but a statement so magnificent that it would be difficult to say anything more meaningful and complete in an equal number of words (see Bosch, 1991, 56–57).

DAVID J. HESSELGRAVE

Bibliography. D. J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission;* H. R. Boer, *Pentecost and Missions;* R. D. Culver, *A Greater Commission: A Theology for World Missions;* D. A. McGavran, *The Bridges of God.*

Hell. Place of God's final retributive punishment for the wicked. In the Old Testament souls of the dead face a shadowy existence in Sheol (Job 10:21; Ps. 88:12; Isa. 14:10; Eccles. 9:10). Since death is not God's original intent but results from the fall, the Old Testament confidently awaits God's demonstration of his lordship by raising the righteous to life (Gen. 2–3; Pss. 16:10, 49:15; Isa. 25:8; Hos. 13:14). Occasionally it suggests a future retribution for the wicked (Pss. 21:10; 34:15–16, 140:11; Dan. 12:2; Mal. 3:18–4:2). Jesus further develops this framework, teaching that at the final judgment, Satan, his demons, and the wicked will be thrown into hell, bringing an end to evil's free ways (Matt. 25:41). His standard term for hell is *Gehenna,* referring to the valley of Hinnom outside Jerusalem, a place notorious for evil deeds and God's fiery JUDGMENT (Jer. 7:31ff.; Isa. 30:33; 66:24).

The Biblical View of Hell. Jesus is most responsible for defining the biblical concept of hell, which includes the following integral features.

Place of Irretrievable Bondage. The wicked are imprisoned in a "furnace" (Matt. 13:42, 50), a "lake of fire" (Rev. 20:10, 14–15; 21:8), a "prison" (Matt. 5:22–26; 18:34–35; Jude 6) and so separated from the righteous (Luke 16:26).

Place of Retribution. Jesus' image of fire portrays God's searing holiness exacting retribution for evil deeds (Luke 17:29–30). Here the wicked are punished and "paid back with harm for the harm they have done" (2 Peter 2:13; Matt. 16:27; Jude 7; Rev. 14:9–11).

Penalties of Loss. The grave's maggots (Mark 9:48; Isa. 14:11) and darkness (Matt. 8:12; Ps. 88:12) were common images of a ruined and despairing existence without hope, and thus separated from God's loving presence (Matt. 25:30).

Penalties of Torment. The pictures of "gnashing teeth," "beatings," and "fire" suggest that hell's punishment includes physical affliction (Matt 13:42; Mark 9:48–49; Luke 12:47). Since these images are often at odds with each other—darkness and fire, or never-dying worms in an unquenchable fire—they should not be interpreted literally but as metaphors for punishment.

Degrees of Punishment. Punishment varies so that those who were "entrusted with much" are more responsible (Luke 12:48).

Hell Exists Forever. Jesus' picture of hell as a place where "the fire is never put out" (Mark 9:48) reflects what Scripture clearly states elsewhere: punishment is "forever and ever" (Rev. 20:10; 14:11; Matt 25:46).

Justice and Hell. Hell answers the perennial cry for justice. The Holocaust and ethnic cleansing haunt us with the question, "When will the wicked be judged?" These pangs of morality reflect the way God made us as accountable to him, the Moral Judge of the cosmos (Rom. 2:15–16). Scripture's ultimate answer to the problem of evil is that God, the holy Judge of all the earth, calls every human to account on the Day of Judgment for his or her life (Matt. 12:36; Ps. 31:18; Rom. 2:6–11). Hell is the horrific and tragic place where God will pay back the wicked for their evils and reestablish his righteous rule even over the reprobate (Matt. 16:27; 25:31–46; Rom. 12:19; 1 Cor. 15:24–25; 2 Cor. 5:10).

However, the fact that God will punish all sin defines the human predicament. Although created for God, humans proclaimed their independence, resulting in history's tragedy of hatred, deceit, and neglect. As a result, each sin is first and foremost an offense against the infinite God against whom "all have sinned" (Rom. 8:7; 3:23). Scripture reveals that the penalty required for sin is hell. Jesus repeatedly warns of sin's heinous nature and dreadful consequence: "If your eye causes you to sin, gouge it out. . . . It is better for you to enter life with one eye than to have two and be thrown into the fire of Hell" (Matt. 18:9).

Hell and the Proclamation of the Gospel. How is it possible for God the Holy Judge to be merciful to sinners? The biblical answer is that the personal, infinite God has substituted himself for us. The gospel is the good news that God in Jesus

Christ has come to this rebellious world and suffered the judgment for those who have "faith in Christ's blood" (Rom. 3:25; 2 Cor. 5:21). Except for God's awesome love, everyone would lack hope! If one fails to trust in Jesus, hell is the awful consequence (Luke 12:8–9; Acts 4:12; Rom. 10:9–15). So hell is both the presupposition for the gospel as well as the consequence of its rejection.

Challenges to Hell. In view of the integral link between the gospel and the judgment for sin, revisions to the doctrine of hell have direct and even devastating implications for the proclamation of the gospel. Revisionist eschatology, UNIVERSALISM, and ANNIHILATIONISM pose significant challenges to concepts of hell and may result in changes to the biblical understanding of the gospel.

Revisionist Eschatology. Many have abandoned Jesus' bodily resurrection and any personal life after death, interpreting heaven and hell as simply mythological expressions of a first-century faith. Not only does this view demolish the gospel's promised hope but it also undermines life's moral significance. In this view justice cannot be established.

Universalism. Universalists insist that God will eventually transform everyone into Christ's image, even if it requires remedial punishments after death. How, they ask, could a loving God reject forever the creature he loves? Note that this question elevates humanity as God's highest good! But God is self-sufficient; his goodness and love are completely grounded in himself (Acts 17:25). Humanity exists to glorify God (Ps. 73:24–26; 1 Cor. 10:31; Col. 1:16). Because God's goodness is self-grounded, anything contrary to his will is evil and retribution reflects God's goodness. In view of Jesus' own concept of hell, universalism also attacks his character. For it must treat Jesus as ignorant of God's moral character or as intentionally misleading his hearers.

Not only does universalism dispute God's revelation in Jesus Christ, its insistence that God's eternal pursuit will bring everyone to salvation undermines the moral seriousness of our present life. By contrast Jesus stresses the urgency of a decision in the present life (Matt. 25:13; Mark 13:32–37) precisely because God's gracious offer is not eternal (Matt. 25:41). This present life is decisive for our future (Heb. 9:27). Moreover, universalism's view that those who die outside of Christ are not lost eliminates the need for evangelism. Historically universalism has subverted mission institutions into becoming merely social and political agencies.

Annihilationism. Annihilationists acknowledge the necessity for retribution, but insist that the wicked are obliterated by God's wrath and not punished forever and ever. The punishment due for sin is the crucial issue. Scripture's answer focuses on Christ's death. At the cross God in Christ became our substitute to bear the punishment for our sins so as "to be just and the one who justifies the man who has faith in Jesus" (2 Cor. 5:21; Rom. 3:21–26; 1 Peter 2:24). The fact that only God the Judge, the "Lord of glory himself" (1 Cor. 2:8), could pay the penalty due us, suggests that the penalty for sin against the Infinite is infinite. Annihilationism fails to take seriously the infinite penalty that God in Jesus Christ paid for us. Moreover, hell marks the gravity of humanity's rebellion. Diminishing hell means the horrific nature of sin begins to be lost.

Conclusion. Many questions remain. While Scripture does not answer all our questions, we know that the Lord of all the earth will do right (Gen. 18:25). Just as Christ cried over Jerusalem's fate (Luke 19:41), we can only speak of God's final damning punishment with tears as we respond to a lost world as did our Savior, who humbled himself to our condition, suffered, and died for the wicked. This destiny should impel the church to follow Christ in sacrificially proclaiming the gospel in word and deed to the lost.

TIMOTHY R. PHILLIPS

Bibliography. A. A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future,* pp. 265–73; C. S. Lewis, *The Problem of Pain;* J. I. Packer, *Evangelical Affirmations,* pp. 107–36; T. R. Phillips, *Through No Fault of Their Own: The Fate of Those Who Have Never Heard,* pp. 47–59; W. G. T. Shedd, *The Doctrine of Endless Punishment;* J. F. Walvoord, W. Crockett, Z. Hayes, and C. H. Pinnock, *Four Views on Hell.*

Holiness. In Scripture, the term "holiness" most commonly derives from the Hebrew word *qadash* or the Greek word *hagios*. The issue of holiness, however, must begin with understanding the holy God who determines the standard for holiness. The concept of holiness is to be developed via the self-revelation of God's character and nature (*see* DIVINE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD). In conveying the idea of holiness in missions, it must be supposed that some cultures may not think of moral and ethical issues by the norms assumed by the missionary (*see* ETHICS) and therefore the concept of holiness must be introduced by understanding and imitating the holiness of God. It is for this reason Peter reminds the church of the same responsibility which Israel had, that is, all of God's people are to be like God in holiness: "You shall be holy for I am holy" (1 Peter 1:16; Lev. 11:44).

In the New Testament, the Greek *hagios* occurs more than 200 times and has as its basic meaning "separation." A cognate word, *hagiazō,* used 25 times in the New Testament, often means to purify or to cleanse. This can be seen in the Old Testament *qadash* as well. Israel is told to be holy because God is holy, and they were therefore to be separate from the practices and attitudes of the Canaanite people around them. Thus it must

be assumed that the basic concept behind holiness is separation from those things which God has determined to be impure or those things which God has separated out for his own use. In Scripture, a great variety of items can be holy: cities (Matt. 4:5); ground (Acts 7:33); buildings (1 Kings 8:6–11); created beings (Mark 8:38); humans (2 Peter 1:32); the law (Rom. 7:12); and bodies of believers (Rom. 12:1). It would appear that any object, place, person, or act can be holy when used in the purpose of God.

Holiness is also a quality of character. It implies a disposition and attitude toward those things consistent with the nature of God. Believers are commanded to be holy like God himself (1 Peter 1:15) and therefore holiness is the norm for standard of conduct. Holiness, however, must never be confused with religiousness or self-righteousness.

In mission, the focus on holiness has two equally significant dimensions. On the one hand, missionaries must protect themselves from impurities which will affect the way they are seen by the people who are being reached. Since the missionaries represent God to the people to whom they are ministering, lifestyle and attitude are to be compatible with God. This may require special sensitivity toward particularly offensive practices in each culture.

A significant danger for missionaries is that one must be careful that the holiness presented is according to God's definition and character and not according to one's own culturally conditioned assumptions (*see* GUILT). Jesus shocked his generation by being a "friend of sinners" (Matt. 11:19). This judgment against him was based upon culturally defined religious values and not by God's heart and will for lost people. Jesus kept himself pure from immorality and did not sin in any fashion, but he also kept himself pure from the religious hypocrisy of his day.

The second dimension of missiological holiness is separation from cultural influences in the field of service. There are always dangers related to striving for acceptance by the people to whom one is ministering, especially in a foreign culture (*see* EXTENT OF MISSIONARY IDENTIFICATION). Missionaries are trained and conditioned to be culturally relevant. This could possibly lead to unknowingly compromising the holy standards of God in order to be admitted into the new community. God's standards and character must always be in focus and the missionary must be able to evaluate each situation to guard God's holiness. The highest goal is not to be accepted by the new culture, but to correctly demonstrate God's holy character to those who must understand God's message of sin and salvation.

L. E. GLASSCOCK

Bibliography. B. A. Demarest, *BEB,* I:984–85; E. Russell, *ZPBD,* pp. 357–58; A. J. Saldarini, *HBD,* pp. 264–65; H. Seebass, *NIDNTT,* II:223–38; R. H. Strachan, *DAC,* 1:566–71; W. I. Thomas, *The Mystery of Godliness.*

Holism, Biblical. Holism is the philosophy that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. In reaction, holism, explained biblically, has been claimed as a unifying concept within the Christian worldview.

The Greek word *holos,* meaning whole, wholly, or complete is used by Matthew (5:29–30), Luke (Acts 3:16), John (9:34), James (1:4), and Paul (1 Thess. 5:23). Jesus (John 7:23) and Peter (Acts 3:16) are quoted using it. The English "wholly" and "holy" (Greek *hagios*), frequently confused, are not the same, although the latter is impossible without the former. The Hebrew word closest to *holos* is possibly *shalom.*

Biblical holism is based on Christ's lordship over every part of life—where people who are in right relationship with God and one another (relationship), are responsibly managing the resources entrusted by him (stewardship), in ways that show that those resources belong to God (ownership).

Sin also affects life holistically: relationships are broken, stewardship is affected, and God's ownership is ignored or usurped (Gen. 3:1–10). Every part of life shows the pain of the fall (Gen. 3:14–24). Redemption is about reversing the effects of the fall; it is multidimensional (Isa. 42:6–7).

God called the community of Israel to a shalom life (Mic. 6:8) that G. E. Wright sees as a paradigm or model for the holistic kingdom living of the New Testament community. The promises of a redeemed humanity and a new heaven and earth (Rom. 8:18–23; Rev. 21:1–5) reflect God's desire for the ultimate wholeness in the creation. If God acts holistically from Genesis to Revelation, dare we do less than that?

Mission is then no longer seen in terms of priorities, but as parts of a whole. "The scope of the gospel is the same as the scope of sin and its effects. Because sin is holistic, it is imperative that the gospel be holistic" (Athyal).

We discover three dimensions of the whole gospel: words proclaim the truth of God (the traditional focus of evangelicals); signs proclaim the power of God (most loved by Pentecostals and charismatics); and deeds proclaim the love of God (a strength of liberals and social activists). Each is a part of the Good News, but the gospel is not fully proclaimed until all three dimensions are experienced and understood; it is "both the truth and love and the power of God" (Hathaway).

Any of the three dimensions is an appropriate starting point for mission: word is for those who

need to know, deed is for those who need to have, sign is for those who need to experience the power of God. Since we live in a world full of unwanted words, the starting point is often deed or sign. Both deed and sign need explaining; in this way the Word that brings faith is received (Rom. 10:17).

There is room for all the gifts of the Spirit in holistic mission. The best missionary teams are groups of diversely gifted people representing the three dimensions of mission. "The Christian community is to be a sign of the kingdom in which evangelism, social action and the Spirit are present and inseparably related" (McAlpine).

As a result, a new focus is needed in training. This focus involves an orientation to kingdom wholeness, giving as much weight to sign and deed as to Word.

Finally, biblical holism in mission is a call to rehearing Scripture in community, putting process before program, people before structure, context before tradition, and having a commitment to continual learning. Wherever this is happening people are entering the kingdom of Christ.

JOHN STEWARD

Bibliography. B. Bradshaw, *Bridging the Gap;* D. J. Hesselgrave, *EMQ* 35:3 (1999): 278–84; T. McAlpine, *By Word, Work and Wonder;* B. Myers, *EMQ* 35:3 (1999): 285–87; J. Steward, *Where God, People and Deeds Connect.*

Holistic Mission. Holistic mission is concerned with ministry to the whole person through the transforming power of the gospel. While holistic mission affirms the functional uniqueness of evangelism and social responsibility, it views them as inseparable from the ministry of the kingdom of God. Therefore, holistic mission is the intentional integration of building the church and transforming society.

Scriptural Foundation. Holistic mission begins with creation in perfect harmony under the lordship of God (Gen. 1–2) and humans in relationship with their Creator as stewards of his creation (Gen. 1:27–30). The entry of sin and consequent judgment affected every aspect of creation (Gen. 3; Rom. 3:23; 6:23), yet God did not abandon humankind but sought to redeem them by calling out a people for himself (Gen. 12:1–3; Exod. 15:2–13). His people were to be an obedient and holy nation (Exod. 19:5–6), living as stewards of the land he gave them (Deut. 4:1–8, 32–40), so that in obedience they might "enjoy long life" (Deut. 6:1–3). The law prescribed the theological, social, and economic dimensions of God's rule, symbolized by the Hebrew word SHALOM (Mal. 2:5).

The record of God's people is one of struggle and failure to maintain their allegiance, resulting in judgment (2 Kings 17:7–20; 2 Chron. 36:15–19). During this period, the prophets denounced Israel for her sins (Isa. 5:1–7; Amos 2:6–16), calling her to live according to God's will (Jer. 22:3–5; Hos. 6:6; Mic. 6:8). The failure that resulted in judgment also held the promise that a redeemer would come who would establish the kingdom characterized by *shalom* (Isa. 2:4; 9:6–7; 42:1–4; Jer. 31:31–34).

Throughout his ministry, Jesus announced the kingdom (Mark 1:15; Luke 16:16). As the fulfillment of the prophetic hope, Jesus brought *shalom* (Luke 1:32–33, 79; 2:14), which includes reconciliation with God through repentance (Matt. 4:16) leading to salvation (John 1:1–18; 3:16) and transformed relationships (Matt. 5–7; Luke 6; John 13:34–35). In establishing the kingdom, Jesus reclaimed that which was lost in the fall (Matt. 13:31–33) and called his followers to do the same (John 20:21). The church, as the community of God's redeemed people (Matt. 18:20; Rom. 12:5–8; 1 Cor. 12; Eph. 4:1–16; 1 Peter 4:10–11), is called to fulfill the mission of Christ in creation (Eph. 1:20–23; 3:10–11).

Holistic mission is the commitment to all that the church is called to do, which includes the GREAT COMMISSION (Matt. 28:18–20) and the GREAT COMMANDMENT (Matt. 22:37–40).

Critical Issues. Central to the concerns of holistic mission is the relationship between evangelism and social responsibility. The contemporary concern arose out of the fundamentalist and liberal movements of the early twentieth century. The liberal movement moved toward a conciliar position with other religions and away from the issue of conversion, emphasizing cooperation on issues of social concern. In a strong reaction against the social gospel, evangelical missions emphasized the UNIQUENESS OF CHRIST as the only way of salvation and made evangelism the primary emphasis of the MISSIONARY TASK.

Evangelical concern over the relationship between evangelism and social concern has contributed to the multiplication of specialized organizations. This dichotomy has been reflected in the traditional evangelical missions emphases on evangelism and church planting despite their widespread involvement in education, health, and development. Growing out of the concerns for social needs, evangelical relief and development organizations have multiplied. Unlike traditional missions, the relief and development groups have concentrated on physical and social needs, cooperating with other groups in their efforts (*see also* DEVELOPMENT).

In the past two decades a shift has occurred, which is evident by comparing the Lausanne Covenant (1974) with the Manila Manifesto (1989). Both documents focus on evangelism, yet the latter emphasizes the issue of the whole gospel, demonstrating the wide acceptance of social

concern as an integral part of the Good News of Christ.

Current literature is exploring the biblical nature of transformation, the effects of differing worldviews, and the church's role in development. The internationalization of missions (*see* GLOBALIZATION) and the increased cooperation among organizations have functionally expanded the view of the church's role in the world and the necessity for a greater understanding of holistic mission.

DOUGLAS MCCONNELL

Bibliography. B. Bradshaw, *Bridging the Gap: Evangelism, Development and Shalom;* T. H. McAlpine, *By Word, Work and Wonder;* J. Matthews, *EMQ* 35:3 (1999): 290–98; D. Miller, *EMQ* 35:3 (1999): 299–302; A. Nichols, ed., *The Whole Gospel for the Whole World;* R. J. Sider, *One-sided Christianity? Uniting the Church to Heal a Lost and Broken World;* J. Steward, *Biblical Holism*: *Where God, People and Deeds Connect;* T. B. Yamamori, B. Myers, and D. Conner, eds., *Serving with the Poor in Asia*: *Cases in Holistic Ministry;* C. J. H. Wright, *Living as the People of God.*

Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God appears in Scripture from creation (Gen. 1:2) to re-creation (Rev. 22:17); from the Old Covenant (Exod. 31:3) to the New Covenant (Acts 2:1–4; Titus 3:5); and, wherever he appears he is the creative, dynamic life force of the Triune God. Who he is and how he functions becomes progressively known in the unfolding of salvation history. Throughout salvation history the Spirit empowers the people of God in making God known and experienced. The New Testament makes clear his deity and coequality with the Father and Son (Matt. 28:19; Eph. 4:4–6).

The word *ruah* appears some 377 times in the Old Testament and can refer to breath, wind, or spirit while the word *pneuma* appears some 387 times in the New Testament and can be translated by the same words. Approximately 350 times these words refer to the Holy Spirit with slightly less than 100 of these occurring in the Old Testament. The Holy Spirit is especially prominent at redemptive and revelational moments. He gives skill in building the tabernacle (Exod. 31: 1–5); inspires national and prophetic leaders (Num. 11:24–26; 1 Sam. 16:13; Ezek. 2:2); anoints Jesus for his mission (Luke 4:18); and empowers the apostles in proclamation of the gospel to Jews and Gentiles (Acts 2:14–21; 13:1–4).

The Spirit of God in the Old Testament. The Spirit makes his presence manifest during Israel's movement into nationhood, in clarifying and applying the Law, and as the promised Spirit who will empower God's Messiah and make the New Covenant possible.

God's command that Israel build a tabernacle brings forth the Spirit's creativity and power for skill in workmanship and wisdom in interpreting and applying the Law (Exod. 31:3; Num. 11:16). The Spirit is actively involved as Israel attains nationhood. The Spirit of the Lord *came upon* Othniel, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson, enabling them to deliver Israel from the oppression of the nations (Judg. 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 14:19). The Spirit of the Lord came upon Saul with power and he prophesied (1 Sam. 10:5–11). The Spirit later humiliates him when Saul strips off his clothes and prophesies (1 Sam. 19:23–24). The Spirit came upon David with power (1 Sam. 16:13). When David sins he pleads: "Do not . . . take your Holy Spirit from me" (Ps. 51:11).

The prophets are keenly aware of the role of the Spirit as they call Israel to holiness. But the prophets are especially sensitive to the Spirit's work during the age to come of which they often prophesy. The Servant of the Lord, who will usher in this age, will be filled with the Spirit to accomplish a worldwide mission (Isa. 11:1: 42:1; 61:1). The Spirit will give God's people a new heart and empower them (Ezek. 18:31; 36:26; Joel 2:28–32).

The Holy Spirit in the New Testament. The sharp sense of discontinuity felt when moving from the Old Testament to the New Testament is alleviated somewhat by the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus. The degree to which the Holy Spirit appears in the life of the early church, in Paul's letters, and in all parts of the New Testament is truly impressive. Jesus made it clear that his departure would be advantageous over his personal presence (Luke 24:49; John 16:5–15; Acts 1:8). The Spirit of God in the Old Testament quickly becomes known as the *Holy* Spirit in the New Testament. He is the gift of the Father, also called the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Jesus, or the Spirit of the Lord. The New Testament writers can refer to the Holy Spirit on a par with the Father and Son without any need of explaining this as a radical idea. The Holy Spirit is the sine qua non of the Good News (Acts 2:38; Gal. 3:2).

Jesus and the Spirit. Jesus' mission cannot be explained apart from the Holy Spirit. The Spirit launches Jesus into mission, leads him, fills him, anoints him, and gives him joy (Mark 1:10, 12; Luke 4:1, 18; 10:21). The Spirit's presence in his life cannot be measured (John 3:34). All the Gospel writers stress the empowering presence of the Holy Spirit in Jesus' ministry of preaching, healing the sick, casting out demons, and relieving suffering. The Spirit's presence in the life of Jesus confirms for John the Baptist his messiahship (John 1:33). John, as well as Jesus, stresses the importance of the Holy Spirit in the apostles' mission (Luke 3:16; John 20:22; Acts 1:8).

The Holy Spirit as the Missionary Spirit. Mission as glorifying God through reconciliation places the Spirit at the center of salvation his-

tory. The statement that "the Spirit of the LORD came upon David in power" (1 Sam. 16:13) clarifies David's statement to Goliath: "I'll strike you down and cut off your head . . . the *whole world will know* that *there is a God* in Israel" (1 Sam. 17:46).

The Spirit comes upon, falls on, clothes and enables judges, prophets, and kings to lead, war, prophesy, and make God known to the world. The new age will be characterized by God's empowering presence through the Spirit. The Messiah, the apostles, and all post-Pentecost disciples are people of the Spirit. While the entire New Testament is Spirit-imprinted, John, Paul, and Luke have the most profound pneumatology.

John: The Spirit as Jesus' Presence. Without question John's pneumatology is the most complex, rich, and exact of all the Gospel accounts. In John's theology the Holy Spirit is the "other" Jesus (14:16–17, 26). The Holy Spirit will replace Jesus, giving an even greater sense of God's presence, teaching the disciples and giving them divine illumination (16:4–15).

While John's pneumatology informs mission, three passages in particular provide a clear view of the relationship of the Spirit and mission. John the Baptist sees Jesus anointed for mission during his baptism and God reveals to him that Jesus will be known as "he who baptizes with the Spirit" (1:33). When giving the apostles the GREAT COMMISSION, Jesus "breathed on them, and said, 'Receive the Holy Spirit' (20:22). Just as God breathed into Adam the breath of life, so Jesus breathes on his disciples. The most detailed outline of the Spirit's ministry in the lives of those hearing the gospel is outlined by John in 16:8–11. The Spirit "will convict the world of guilt in regard to sin and righteousness and judgment." These three themes—sin, righteousness, and judgment—find a significant place in John. John's designation of the source of this conviction as the world indicates the mission application of this passage.

Paul: The Spirit as the Eschatological Gift. Paul is the theologian of the Holy Spirit. His letters are saturated with references to the Holy Spirit. Most of Paul's 145 uses of *pneuma* refer to the Holy Spirit. Paul uses the name *Holy* Spirit about sixteen times. His favorite word is Spirit, leading to some doubt on how best to translate some of his references. For example, the NIV translators see the Holy Spirit in Romans 1:4 and 2:29, but the majority of the NRSV translators see spirit here.

For Paul the Spirit is God's eschatological gift, who cannot be understood apart from the Good News. The Spirit initiates a person into Christ through regeneration (Titus 3:5), seals the person until the day of redemption (Eph. 1:13), assures the Christian of family life (Rom. 8:14), and enables the Christian to live the Christian life (Gal. 5:16, 22, 25). The church is the temple of the Holy Spirit, receives gifts from the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 12), and makes Jews and Gentiles one body (Eph. 2:19–22).

But some find Paul's rich theology of the Spirit incomplete or inadequate on mission. Why does Paul say so little about the Spirit's missionary role? Is the Spirit a missionary Spirit for Paul? Paul's call and commission comes from a revelation (Gal. 1:16). Paul's theological center can be found in eschatology. For Paul this new age has dawned through the resurrection of Christ and the coming of the Holy Spirit (Gal. 1:1–5; 4:4–7). Paul's conversion and call to mission, coming apocalyptically through his post-Easter experience with the risen Jesus, cannot be distinguished (Gal. 1:11–17). Paul's personal call to mission cannot be traced to the Spirit, but the Spirit is an eschatological gift, who longs for the conversion of the Gentiles (Rom. 15:8–22). Paul emphasizes the power of the Holy Spirit in his mission (1 Thess. 1:5–6). It is the Holy Spirit's power manifested by signs and wonders that confirms his apostleship and authenticates his mission (2 Cor. 12:12). The Holy Spirit gives gifts to every Christian, enabling each to minister for God (1 Cor. 12:7).

Luke: The Spirit as the Missionary Spirit. Whatever other contributions Luke makes, he is a missionary theologian and the centerpiece of his missionary theology is the Holy Spirit. Luke's focus on the Holy Spirit as the missionary Spirit begins with the announcement of John's birth to Zechariah (1:13–16). While the full manifestation of the Holy Spirit awaits Pentecost, an unprecedented outburst of charismatic activity occurs at the birth and launching of Jesus' mission. Zechariah, Elizabeth, John the Baptist, Simeon, and Jesus are all filled with the Holy Spirit (1:41, 67; 2:26–27). Mary, Zechariah, Simeon, and Anna manifest the presence of the Holy Spirit by prophetic activity (1:45, 67; 2:28–32, 38).

In Jesus' life "the Holy Spirit descended on him in bodily form" as he was praying after his baptism (3:21–22). He returns from the Jordan "full of the Spirit" and "was led by the Spirit in the desert," (4:1). After defeating the devil and defining the nature of his mission, he "returned to Galilee in the power of the Spirit" (4:14). In the synagogue of Nazareth, Jesus took the scroll of Isaiah and read these words: "The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach the good news to the poor" (4:18).

Concluding his mission through death and resurrection, Jesus commands his disciples to remain in Jerusalem for the empowering they would need to fulfill his worldwide mission (24:49; Acts 1:4–5, 8). Pentecost comes ten days after Jesus' ascension with mighty signs from heaven, enabling all those present to witness powerfully and persuasively. Peter's words from Joel emphasize the eschatological nature of this

outpouring. The Holy Spirit has now been poured out on all of God's people, giving them the ability to prophesy, leading people to "call upon the name of the Lord" (Acts 2:17–18, 21).

The Holy Spirit is the missionary Spirit, sent from the Father by the exalted Jesus, empowering the church in fulfilling God's intention that the gospel become a universal message, with Jews and Gentiles embracing the Good News. The Spirit leads the mission at every point, empowering the witnesses and directing them in preaching the gospel to those who have never heard, enabling them with signs and wonders.

Conclusion. Scripture is clear and emphatic: The Holy Spirit is God the missionary Spirit. He broods over emptiness and formlessness. Whether in the life of Israel, Jesus, or the church, the Spirit empowers the people of God in proclaiming and witnessing to the nations. He is the eschatological gift of God, enabling Christians to experience the "already" of the kingdom of God while living in the present evil age. The Spirit constantly motivates and empowers the church in reaching the unreached.

HAROLD G. DOLLAR

Bibliography. H. Boer, *Pentecost and Mission;* C. Brown, *NIDNTT,* III:689–709; F. W. Dillistone, *The Theology of the Christian Mission,* pp. 69–80; G. D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul;* G. W. H. Lampe, *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot,* pp. 159–200; R. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology: With Special Reference to Luke–Acts;* R. Stronstad, *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke;* B. B. Warfield, *Biblical and Theological Studies,* pp. 127–56.

Human Condition in World Religions. Common to most religions is the notion that human beings—and, in many cases, the cosmos at large—suffer from some kind of undesirable condition. Violence, murders, and wars; natural disasters such as earthquakes and floods; the inability of people to get along with each other; illness and death; a sense of anxiety and alienation—all of these indicate that something is seriously amiss in our world. A sense of longing for the transcendent suggests a reality beyond the world of ordinary experience, and religions characteristically hold that our ultimate well-being is linked to this transcendent realm.

However, in spite of these common themes the various religions offer quite different diagnoses of the human predicament. Monotheistic religions generally regard the problem in terms of an unsatisfactory relationship between God the Creator and his creatures. Central to Christianity, for example, is the idea of SIN as deliberate rejection of God and his righteous ways. The biblical view of sin must be understood with reference to a holy and righteous God to whom human beings are morally accountable. Sin includes not only individual acts that transgress God's righteous standard but also a condition or state of rebellion against God, resulting in alienation from God. The original sin of Adam and Eve resulted in a condition of sinfulness that has been passed on to all humanity (*see also* FALL OF HUMANKIND). The suffering and evils we experience are all due ultimately to sin and its tragic consequences.

JUDAISM, rooted in the Hebrew Scriptures, has focused extensively on the PROBLEM OF EVIL and suffering. Although it acknowledges the heart of the problem as human moral failure in committing sins against God, Judaism generally does not share Christianity's belief in original sin and total depravity. Rather, a more optimistic view of human nature stresses original virtue and the capacity, with God's gracious help, of working toward progressive moral development.

ISLAM holds that human beings have erred by straying from the right path of obedience to Allah. But sin in Islam is more a weakness or deficiency in human character rather than the radical corruption of human nature. People are subject to temptation from Iblis (the devil), but it is within their power to resist and remain faithful to Allah. The suffering and trials we encounter in this life are regarded not only as punishment for individual sins but also as Allah's way of testing the sincerity and faithfulness of his followers.

Quite different views of the human predicament are found in religious traditions originating in the Indian subcontinent. Here the problem is *samsara,* the wearisome and repetitive cycle of rebirths through which one transmigrates in accordance with *karma.* Birth leads inevitably to death. Death in turn inevitably results in rebirth in another body, and it is the impersonal cosmic law of *karma* that determines the conditions of each existence. HINDUISM, BUDDHISM, and JAINISM, although differing in certain key respects, all accept the framework of *samsara* and *karma*, and thus the religious goal came to be identified with liberation from *samsara* by rendering ineffective the principle of *karma.*

In spite of this common framework, however, various traditions within Hinduism and Buddhism give different views on the nature of the problem. Often the root problem is identified with ignorance *(avidya),* or holding false views about reality resulting in *samsara.* But even here various differences emerge. In Advaita Vedanta Hinduism *samsara* arises from and is rooted in false views about the nature of Brahman and the relation of the self to Brahman; in Theravada Buddhism, by contrast, it is the false belief in an enduring, substantial self (*atman*) which, when combined with desire and craving, results in suffering and rebirth. Buddhism identifies the

human predicament with the claim that all existence is characterized by pervasive suffering, dissatisfaction, and impermanence.

In Chinese religious traditions, or at least non-Buddhist traditions, the human predicament is not understood in terms of the cycle of rebirths so much as failure to attain the proper balance and harmony within the social nexus, which in turn is patterned after the cosmic harmony of Heaven and the Tao. Proper alignment and harmony—within the person, the familial and social contexts, the realm of ancestors and spirits, nature, and the cosmos at large—result in human flourishing. Disharmony on any level can result in the suffering and problems encountered in ordinary life. TAOISM in particular emphasizes balance and proper alignment with the Tao, the Way or eternal principle immanent within the cosmos. Problems in society are due to the imposition of artificial constraints that prohibit the free expression of life in accordance with the Tao. CONFUCIANISM, by contrast, has been concerned with cultivating proper relationships and order within society based on virtue and moral character. With Mencius, and later Chu Hsi, Confucianism has emphasized the inherent goodness of human nature; evil results from corrupt external influences. On a popular folk level, the reality of the spirit world and the importance of proper alignment with spiritual powers is indicated by widespread practices of divination, ancestral rites, and recognition of a vast array of deities, spirits, and demons that can influence life in this world for good or ill.

Animistic traditions and primal religions, which do not make a sharp distinction between the world of ordinary experience and a transcendent spiritual world, attribute problems in everyday life such as illness, death, natural disasters, wars, and infertility to various spiritual powers believed to be capable of impacting affairs in this life. Thus, great care is taken to maintain proper rituals through which the many ancestors, demons, spirits, and gods who hold such power can be appeased.

The recognition that something is profoundly wrong with the way things are can be a point of contact between the Christian gospel and followers of other traditions. Augustine captured this sense of alienation well in his statement at the beginning of the *Confessions:* "You [God] have made us for yourself, and our hearts are restless and will find no rest until they rest in you."

HAROLD A. NETLAND

Bibliography. J. Bowker, *Problems of Suffering in the Religions of the World;* S. G. F. Brandon, *Man and His Destiny in the Great Religions;* H. Netland, *Dissonant Voices;* D. Noss and J. Noss, *A History of the World's Religions.*

Humankind, Doctrine of. The Bible gives clear teaching on humankind's origin, nature, and destiny (Gen. 1–2; Ps. 8; Acts 17:16–31; Rev. 5:9; 7:9; 20:1–6). Humans are the result of a direct act of divine creation in which God declares they have been made in his image (Gen. 1:26–27). The IMAGE OF GOD involves humans relating to the earth as vice-regents, just as God is sovereign over the entire universe; relating to God as children in filial fellowship, expressing a family likeness in righteousness, holiness, and integrity (Ferguson, 1988, 329). Humankind's position in creation is unique, a "little lower than the angels," yet with dominion and stewardship of all the rest of creation (Ps. 8).

From one human being God created every culture of humans to dwell on the face of the earth in a harmonious patchwork of cultural diversity (Gen. 1:28; Deut. 32:8; Acts 17:26). Humankind in its origin is one, from one set of human parents, and that unity is more basic to the Scripture's understanding of humankind than the equally God-ordained cultural diversity.

Though after the fall and flood God left humans in cultures to go their own ways and did not punish them in each generation for their waywardness, still they are responsible to him, for he did not leave himself without a witness to his divine nature, power, and goodness (Acts 14:15–17; Rom. 1:19–20). His desire was always for humankind to seek him, find him, thank him, and worship him (Acts 17:27; Rom. 1:21). But because of sin, all humankind's religiosity is only blind groping and an ignorant, rebellious substitution of idolatry for the worship of the one true God (Acts 17:27–30; Rom. 1:21–32). So extensive have the effects of the fall been, that, left to themselves, humans do not seek God (Rom. 3:9–20) (*see also* FALL OF HUMANKIND).

Humankind's destiny is twofold. Those human beings, some from every tribe, language, people, and culture, to whom Christ has applied salvation from sin and who have responded in faith to the saving good news, will enjoy an eternity at the end of time in the glorious presence of their Savior (Rev. 5:9). Those who continue, without repentance, in their blind rebellion against the one true God will experience the eternal punishment that such sin requires (Matt. 25:41, 46; Rev. 20:15).

The biblical teaching on humankind challenges the WORLDVIEWS molded by the WORLD RELIGIONS. While Islam does follow the Genesis creation account in its understanding of the origins of the human race (Koran 15:29; 32:9; 38:72), the monisms of Hinduism and Buddhism, and the interpenetration of matter and spirit in Chinese thinking do not. Their systems cannot accommodate a Creator God who stands over against his creation, particularly its crown: human beings.

Christian teaching uniquely espouses a personal relationship between God and human beings made in his image. Human beings' position as vice-regents and stewards of all creation, with which Islam strongly concurs, stands against the passivity, the harmonious fitting into nature, which Eastern religions encourage.

The concepts of the image of God in humans and the basic unity of humankind provide a fruitful perspective for WITNESS. If all fallen human beings have the faint glimmers of the "family likeness," then as Paul at Lystra, the witness can appeal to common humanity as a means to overcome the ignorant rebellion of non-Christian religions (Acts 14:15). If what humans have in common is more basic than what divides them, then thoroughgoing cultural relativism as a barrier against CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION of the gospel is effectively dismantled. At the same time, if God's original design was for the earth to be filled with humankind living in a harmonious patchwork of diverse cultures, then ETHNOCENTRISM is effectively dealt with.

Today there is a call from inside and outside evangelicalism to somehow qualify the exclusive claims of Christ as unique Savior who must be particularly, explicitly owned as Savior and Lord by those who would be saved. But Scripture is unequivocal. Jesus is the only way salvation is accomplished (John 14:6; Acts 4:12). Explicit faith in him is the only way it is applied to humans (Rom. 10:13–17) (*see also* UNIQUENESS OF CHRIST).

Two passages capture the key concepts of biblical anthropology in their interrelationships (Gen. 2:7; 6:17). "And the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being [*nephesh*—soul] . . . every creature [*kal-basar*—all flesh] that has the breath [*ruach*—spirit] of life in it." Because of the range of meaning of the terms and their juxtaposition in various passages, there is an ongoing debate about whether the biblical view of the constituent elements of a human being is trichotomous (body, soul, spirit, 1 Thess. 5:23) or dichotomous (body and soul or spirit). If Genesis 2:7 and 6:17 may be taken as guides, together with other Scriptures, then the dichotomous approach seems best. Humans have a material component: flesh (a body) and spirit (an immaterial component). The soul refers to the whole person, though in various relationships.

The biblical teaching on the material component has both a positive and a negative aspect. Positively, though taken from the dust and in frailty returning to dust, a human's body is part of a good creation (Gen. 1:31; Isa. 40:6). Indeed, it is destined for resurrection as a glorified spiritual body (1 Cor. 15:44). Negatively, since the fall, the flesh, the body of death, has been the seat of the sin principle, which works its will out through the misuse of the body's appetites, the lusts of the flesh (Rom. 7:14, 18, 24; Gal. 5:16–24).

The immaterial or animating component of our constitution is spirit (Heb. *ruach;* Gk. *pneuma*). In the Bible the vocabulary can refer to breath (Gen. 6:17); the vital powers that sustain a person alive (45:26–27); and an aspect of the inner life, whether a disposition (Job 21:4; Ezek. 3:14) or the seat of cognition (Exod. 28:3) and will (Num. 14:24; Isa. 29:24). Scripture knows of nonhuman spirits, incorporeal, intelligent, feeling beings. Normally, this designates members of the demonic hierarchy (Luke 4:33; Acts 19:12–16). It can speak of a human's spirit, not only as that dimension of the person that relates to God (Rom. 8:16; cf. 1:9). The Scriptures also use it to refer to a human's mode of existence in a disembodied state, whether in this life (2 Cor. 12:12; cf. 1 Cor. 5:3; Col. 2:5) or after death in the intermediate state (Eccles. 12:7; Luke 24:37–39; 2 Cor. 5:1–5; Heb. 12:23).

The biblical terminology for soul (Heb. *nephesh,* Gk. *psychē*) participates in much of the same range of meaning as spirit, but with some significant differences. Soul can refer to breath (Ps. 107:5) and life (Gen. 9:5) or seat of life (Mark 8:35), but it does so in an extensive way. The term embraces the whole person, either in the sense of physical existence (Matt. 6:25; Luke 12:19; John 10:11; Acts 2:27); or being a living being (Gen. 2:7); or individuality as a self (Ps. 7:2), even to the human with powers of reason, emotion, and will (Col. 3:23; 1 Thess. 2:8; Heb. 6:19). Although Scripture first and foremost views the human being as a unity, it presents every person as having a spirit, in or which animates, a physical body. But it describes each of us as a soul.

It is true that soul sometimes refers to the inner person, both in terms of desires and inclinations (Prov. 23:2; Jer. 2:24), including religious ones (Deut. 6:5). Humans relate to God and experience final salvation or condemnation. Does this mean that the Scriptures also participate in Greek thought, seeing humans as possessing an immortal soul? The biblical evidence as a whole points in another direction, having to do with eschatological and soteriological matters in which the soul stands for the person and any immortality is contingent, dependent on God who sustains persons in ETERNAL LIFE.

Biblical anthropology also challenges other religious wordviews. Since Islam builds its understanding on the same Genesis passages, it participates in the same radical distinction between the material and nonmaterial in humans as Christianity does. It equates the concepts of "soul" and "spirit" and differs from biblical

teaching only in its view of the effects of the fall on the human race: the guilt is imputed to Satan, the sanctions and consequences to humankind.

Hindu thought from one standpoint views the *atman* (soul) as a distinct entity being reincarnated from life to life according to accumulated karma. From another, however, it participates in a monistic subjective ontology: all is soul. The macrocosm of *paranatman* (the universe in its true essence as Supreme Soul) is viewed as essentially identical with the microcosm of *atman* in the individual. True enlightenment and release come when persons lose their identity in the universal consciousness (Supreme Soul) and are united with it in universal Bliss. Biblical thought challenges this monism as idolatry: deification of the human soul. It presents a solution to the problem of sin and suffering that is holistic, life-affirming, fully satisfying for the whole self.

In Buddhist thought the ontological soul is nonsubstantial and illusory. The most troublesome, but, when properly understood, most promising statement according to Buddha is "I have no soul." The trouble comes from realizing the soul does not exist. The liberation comes from realizing that "I" also does not exist. The embracing of radical nonexistence is Buddhism's way of dealing with the pain of illusory reality. Christians have hope for Buddhists for they declare that pain can be reckoned with, if we embrace an ontology with a transcendent, gracious, Creator God at the center guaranteeing the reality of and basic goodness of created existence. He created humans in his image as living souls, with the purpose that they relate to him forever in love and worship.

Animistic thought posits a world full of souls, understanding the world within the framework of immanent power. The vital principle inhabits whatever moves and lives. For humans there is an internal soul, soul-substance, which animates the body and temporarily resides in vital centers or products related to them (saliva, sweat, blood, sperm, tears). This is not a distinct entity, but an animating power made known through functional props (heart, brain), images (shadow, ghost), symbols (name, character sign), or its activities. There is an external soul, powers of the soul located outside the body. Here animists speak of the ability to leave the body and the fact of animal (totem) and human (shadow) doubles. Souls whether malevolent or benevolent may be manipulated, and must be appeased.

Chinese thought participates in this animistic thinking through its conception of the interpenetration of the material and nonmaterial aspects of the human. By linking the two souls of humans, *po* (spirit of the physical nature) and *hun* (a person's vital force: consciousness, intelligence), with the two essential components of the universe, yin and yang, the former acquire the same quality of interpenetration as the latter have. The vital force principle, *chi,* endows some with pure *po* and others with an admixture of evil. By education, the soul becomes an increasingly refined vital force that mediates between the human world and the spiritual realm. With "soul force" humans can be in touch with the dead and the highest spiritual realm: heaven. The soul helps the human achieve harmony with nature and to enter communion with the universe.

Biblical teaching, while concurring with the reality of the spiritual realm, presents a much simpler and unified view than animism does. By seeing humans as being a soul with body and spirit, made in God's image with dominion over creation, the fear engendered by a false enchantment of reality through multiple souls, inhabiting multiple phenomena, may be overcome. Again biblical teaching has good news for Chinese thought. Humans are not under an ontological bondage to evil, which is inextricably mixed with the good in the soul. Rather, there are such distinctions between the Creator and the creature, humans made in God's image, yet fallen, that salvation can be achieved through the Creator God's atoning sacrifice of his Son. True harmony is reconciliation with God the Creator in Christ.

William J. Larkin Jr.

Bibliography. J. Ching, *Confucianism and Christianity: A Comparative Study;* S. B. Ferguson, *NBD,* pp. 328–29; D. C, Fredericks, *NIDOTTE,* 3:133–34; *The Hindu World: An Encyclopedic Survey of Hinduism.* 2:250–52, 425–26; C. Riviere, et al., *ER* 13:426–31; 438–43; 447–50; 460–65; C. Schultz, *EDBT,* pp. 602–04; M. Van Pelt, W. C. Kaiser Jr., and D. I. Block, *NIDOTTE,* 3:1073–78.

Image of God. "Imaging God" means showing God's attributes in actions and attitudes, words and works. God designed humans to fellowship with him, obey him, administer for him, and imitate him, including procreating more images, naming, prophesying, and influencing for righteousness. Thus work of all types, "secular" and "sacred," images God, especially when energized with the Spirit's loving power that brings all things into submission to Christ (Ps. 8:4–6; Col. 1:15–20).

God created humans as his images or "royal representatives" to glorify him. "Image" implies an audience, so imaging God was in itself a missionary endeavor. God assigned his royal priestly representatives to spread out and subdue the earth, including all the wilderness outside the Garden and the rebellious creature who would tempt the new couple to sin (Rom. 16:19–20).

God instituted the family as imaging procreation and organization, relating creatively and ruling beneficently. From the very beginning God

designed individuals and families to glorify him as ambassadors, royal priests and prophets, "missionaries." The only thing that changed through time under Israel and then via the GREAT COMMISSION was the specificity of the message God's people were to take to the world. The core message has always been "follow the true God like we do, and let us show you the way."

Image as a Missionary Polemic against IDOLATRY. This missionary message directly conflicted with the message of the images of other nations. Images from wood, clay, and metal conveyed the message, "worship our gods." The creation account displays the superiority of persons as God's living images over Baal's lifeless images. Worshiping God with manufactured idols was futile (Exod. 20:4–5). The polemical intent of Genesis 1:26–28 may be paraphrased: People make images of Baal. Can you show me an image Baal has made of himself? God made humans as images of himself, so far superior to images of Baal as God himself is superior to Baal! Individually and corporately, in words and works, we show what God is like. This is our responsibility. Don't reduce your beautiful complexity to a statue! How can an idol ever replace you: living, breathing, walking, talking, authoritative representatives of our God?!

The polemic continues in Genesis 5:1–3, when God's image procreates in its own image—what image of Baal can do that? And in Genesis 9:6 the Lord states his justice in a manner the surrounding nations could easily understand: "If you attack the image, you attack God." When asked to summarize righteousness, Christ essentially asserts the converse, "If you love the image, you love God" (Matt. 22:37–40; 1 John 4:20–21).

The biblical basis of civil government rests on the foundation that we each represent God to one another. Every person continuously images God in basic minimal ways: God's breath blows through our being; God's life flows in our blood; God's light shines in our eyes. Every person must be treated with dignity as valuable to God. From the preborn to the terminally ill, from the profoundly handicapped to the profoundly rebellious, every person images God and may not be violated with impunity (James 3:9; *see also* PERSON, PERSONHOOD).

The prophets expand this polemic, insisting that individually and corporately Israel is God's image, welded together by God's strength, held upright by his power, decorated by his glory, enlivened by his Spirit-breath. When the nations bow before their images seeking guidance and power, their images remain silent. But when the nations listen to believers (God's living images), through those royal representatives God guides the nations and promises to bless their obedience to his Word with the protection and provision, fecundity and fertility their gods fail to provide them (Isa. 40:18–31; 41:7–10; 41:22–42:1; 57:13–16; Jer. 16:18; Hab. 2:17–19).

Israel images God as children image their parents (e.g., Exod. 4:22; Deut. 32:5–6, 15–20). Israel glorifies God as a missionary to the nations in the same way a good servant accurately represents (glorifies) his or her master (Isa. 44:21–26; 49:3–6). On the other hand, when Israelites worship the images of the nations' gods, they become like those images. The prophets describe an Israel which had become like the idols she worshiped: deaf, dumb, and unclean. Eventually God will cleanse Israel of the idols, removing hearts of stone, and breathing his Spirit into them: a re-creation of Adam, a renewal of God's image (Ezek. 36:25–27; cf. Ps. 115).

Transformed into the Image. Today the church images God corporately and individually, as God's Spirit transforms believers into Christ's image. Moses implied that a person fully images God by keeping God's Law (e.g., Deut. 13:17; 14:2). In the New Testament, Christ "is the true image" (2 Cor. 4:4), in part because he perfectly kept the Law. We all are created "as God's image," for the purpose of representing God by fulfilling the Law of Christ.

Because the Spirit writes the Law in our hearts, we have the opportunity to represent God in a more complete way than could persons prior to the NEW COVENANT (Eph. 4:23–24; 2 Cor. 4:1–6). Believers become God's images more fully by Christ's righteousness judicially applied to us and by the Spirit's empowering us to live out Christ's righteousness. In this way we display God's glory shining through our holy love (2 Cor. 3:18; Eph. 3:10).

Being conformed to the image of Christ is inherently evangelistic and missionary (Phil. 1:27–2:16). As we act more every day like a child of our Father, a brother of our Lord, our family resemblance works itself out in all relationships, all activities, undergirding and enabling our witness.

Children Image Parents. Imitating God, Adam and Eve procreated a son in their own likeness, as their image (Gen. 5:1–3; Luke 3:38). Children represent their parents by being like them in many ways: physical appearance, values, and will. Believers carry on this responsibility by speaking and acting on God's behalf, sharing his goals and values, mirroring his mighty abilities (Isa. 43:6–7). Our goal is to represent our loving Father perfectly (Matt. 5:45, 48). Our Lord repeatedly said that to look at him was to look at his Father, to honor him was to honor his Father (John 5:19–27; 14:9). Hebrews emphasizes the parent-child relationship as central to the concept of image: "The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being" (Heb. 1:2–5; 2:6–13). In loving actions we honor our Father; in unrighteous actions we dishonor him by grotesque caricature (1 John 4:12, 20).

Persons who behave in an anti-Christ manner may be labeled "children of your father the devil" (John 8:44).

Corporate Representation. We image God by functioning together as men and women (Gen. 1:27–28; 1 Cor. 11:7). Every individual represents God at some level, but corporately we image more fully and clearly. A single man and woman working in godly cooperation with one another more fully represent God than either working alone. The two married and parenting godly offspring represent God even more fully. A gathering of godly individuals and families into God's Family, Christ's Body and Bride, shows a watching universe even more fully and clearly what God is like (1 Cor. 12:27; Eph. 3:6, 9–11; 5:1ff.; Rev. 22:17).

DOUGLAS J. VARDELL

Bibliography. N. T. Anderson and R. L. Saucy, *The Common Made Holy: Being Conformed to the Image of God;* G. W. Bromiley, *ISBE Revised,* 2:803–5; G. Edwards, *The Divine Romance: The Most Beautiful Love Story Ever Told;* M. J. Erickson, *Christian Theology;* idem, *Readings in Christian Theology,* vol. 2, *Man's Need and God's Gift;* R. S. Greenway and T. M. Monsma, *Cities: Missions' New Frontier;* R. E. Hedlund, *The Mission of the Church in the World: A Biblical Theology;* C. F. H. Henry, *EDT,* pp. 545–48; D. J. Hesselgrave, *Communicating Christ Cross-Culturally,* 2nd ed.; idem, *Counseling Cross-Culturally;* M. G. Kline, *Images of the Spirit;* idem, *Kingdom Prologue;* J. D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence;* C. G. Olson, *What in the World is God Doing?;* A. P. Ross, *Creation and Blessing.*

Incarnational Mission. The dramatic opening of John's Gospel is foundational for understanding the meaning and implications of "incarnational mission." "In the beginning was the Word," the apostle wrote, "and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word became flesh and lived among us . . ." (1:1, 14). The fuller context of the passage suggests that in Jesus, God identified thoroughly with humankind, and that God came in Jesus for the express purpose of disclosing not only God's love but also God's salvific intent for the world (3:16–17).

However the Gospel writer may have understood the nature of Jesus, the church has steadfastly regarded the incarnation to mean that God was "enfleshed" in Jesus. All the Gospels bear witness to the fact that Jesus was born in a specific time and place, into a particular culture, and that he lived, matured, worked, ministered, and died as a human being. In Jesus—who came to be called "the Christ" or the Messiah—God was thereby revealed as love, self-giving love, love vulnerable to the exigencies of human life including the assault of evil and death. Yet evil was not victorious. It was instead inexorably defeated in Christ's death and resurrection. God became a human being to redeem all humankind from the destructive power of sin and to reconcile and transform the whole of creation.

Belief in the incarnation raises profound questions about the nature of God and about the nature of Jesus Christ. Yet, from the earliest attempts to grapple with and understand who Jesus was, the incarnation—God's assuming humanness—has been pivotal in comprehending the Christian faith. The earliest church councils discussed, debated, and concluded that the "God was *in Christ*" affirmation (2 Cor. 5:19) means that Jesus was fully human and fully divine. Explications (or the theology) of the incarnation are found not only in Scripture, but also in a succession of creeds. Three branches of Christianity, especially the Orthodox, as well as Roman Catholic and Anglo-Catholic, customarily give more attention and emphasis to the doctrine of the incarnation than do Protestants. In fact, some evangelical theologies tend to accentuate the divinity of Christ so disproportionately that the ultimate result is a kind of Christological docetism in which the human nature of Jesus is virtually eliminated or is little more than a facade for his divinity. Maintaining theological balance has never been easy, as any comprehensive survey of the history of theology reveals. Yet when either the divinity or the humanity of Jesus is over-emphasized, the outcome is a distortion of the nature of Jesus as represented in the New Testament. Mainstream Christianity has been unwilling to relinquish either the divine or the human nature of Jesus, though some theologians have given more attention to the meaning of the incarnation than others. Grassroots believers, meanwhile, appear to be satisfied to confess that in Jesus Christ God was uniquely revealed in history, and that in Jesus Christ the divine intent for humanity was definitively imaged. That there is mystery here no one denies. As Archbishop William Temple put it, anyone who professes to understand the relationship of the divine to the human in Jesus Christ simply demonstrates that he or she has failed to understand the significance of the incarnation (p. 139).

To refer to the incarnation as mystery, however, is not to suggest that it is "beyond us" or a kind of theological icon. Quite the contrary. As Donald Baillie said, the mystery will always be mystery, but the mystery is lessened once we realize that believing in the incarnation means accepting a paradox "which can to some small measure be understood in the light of the 'paradox of grace'" (p. 131). For the incarnation was not and is not primarily a doctrine. It was and is an event. It was a life lived, and it is a life to be lived. "He was made what we are," declared Irenaeus, "that He might make us what He is Himself" (*Adv. Haer.,* Bk. v. Pref. cited by Baillie, ibid.). Thus Paul could make the staggering claim, "For me to live

is Christ" (Phil. 2:21). So committed was the apostle to the Christ who summoned, transformed, and "missioned" him, and so determined was Paul to communicate the same good news Jesus fleshed-out, that he could say, "I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I who live, but it is Christ who lives in me" (Gal. 2:19–20). In these words believers find the most significant implication of the incarnation, namely, that Jesus Christ can be fleshed out in the lives of those who follow in Jesus' steps (1 Peter 2:21). In essence, therefore, this is the mission of Jesus' followers, to walk in Jesus' steps.

Common in Catholic theological tradition is the idea that the incarnation of Christ is the link between God and the institutional church, or, even more specifically, it is the link between God and the sacraments by which believers become "partakers of Christ." It is a short step, therefore, from seeing the SACRAMENTS administered by the church as means of grace to regarding the *plantatio ecclesiae* as extending the incarnation.

In 1838, with the publication of his *Kingdom of Christ,* British theologian Frederick D. Maurice went beyond the conventional Anglo-Catholic understanding of the incarnation by positing specific social and political implications. In a sense, Maurice anticipated the approach to the life of Jesus developed by many liberation theologians during the last quarter of the twentieth century. For in terms of the social and political significance of the incarnation, it has been the liberation theologians who expounded the relationship of the incarnation in the world today. Jesus, they underscore, was born in a religio-political context of suffering, oppression, and injustice. He was counted not among the rich or the powerful but rather among the common, the nondescript folk from the hill country of Galilee. To inaugurate his mission, nonetheless, Jesus made an astonishing association: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free, [and] to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor" (Luke 4:18–19).

His mission, as he described it, was to liberate the impoverished, the imprisoned, the sightless, and the oppressed. As it turned out, it was these kinds of people who became Jesus' principal followers—the poor, the sick, the disabled, the despised, the marginalized, and the alienated—women, tax collectors, prostitutes, and others whom society scorned. Moreover, it was from these that Jesus chose his disciples whom he declared were "the salt of the earth" and the "light of the world" (Matt. 5:1: 13, 14).

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Latin American liberation theologians, following the lead of the SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL, began asking what the incarnation of Jesus implied in a world beset with injustice, hatred, poverty, exploitation, premature death, and hopelessness. Though their response to the question incited intense debate—and more resistance than support from "officialdom"—the basic question they asked still begs to be answered. Jesus, liberation theologians said, indisputably sided with the hurting, exploited, and abused of his day. This was his mission, and anyone who presumes to incarnate Christ's mission today will likewise stand with the suffering peoples of the world whether they are in America, Europe, Asia, or Africa (*see* LIBERATION THEOLOGIES).

Standing with the poor and oppressed does not mean ignoring or neglecting the mission of evangelization, but, as Mortimer Arias notes, evangelization can never be merely "verbal proclamation." Authentic evangelization will be also "the incarnation of the gospel" in the lives of Christ's people, Christ's community (p. 107).

Reflection on the meaning of "incarnational mission" can be found also in the writings of certain ecumenical and evangelical theologians. For J. R. Chandran of India, an incarnational view of mission means INDIGENIZATION. For Nigerian Emefie Ikenga-Metuh, it means CONTEXTUALIZATION for "God has always been incarnate in human cultures." For former World Council of Churches general secretary W. Visser 't. Hooft, it meant a holistic ministry. Other more recent examples are John S. Pobee's insightful *Mission in Christ's Way* and Jonathan J. Bonk's disturbing *Missions and Money.* Pobee, an African on loan to the World Council of Churches, spells out in detail the dimensions of an incarnational mission, while Bonk, a former Mennonite missionary and now associate director of the Overseas Ministries Study Center in New Haven, Connecticut, addresses the crucial issue of missionary prosperity, saying that economically affluent missionaries can never engage in incarnational mission for what they model is an "inversion of the Incarnation." Their prosperity makes it impossible for them to "identify with the life situations of the poor" to whom the gospel is addressed (p. 61).

Nearly a half-century ago one of the most respected and effective mission leaders among Southern Baptists, M. Theron Rankin, then the executive secretary of the Foreign Mission Board, envisioned a model of incarnational mission. "If God could have saved the world by remoteness," and achieved the divine purpose while remaining detached from humanity, Rankin asked, would there have been the incarnation? Then he added, the most effective witness the church makes will always be in the lives of those who in Christ's name bury themselves in the lives and struggles of another people, missionaries who serve the people, learn to speak their language, develop the capacity to feel their

hurt and hunger, and "who learn to love them personally and individually."

ALAN NEELY

Bibliography. A. Mortimer, *Announcing the Reign of God;* D. M. Baillie, *God Was in Christ;* J. J. Bonk, *Missions and Money;* J. R. Chandran, *Student World* 51 (1958): 334–42; E. Ikenga-Metuh, *Mission Studies* 6 (1989): 5–12; F. D. Maurice, *Kingdom of Christ;* J. S. Pobee, *Mission in Christ's Way;* T. M. Rankin, *The Commission* 15 (June 1952): 9; W. Temple, *Christus Veritas;* W. A. Visser 't. Hooft, *The Uppsala Report,* pp. 317–20.

Indigenization. In the broadest sense, indigenization is a term describing the "translatability" of the universal Christian faith into the forms and symbols of the particular cultures of the world. Still widely accepted among evangelicals, the word validates all human languages and cultures before God as legitimate paths for understanding his divine meanings.

Indigenization provided the freedom for the Greek translators of the Hebrew Old Testament (the Septuagint) to take a word like *theos* from the idolatrous world of polytheism and use it to describe the only Creator of heaven and earth, the God *(theos)* and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Indigenization enabled first-century Christian Jews in Gentile-dominated Antioch to cross a massive cultural barrier and begin preaching to the Greeks (Walls, 1996, 17). They knew that their time-honored word *Christ* would mean little to their neighbors. So they used another name to identify their Messiah in this new cultural setting: "the Lord Jesus" (Acts 11:20).

The same process of indigenization allowed freedom for the emerging churches of the world to wrestle with infusing traditional cultural and social practices with new Christian meaning. Patterns of worship and music, of initiation, marriage, and funeral rites, even of church structure and leadership could be adapted or transformed by the gospel.

The Boundaries of Indigenization. Indigenization is born out of the tension created by two realities. One is the recognition that Christians bring with their faith the particulars of their culture and social group and best appropriate that faith in terms of those particulars. The other is the recognition that this new Christian faith brings with it a universalizing factor that extends the Christian community past the particular borders of culture and group.

Indigenization as a process asks, How can the church be a universal, global Christian community and also a particular community, shaped within its own culture and society? How can the gospel flower be planted in new soil without also planting the foreign flower pot?

Working within these boundaries is not easy. How do the churches keep the balance between freedom to develop on their own path and allegiance to the transcultural gospel uniting all the churches? What should be the relation of a Christian church to its non-Christian past? When does indigenization in the name of Christian liberty slip into over-indigenization or SYNCRETISM? When does hesitation over indigenization slip into legalism and traditionalism?

Toward a Biblical Framework. The legitimacy of this process flows from the "accommodations of God himself" (Battles, 1977, 19–38). Revelation itself comes with a sensitivity to the time, place, culture, and literary genres of its receptors but never with capitulation to error. There is a history to special revelation; the condescending Father communicates truth to us in a form suited to our particular human situations (*see* BIBLE; Vos, 1948, 11–27).

Out of the reservoir of ancient Near Eastern metaphors God paints himself as the divine warrior (Exod. 15:1–3) come to deliver his people from Egypt. He reshapes the treaty language of the ancient Hittite codes from their polytheistic connections to draw a picture of the covenant made between Creator and creature, Redeemer and redeemed (Exod. 20:1–17). He encloses his eternal Word in the limiting wrappings of the Hebrew language, his own coming in the God-man Jesus Christ, the Word of God incarnate as a first-century Palestinian Jew.

In the fullness and power of his Holy Spirit he breaks through that Hebrew sociocultural world to proclaim Christ both across and within the global borders of cultural diversities and linguistic expressions (Acts 1:8). Pentecost transforms the Babel curse of diversity into global blessing; we are called to be all things to all people in order to save some at any cost (1 Cor. 9:23). The world's cultures become home where the gospel takes root. And the gospel becomes the leaven in which those cultures are judged, transformed, and liberated.

The Rocky Road of Indigenization. This apostolic balance did not always appear in the centuries that follow. Within the Roman Catholic Church, ACCOMMODATION grew as a middle ground of gradualism. The imperfections of the pagan world of nature were to be supplemented by the perfections of grace. Thus, in the seventh century Pope Gregory the Great could advise Augustine, his evangelist laboring in England, "to destroy the idols, but the temples themselves are to be sprinkled with holy water, altars set up, and relics enclosed in them."

Later Jesuit experiments particularly in China moved in a similar direction. MATTEO RICCI saw the Chinese homage to Confucius and to the ancestors as ritual expressions of gratitude not inimical to the Christian faith. He "found in Confucius the natural theology, the *preparatio evangelica,* of

China as his theological training had given him this for the West in Aristotle" (Allen, 1960, 39).

In Europe observers often matched Jesuit enthusiasm. The philosopher Leibnitz could argue, "I almost think it necessary that Chinese missionaries should be sent to us to teach us the aim and practice of natural theology, as we send missionaries to them to instruct them in revealed religion."

In the face of mounting opposition by the Dominicans, confusion, and misunderstanding, in 1744, the papacy said enough was enough. Such experiments in accommodation were condemned and Roman Catholic missionary churches found themselves required to reflect in every detail the Catholic customs of the moment. Not until 1938 was that ban lifted. And not until the years following the SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL (1962–65) did Roman Catholic missiology seek to reclaim and correct features of the accommodation model in what is now called INCULTURATION (Luzbetak, 1988, 82–83).

Protestant models in the nineteenth century promised more freedom but often practiced a similar reluctance toward indigenization. There were many reasons for the hesitancy: a long history of ETHNOCENTRISM that identified things Christian with the superiority of things Western; the shaping role played by the missionary "outsider" in the receptor culture; the sense that the "native church" was still too immature to be "let go"; the emerging national churches' own identification of the shape of Christianity with its European models.

The promotion of the "indigenous church formula" (*see* INDIGENOUS CHURCHES) in the latter half of the nineteenth century began to break through those patterns. Developed by the missionary community to identify the emerging church, the "three-self" understanding of the church as self-governing, self-propagating, and self-supporting became a stepping stone to other questions that would expand into the twentieth century.

The indigenous church began to ask, What were the implications of selfhood beyond the "three-selfs"? Could the local church possess all three selfs and still look and sound "foreign"? The recall of foreign missionaries during World War II and the breaking up of Western COLONIALISM gave the global church the long promised freedom to press these questions.

Indigenization became the slogan word under which such questions were asked. How could the church now be itself, responsible to the Lord and to its own cultural world (Beyerhaus and Lefever, 1964)? How could the church now planted on six continents be a viable, prophetic force in its own culture, reflecting the full power of the gospel in every part of its social context?

Since the 1970s the term CONTEXTUALIZATION has also been used to include these discussions and to add other topics. What of the self-theologizing of the global church? Indigenization is being seen as more than what is happening on "the mission field out there." It is a reflection process that does not exempt the West from self-analysis. Indigenization/contextualization now places the burden of initiative and responsibility "squarely on Christians in the local context" (Taber, 1991, 177).

HARVIE M. CONN

Bibliography. E. L. Allen, *Christianity Among the Religions;* F. Battles, *Interpretation* 31 (1977): 19–38; P. Beyerhaus and H. Lefever, *The Responsible Church and the Foreign Mission;* V. Cronin, *The Wise Man From the West;* L. Luzbetak, *The Church and Cultures;* C. Taber, *The World is Too Much with Us;* G. Vos, *Biblical Theology;* A. Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History.*

Inerrancy. Along with "verbal" and "plenary," both "inerrant" and "infallible" are terms the church has employed to indicate the divine truth and authority of the BIBLE. Each term carries a slightly different connotation. Verbal emphasizes that every word of Scripture is divinely authored and therefore carries God's authority; plenary notes that the divine authority is full and complete; infallible, that Scripture is incapable of mistake; and inerrant, that Scripture never wanders from the divine truth.

In the ancient church Irenaeus and Augustine represented the position of the churches of their day and handed this view on to the medieval and modern church (see the extensive list of citations in William Lee; *Inspiration,* Appendix G). At the time of the Reformation, the inerrancy of Scripture was embedded in the teaching of the Council of Trent (1545–63) and reaffirmed in the first Vatican Council (1869–70).

Luther and Calvin followed Augustine in defense of scriptural inerrancy. In the early Protestant confessions the emphasis lay on the full authority of Scripture, but this rested on the divine authorship and inerrant truth of Scripture. For Luther this is evident in his unequivocal endorsement of Augustine's doctrine of scriptural inerrancy (*"Holy Scripture cannot err"*—Luther, *Luthers Deutsche Schriften,* XXVII, 33); and from the fact that he found it necessary to expunge the Book of James from the canon of Scripture because he believed he had found an error in it (see the introduction to his *Commentary on Genesis* written in 1545 just before his death; and William Barclay, *The Letters of James and Peter*). Similarly Calvin charged Servetus with holding to a geographical error in the Bible, and the charge was dropped only when Servetus claimed not to have written or been responsible for that statement. Wesley argued that if we found but

one error in the Bible, we could never trust it as the Word of God (see *Works of John Wesley,* 8:45–46).

In holding to inerrancy the church has with rare exceptions argued that the method by which God secured an infallible Bible was certainly not dictation (in spite of the charges made by their opponents). If the Latin word *dictare* was employed to refer to Scripture (so Calvin, for example), the point was explicitly made (as by Calvin) that this was not a literal dictation. Human authors of Scripture reflected their own personality and employed their own vocabulary (see, for example, Luke 1:1–4 and John 20:30, 31).

The case for biblical infallibility has always rested firmly on the teaching of our Lord and of the Scripture itself about its divine truth. How, after all, could finite humans know the Bible was infallible as to heavenly reality and the prophetic future? If Jesus Christ is truly divine, then he is our divine Lord; and we must trust him in all he taught, including what he taught about the infallible authority of Holy Scripture (see, for example, Matt. 5:17–21; 19:3–9; Mark 7:6ff.; Luke 16:17; 24:25, 44, 45; and John 10:34, 35). Likewise, if we accept the divine commission of the prophets and apostles to speak the Word of God, we cannot consistently reject their authority when they teach the necessity of believing and obeying Scripture (see, for example, Pss. 19 and 119, especially vv. 60 and 160–168; 1 Cor. 2; 2 Peter 1:19–21; and 2 Tim. 14–17).

In recent years, though rarely in earlier centuries, some evangelicals have defended a limited infallibility or limited inerrancy of Scripture. Usually this takes the form of limiting scriptural infallibility to its ethical or theological teaching. Naturally we must not take every scriptural instruction given to an individual or a group in a specific situation as necessarily a divine command to be obeyed in the same way in all circumstances (*see also* HERMENEUTICS). What is right in one instance may be quite wrong in a very different context. Inerrancy should not be understood as an excuse to take texts out of context. Yet all Scripture is profitable for every child of God, and God never commands and expects us to do what is truly wrong in the specific situation he addresses (see Gen. 22:2; 12).

Neither does the Bible speak in scientific language. Nor does it seek to provide us with a neutral scientific history of Israel or of the life and teaching of our Lord. Nor does the Bible always speak in precise and exact language. Nor does the New Testament invariably quote the Old Testament the way a twentieth-century biblical scholar would exegete the Scripture in a university classroom. But, when properly understood, it always tells the truth; and it never teaches what, as a matter of fact, is not so.

Finally, it must be noted that the contemporary theological battleground over Scripture has shifted significantly in the latter half of the twentieth century. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the threat to biblical authority came from the disciplines of history, biblical criticism, and natural science. Not so today! The issue evangelicals most acutely face today is not, "Is the Bible objectively true?" More frequently it is likely to be, "Is objective nonrelative truth possible for finite human beings?" All TRUTH is relative, so it is argued; and I as a human being can possess only truth relative to me. And truth for me, as John Dewey and early pragmatists argued, is only what I as an individual hold to be true to enable me to adjust more comfortably to my environment.

While there are humbling lessons we need to learn from such relativists, Augustine, and before him, Aristotle, gave us an appropriate answer to such a position. To say one knows nothing is a fundamental nonsensical contradiction. If someone claims that he or she really does not know whether or not he or she exists, we can wash our hands of such a being and walk away realizing that such a being is functioning only as an animal, not as a human person. Such a view is as devastating to basic Christianity and to the essential gospel as it is to the infallibility of Scripture. And that is where the consistent evangelical wishes to stand.

Basic Christianity, the fundamental Christian gospel, the Lordship of Jesus Christ, and the divine authority and infallible truth of Holy Scripture—all hold together in a unity of truth. Trusting Scripture follows irresistibly from trusting Jesus Christ as Lord.

KENNETH S. KANTZER

Bibliography. J. Barr, *The Scope and Authority of the Bible*; D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge, eds., *Scripture and Truth;* H. M. Conn, ed., *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic;* N. Geisler, ed., *Inerrancy;* B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible;* N. Wolterstorff, *Divine Discourse.*

Jesus and Mission. The concept of mission is central to an understanding of Jesus because Jesus and his mission are virtually synonymous. So identified was Jesus with his mission that it became his very life. "My food," said Jesus, "is to do the will of him who sent me and to finish his work" (John 4:24).

Jesus' Sense of Calling to Mission. Any discussion of Jesus' understanding of mission must begin with Jesus' own profound sense of calling. There is no indication in Scripture that Jesus ever struggled with what he should do with his life or that he tried various options before settling on his chosen path. From the very beginning, he was committed to the will of God as revealed directly to him and mediated through his

reading of the Old Testament. Matthew sees this as operative even before Jesus' birth in the words of the angel to Joseph, "You are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). The only episode recorded in our Gospels from Jesus' first thirty years shows his early sense of calling. Just before he entered into adult life, Jesus knew what he was to do: "Didn't you know I had to be in my Father's house?" (Luke 2:49). At his baptism, Jesus told John it was necessary in order to fulfill all righteousness. That act of acceptance by Jesus of God's will was ratified by the voice from on High, "This is my Son whom I love; with him I am well pleased," accompanied by the descent of the Spirit of God (Matt. 3:13–17). After calling four fishermen to ministry, he began his next day in a solitary place, while it was still dark, in prayer. His disciples wondered why he was there and said everyone was looking for him. His reply was, "Let us go somewhere else—to the nearby villages—so I can preach there also. That is why I have come" (Mark 1:35–39). Later he would say, "the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45) and "the Son of Man came to seek and to save what was lost" (Luke 19:10). This sense of calling finds expression in the graphic words of Luke, "as the time approached for him to be taken up to heaven, Jesus resolutely set out [literally, set his face] for Jerusalem" (Luke 9:51). And what sustained Jesus in those last terrible hours on earth was his determination that the will of God be done (Matt. 26:39–44). Jesus' realization that he was to be the Savior of the world and his sense of calling to that task as the will of God for him is what gave shape to his life and ministry up to the very end.

Elements Shaping Jesus' Concept of Mission. There is no reasonable way that we can probe the mind of Jesus to determine exactly how this realization took precise shape, but we can look at three elements that went into the idea itself. The first of these is Jesus' understanding of the nature of God. For Jesus, God is compassionate, merciful, and loving. God is repeatedly called "Heavenly Father" and all that is best in fatherhood is to be found in God. Our Heavenly Father knows our deepest needs and is seeking to meet them (Matt. 6:25–32). And if human fathers, evil as they are, know how to give good gifts to their children, "how much more will your Father in heaven give good gifts to those who ask him!" (Matt. 7:11). The parable of the prodigal son, in which the father is really the key figure, pictures him as never giving up on the lost son and seeing him while still far off and lovingly welcoming him home. This love of God prompted him to send his own Son into the world so that the world might be saved (John 3:16, 17). The theme that God sent the Son is repeatedly emphasized by Jesus in the Gospel of John (5:36; 6:57; 7:29; 8:42; 11:42; 17:3, 8, 21, 23). The very essence of love is to give. God, as love, sent his Son as a gift to the world to provide the gift of salvation to those who would believe. Because Jesus understood God as love and himself as the expression of that love, he saw his mission as being sent by God to be the Savior of the world. So the nature of God as love shaped Jesus' understanding of his mission as the embodiment of God's loving purpose on earth.

The second idea that shaped Jesus' understanding of mission was his identification with the people of Israel. One aspect of God's original covenant with Israel was that Israel should be a blessing and that all the peoples of the earth should be blessed through her (Gen. 12:2, 3). Although this was interpreted by Israel essentially to mean that Gentiles who desired salvation could attain it by becoming a part of her, there were glimmers of a concept that Israel should go to the other nations taking the message to them. Jonah is an example of that, as is the message of Amos to the surrounding nations (Amos 1:9, 11, 13; 2:1). In large part, however, universal salvation was seen as eschatological, when Israel's God would be properly acknowledged as supreme over all the earth. It was this point Jesus picked up on in his correlation of eschatology and mission by postulating both a present and a future dimension to the kingdom. Inasmuch as the eschatological reality was present in and through his own earthly ministry, future reality was being brought to bear on the present. The knowledge of God which, in the future, will cover the earth like the waters cover the sea (Hab. 2:14) is now beginning its coverage in the mission of Jesus and will continue in the extension of that mission through his followers. Hence, the task of the church is to reach the ends of the earth and then the end will come when God draws history to a close in his own predetermined way (Matt. 24:14).

An aspect of Jesus' identification with Israel that is often overemphasized and sometimes misunderstood is his apparent confinement of his earthly mission to Israel alone (Matt. 10:6; 15:24). But this must be seen in the light of his prophetic mission of judgment to Israel. He was offering them their final call that in the mystery of God was to be rejected and from which would come the salvation of the world (Rom. 11:7–10, 25–36). This is seen most clearly in Jesus' explanation of his parables. Drawing upon Isaiah's call to make the heart of Israel calloused and their ears dull (Isa. 6:9, 10), Jesus said his teaching was to have this effect also (Matt. 13:10–15). What he was doing fulfilled Isaiah's prophecy, but its ultimate fulfillment was to be that blessedness had arrived which the prophets foresaw as eschatological salvation, including the Gentiles (Matt. 13:16, 17). Hence, Jesus could also

minister to the Gentiles as well, without any contradiction of his being sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 15:24).

The third idea that specifically influenced Jesus' concept of mission was that of the Suffering Servant as found in the Book of Isaiah. There is a collection of prophetic psalms in Isaiah (42:1–7; 49:1–7; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12; 61:1–3; see also Mark 10:45; Luke 24:26) that speaks of God's righteous Servant who would bring redemption to the world. These prophecies were partially fulfilled by Israel, who was also God's servant, but ultimately by Jesus who was to the highest degree both Israel and Servant. The Servant as portrayed by Isaiah was to suffer for the sins of the world, establish justice, provide salvation for the nations, be a light to the Gentiles, give sight to the blind, proclaim the truth, be a covenant to the world, dispense God's Spirit, make intercession for sinners, and make peace for all people. Here in prophetic word is the mission of Jesus made plain, as he himself knew. When he began his ministry in Galilee, in his hometown of Nazareth, he selected Isaiah 61:1–2 to read in the synagogue. After reading the passage he said, "Today this Scripture is fulfilled in your hearing" (Luke 4:20, 21). The whole of Jesus' life was lived out in fulfillment of the prophesied mission of God's Suffering Servant.

Jesus' fundamental mission on earth was redemptive and revelatory of God's saving will for the world. He embodied and revealed the loving nature of God that graciously gives. He also took up into himself the covenant made with Israel, fulfilling Israel's task of mediating God's salvation to the world and came as God's specially anointed Servant, the sin-bearer for all.

Jesus' Mission and His Followers. Jesus knew that the task of mission was not his alone, but was to be transmitted to his followers. In fact, he says it was necessary for him to depart so that they, through the Holy Spirit, could reach their own full potential (John 14:12; 16:7). This inclusion of his followers may be seen in Jesus' ministry from the very beginning. Jesus' first formal calling of the future leaders of his movement (Peter, Andrew, James, and John) was specifically to mission—"I will make you fishers of men" (Matt. 4:19). When he finally settled on twelve to represent and lead the group that followed him, he named them "apostles"—those who are sent (Mark 3:14)—emphasizing the nature of their calling. Their ultimate mission was not to stay indefinitely with him, but to go and proclaim the Good News of the kingdom (Luke 9:2). Indeed, the choice of twelve to lead was in itself a statement regarding mission. Jesus was establishing a New Israel and with that a renewed focus on Israel's place in the history of salvation, the historical mediator of God's salvation to the world. When the training of the twelve was sufficient, Jesus sent them in his own name (and power) on missions of their own, duplicating his own work (Matt. 10:1–7, 8). That was in Galilee. Later, in Judea, seventy-two were sent out in similar fashion (Luke 10:1). After Jesus' resurrection, the apostle John epitomizes this concept of mission in Jesus' own words, "As the Father has sent me, I am sending you" (John 20:21), where a double sense of mission is emphasized. Jesus had been sent by the Father and he sends out his followers to fulfill the mission the Father had given to him. The Gospel story ends in the words of the so-called Great Commission, "Go and make disciples of all nations" (Matt. 28:19).

It would be fair to say that the major focus of Jesus, in his relation to his disciples, was to prepare them for mission. This idea was enunciated over one hundred years ago by A. B. Bruce in *The Training of the Twelve,* where he saw the whole of Jesus' life as being directed to that end and more recently by Rainer Riesner in *Jesus als Lehrer.* The disciples sought to follow Jesus as far as was humanly possible and he set the example for them.

Conclusion. Jesus' sense of urgent divine mission penetrates the New Testament from beginning to end and ultimately goes back to Jesus himself. He was imbued with a sense of divine calling, he gathered his followers to support him in that mission, he commissioned them to proclaim the good news that he was bringing, he sent them out on preaching missions in his name, he accomplished the task given to him by his Father and left the fledgling church with the formidable task of going into all the world with the gospel, promising to be with them to the end of the age.

Walter A. Elwell

Bibliography. A. B. Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve;* R. E. Coleman, *The Master Plan of Evangelism;* idem, *The Mind of the Master;* F. Hahn, *Missions in the New Testament.*

Judgment. Even in the postmodern relativistic West, where judgment is repugnant, the chilling details of ethnic cleansing or child abuse haunt us with the questions, "When will the wicked be judged? Will justice ever be established?"

Sin and Justice. Created for God, humanity proclaimed its autonomy. This rebellion against God is the root of human evil and injustice to others (Rom. 1:20–32; 8:7). History is the narrative of human deceit, treachery, and persecution. Perhaps our actions are not so obviously wicked, but are hidden behind false smiles and vain civility. Or maybe we were like those who were unwilling to defend Jesus publicly when the crowd called for his crucifixion. Sins of commission as well as omission have just as deadly repercussions in society. So history prompts the constant

refrain, "Where is the God of justice?" (Mal. 2:17).

God made us accountable to himself, the Moral Judge of the cosmos (Rom. 2:15–16). We know wrongs must be righted. Even without considering restitution, we have a sense of what is necessary to begin righting a wrong. The offender should be forced to suffer this wrong in order to recognize the full depth of this injury. That is the purpose of retributive punishment as expressed in the Old Testament law of retaliation: those who injure their neighbor, whatever they have done must be done to them: fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth (Lev. 24:19–20).

The Final Judgment. Scripture's ultimate answer for evil is that God, the holy Judge of all the earth, will call every human to account for his or her life on the Day of Judgment (Pss. 5:4–6; 31:18; Matt. 12:36; Rom. 2:6–11; 1 Peter 4:5). This life has grave moral significance! Nothing can be hidden from God, not even our secret thoughts (Rom. 2:16). Every deed will be declared, from idle words to the failure to help the hungry (Matt. 16:27; 25:31–46; Rev. 22:12). We all face a future judgment of either exoneration or condemnation, receiving a welcome to heaven or the sentence of HELL.

But all have sinned (Rom. 3:23; *see also* DEPRAVITY OF HUMANKIND). So God's judgment will fall on all, except those saved by Jesus' work. For Christ, the final Judge, has already suffered the judgment for those who have "faith in Christ's blood" (John 3:18; 5:24; Rom. 3:25; 2 Cor. 5:21). And what God has already forgiven, he will not recall (Jer. 31:34; Isa. 43:25). So those in Christ will stand without accusation (Rom. 8:33–34; Eph. 5:27). It is precisely the gospel's offer of RECONCILIATION with God that occasions missions.

God's Judgment of Those He Loves. Scripture also teaches that God uses contemporary circumstances to test our hearts, discipline us, and direct us toward his righteous ways (Deut. 8:1–5; 1 Cor. 11:29–32; Heb. 12:5–17; Rev. 3:17–19). God will not let his people continue in SIN without judgment. So failures and persecutions should be catalysts for self-reflection and spiritual growth into Christ's image (2 Thess. 1:3–5; Col. 3:10). God's present judgment is not simply directed toward individuals (Rev. 2:5; 3:15–21). Believers need to attend to God's chastisement of every Christian institution, even the missions movement, so that we learn to embody Christ's humility (2 Cor. 6:2–11; 1 Cor. 4:9–16).

The Christian's Judgment of Others. The proclamation of God in Jesus Christ necessarily carries judgment against sinners. Furthermore, correction is essential to forming a church where the fellowship of believers self-consciously build up each other into Christ's body (Eph. 4:16). When preaching is easily turned aside, believers are obliged to help other believers recognize their sinfulness (Matt. 18:15–17; Gal. 5:26–6:2). When Jesus cautions, "Do not judge, or you too will be judged," he is not precluding preaching or reproof (Matt. 7:1–4). However correction must be in his name, so that even the admonisher remains subject to his Lord. Believers must never attempt to impose God's final judgment, but to overcome evil with good (Rom. 12:19–21). For God alone is the holy Judge.

TIMOTHY R. PHILLIPS

Bibliography. L. Morris, *The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment;* T. C. Oden, *Pastoral Theology: Essentials of Ministry,* pp. 206–19; D. M. Paton, *Christian Missions and the Judgment of God;* M. R. Talbot, *Reformation and Revival* 5:4 (Fall 1996): 117–34.

Justice of God. The evangelistic commitment of evangelical missions has continuously stressed the centrality of the cross of Jesus Christ as payment for the penalty for sin. This atoning work satisfies the requirements of the justice of God for eternal life. The Bible reveals, however, that the justice of God encompasses more than the spiritual dimension. His demands extend into the concrete realities of human social existence. For the last several decades this aspect of the justice of God and the relevance of this justice to the worldwide mission of the Christian church has generated vigorous debate within evangelical circles.

Opinions differ over whether social justice issues should be strictly distinguished from the mandate to evangelize the lost and instead be considered by individual Christians subsequent to conversion; whether social action should be understood as providing a bridge to evangelism by presenting opportunities for the verbal proclamation of the gospel of eternal salvation; or lastly, should the concern for social justice be seen as an integral part of the broader mission of the church in the world. In other words, is social justice the *by-product* of the mission of evangelism, the *means* toward accomplishing that foremost task of evangelism, or a *legitimate goal* of mission?

Background to the Debate. Evangelical missions historically have demonstrated an interest in matters of social import. Mission activity, at least to some degree, has been directed at the eradication of personal vices, the establishment of hospitals and orphanages, the promotion of literacy, and the provision of emergency relief from natural disasters. Critics, however, would suggest that these laudable efforts are but gestures of charity, which focus on the individual and ignore the systemic realities that perpetuate social ills. They posit that such endeavors also are limited by a missiological perspective that is

condemnatory of society and wary of close contact with a fallen world. Many locate the seedbed of this reticence to engage the larger context in the fundamentalist-modernist controversies of the early part of the twentieth century.

Nevertheless, in some evangelical circles there has been a broadening of the theology of mission over the last fifty years to embrace a more holistic framework (Van Engen; *see* HOLISTIC MISSION). This development represents a recuperation of evangelical roots in, for example, the influence of JOHN WESLEY (1703–91) and Methodism on English society, the successful efforts by William Wilberforce (1759–1833) and others to abolish the slave trade in the British Empire, and the two GREAT AWAKENINGS in the United States in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries which were concerned with improving the moral life of believers and fomenting Christian education and anti-slavery sentiments (*see* ABOLITIONIST MOVEMENT).

This debate concerning the relationship of justice issues to mission can also be placed within a wider global discussion. In the first place, reflection on the topic can be set against the backdrop of the history of missions around the globe. Some missiologists denounce what they consider to be the complicity of mission agencies with the European colonization of the TWO-THIRDS WORLD and the surfacing of contemporary North Atlantic economic neo-colonial attitudes in mission structures and operation (Costas). More nuanced approaches would suggest a chronological convergence and some ideological affinities of early missions with that colonizing activity and do recognize certain theological limitations. These responses offer a more positive evaluation of pioneer and modern missionary efforts (Escobar and Driver; Scott; Sanneh; Núñez and Taylor).

Second, the relationship between justice and mission has received attention at several international evangelical congresses. An increasing awareness of Christian social responsibility has been encouraged by these gatherings, beginning with Wheaton and Berlin in 1966, through Lausanne (1974) to Manila (1989). The WORLD EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP has sponsored various consultations and regional congresses to wrestle with justice. These meetings have witnessed the growing input of theologians from developing countries, who daily face the harsh realities of poverty and war, and of those whom some label "radical" evangelicals (e.g., Ron Sider and Jim Wallis). Several recently published missiology texts underscore the centrality of the justice of God for mission (Scott; Dyrness; Bosch). For certain missiologists this trend is cause for alarm, because the primacy of evangelism is perceived to be under threat. They liken this direction in missiological reflection to some of the theological options taken by the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES since its watershed assembly at Uppsala of 1968 (Beyerhaus).

Foundational Biblical and Theological Themes. The following brief survey establishes that the demand for justice, both spiritual and social, is dear to the heart of God. This all-encompassing justice should be central to the mission of the people of God in the world and incarnated within the community of faith. Different missiological positions, of course, will appreciate this mandate in their own particular ways.

The Fall and spread of sin. God announces in the garden that to eat the forbidden fruit will bring death (Gen. 2:16–17). Later revelation indicates that transgression brought spiritual death (Rom. 5:12–21), and the provision of covering through the death of an animal (Gen. 3:21) foreshadows the Law's sacrifices for sin and ultimately the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, Jesus Christ (e.g., Isa. 53:7–13; John 2:9; Heb. 9–10; Rev. 5:6–14). The first human death recorded after the Fall in Genesis 3 is fratricide. Cain kills Abel. Later, Lamech boasts of his intention of uncontrolled revenge (Gen. 4:2–9, 23–24). Cain is judged by God, and the impetuosity of Lamech is contrasted with calling on the name of the Lord (Gen. 4:10–16, 26; cf. 5:24). The Lord condemns the pervasive violence with a universal Flood (Gen. 6:11) but afterward delegates the authority to maintain justice to human agents and structures (Gen. 9:5–6; Rom. 12:17–13:5). These early chapters of the first book of the Bible disclose that, even as sin has both vertical and horizontal dimensions, the justice of God involves every dimension of human existence.

The call of Abram. The divine commitment to the various spheres of justice reflected in Genesis 1–11 serves as the framework for the call of Abram. Part of this charge is that he be a channel of blessing to the world (Gen. 12:3). This blessing involves worship and confession of the true God, as well as trusting obedience (e.g., Gen. 12:7–8, 14:18–24, 15:6, 18:17–19; *see* ABRAHAMIC COVENANT). The patriarchal accounts in Genesis demonstrate that the notion of blessing has a social dimension grounded in the character of God. For instance, Abraham intercedes for Sodom on the basis of divine justice (Gen. 18:22–32), a justice which demands chastisement, but that is tempered by mercy.

The exodus and Sinai. God responds to the cry of the Israelites in Egypt because of God's covenant, but action on their behalf also is motivated by compassion for their suffering of cruel infanticide and oppressive labor (Exod. 2:23–25). While they are miraculously delivered in part to be free to worship the Lord (Exod. 5:3), they are called as well to create a new type of society in the Promised Land. The Law given at Sinai (Exod. 20–40) and presented in the rest of the

Pentateuch reveals that God is founding an alternative community with a different kind of spiritual ethos and social ethic. The Lord desires justice among his own people, and their laws are to be a model and testimony to the surrounding nations (Deut. 4:5–8).

The Servant Songs of Isaiah. The themes of salvation and justice are repeated throughout these messianic passages (Isa. 42:1–9; 49:1–13; 50:4–11; 52:13–53:12). The ministry of the Servant will be to establish a reign of righteousness and peace in faithfulness to the God of Israel, a striking antithesis to the idolatry, war, and oppression that serve as the backdrop to this portion of Isaiah. This hope embraces all the nations of the earth and is secured by the voluntary self-sacrifice of the Servant.

Luke 4:16–20. This inaugural sermon of Jesus' ministry is based on Isaiah 61:1–2a (and 58:6b). That Isaianic passage, which describes a messianic jubilee for the nation of Israel, is now given a richer significance, even as Jesus declares its fulfillment. On the one hand, the mention of the poor, prisoners, the sick, and the oppressed anticipates the special targets of his ministry. A closer look at Lucan theology indicates that these terms have spiritual implications, too. His deeds and words are good news to those who are open to God and his Christ (6:20–26), whose bondage can be demonic (4:33–35; 9:1, 37–43; 11:14–28) and their blindness spiritual (1:79; 7:47; 24:47). His person and work exemplify the grace and exigencies of divine justice, and in his death it finds propitiation (Rom. 3:25–26; Heb. 2:17; 1 John 2:2, 4:10).

John 20:21. Some propose that the words of Jesus in John 20:21 (cf. John 17:18; Mark 12:28–31 and parallels) should be taken as the commission which defines Christian mission: the life and ministry of Jesus are a paradigm to be imitated (Stott). This perspective does not devalue evangelistic proclamation, which others consider the defining prescription in the other GREAT COMMISSION passages (Matt. 28:18–20; Mark 16:15–18; Luke 24:45–49), but argues rather for a more comprehensive understanding of mission—a holistic vision which would incorporate both the spiritual and social spheres of God's justice.

Finally, mention should be made of the theme of the KINGDOM OF GOD. The dynamic rule of God is inseparable from the justice of his character. Throughout history he expresses the demand for justice and intervenes to effect it in the various spheres suggested in the preceding survey. The future establishment of a kingdom of justice, in all of its breadth, is an integral part of the biblical hope.

M. DANIEL CARROLL R.

Bibliography. M. Arias and A. Johnson, *The Great Commission: Biblical Models for Evangelism;* P. J. Beyerhaus, *God's Kingdom & the Utopian Error;* D. J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission;* O. E. Costas, *Christ Outside the Gate: Mission Beyond Christendom;* W. A. Dyrness, *Let the Earth Rejoice: A Biblical Theology of Holistic Mission;* S. Escobar and J. Driver, *Christian Mission and Social Justice;* E. A. Núñez, C. and W. D. Taylor, *Crisis and Hope in Latin America: An Evangelical Perspective* (rev. ed.); L. Sanneh, *Encountering the West: Christianity and the Global Cultural Process;* W. Scott, *Bring Forth Justice: A Contemporary Perspective on Mission;* J. R. W. Stott, *Christian Mission in the Modern World;* C. E. Van Engen, *Earthen Vessels: American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880–1980,* pp. 203–32.

Justification. Justification is primarily a forensic term implying the results of God's work of declaring his elect to be righteous. The terms justification and righteousness are related in that they are both from the root *dikai,* having to do with both penalty (or punishment) and justice. Justification is a primary topic in the writings of Paul, who discusses the issue more than any other writer in the New Testament. Paul's mission was to preach the gospel to the peoples of the earth with a view to their being justified by grace through faith in Jesus Christ (Rom. 1:17).

There is both a generic use of the term justification and a technical use. Basically, the idea of justification is to be set right or to pronounce just. Thus, people may be justified among themselves as in James 2:21, "was not Abraham our father justified by works?" James is not declaring that Abraham was righteous before God because of works, but that from the human perspective, he was shown to be a righteous man (justified) by his works. The works were a result of his faith in God. His faith justified Abraham (Gen. 15:6; Rom. 4:1–3), his works openly demonstrated that faith, and therefore, in the eyes of people he was shown to be righteous (justified, James 2:21; see also, e.g., Deut. 25:1).

There is also a technical sense of the word in theological propositions. This is the forensic or legal declaration of one being declared just before God. Paul is the primary theologian of this doctrine in the New Testament. He begins by pointing out that "the doers of the law shall be justified" (Rom. 2:13). The context is that it was not enough to *claim* to do the law, one must *do* the law to be justified before God. He continues his argument by pointing to the condemnation of the whole human race (both Jews who trusted in their ability to do the law, and Gentiles who did not have the law) because "there is none righteous (in God's sight), . . . none who does good (by God's standard)" (Rom. 3:10–18). Therefore, "by the works of the law no flesh will be justified in His sight" (Rom. 3:20; Gal. 3:2, 16; 3:11). However, there was one Man who did keep the law, fulfilling its every demand. This law doer was Jesus Christ, the Second Adam, God who be-

came man (Rom. 5:15–19). In this sense, justification is recognition of fulfilling the requirements of the law and is an actualization of justice in declaring him righteous.

Theologically speaking, justification as it applies to other humans must be imputed because it cannot be earned and is not intrinsic to human nature. It is given as a gift to those who believe (Rom. 3:28) and this gift is available only by God's grace (Rom. 3:24). It is a divine act with a purely legal nature and not an infusion of moral quality into the character of the one justified. As the first Adam sinned and brought condemnation to the human race (Rom. 5:12–14), the second Adam lived righteously and provides justification for those who trust in him (Rom. 5:18–19). The fact that the Righteous One died in the place of unrighteous humankind (Rom. 5:6–9) provided the way in which God could declare righteous his fallen creatures yet remain righteous in himself. Thus, he is both just and the justifier of the one believing (Rom. 3:26). Thus Paul calls Christians to mission and gospel proclamation. "How can they learn without someone preaching to them? And how can they preach unless they are sent?" (Rom. 10:14–15).

The status of being justified does not in any manner assume that the one justified will cease from sin or that his or her character has become intrinsically righteous. Sinlessness is no more possible after being justified than before. When sin does arise in the life of a believer, the Father will discipline his children (Heb. 12) but it does not affect his or her justification because it was attributed upon faith not works. Paul raises the rhetorical question as to who could bring charges against the elect since "God is the one who justifies" (Rom. 8:33). If God has declared the sinner righteous, no one can bring condemnation to him or her. Justification is based upon the death and resurrection of Jesus and one's personal faith in that provision (Rom. 5:1, 9; 4:25).

For those carrying the message of justification to the world, the key elements must not be lost. The sin and darkness of the lost is well documented in both Scripture and the human condition. The need of the lost is to understand their insufficiency and God's gracious provision of justification by grace through faith. The bad news is that all have sinned (Rom. 3:23) and that the wages of that sin is death (Rom. 6:23). The good news (gospel) is that God has provided for sinners by his own grace and righteousness (Rom. 5:8–9). The church seems at times to have forgotten the message of justification and has set out to conform the world to standards they neither understand nor appreciate. It is typical of many Christians to stand back and condemn the lifestyles of the unregenerate and the social evils in the world without understanding that that is all non-Christians know. In this open depravity, the wickedness of humankind has highlighted the helpless condition of fallen humans. This provides a powerful environment for those who have experienced the grace of God to declare the love and provision of God. The Word of God offers a solution to the helplessness of humankind. The mission of the church is to proclaim this opportunity to be set right with God (justification).

ED GLASSCOCK

Bibliography. P. Enns, *The Moody Handbook of Theology;* R. W. Lyon, *BEB* 2:1252–54; L. M. Peterson, *ZPEB,* 3:764–73; G. Schrenk, *TDNT;* D. W. Simon, *DoB,* 2:826–29.

Kingdom of God. ***Terminology.*** No explicit use of the precise phrase "kingdom of God" occurs in the Old Testament, but if one looks at the Old Testament prophets through the teaching of Jesus and the totality of New Testament faith, one finds it is predicted as a future reality (the messianic age) in the ongoing redemptive purpose of God. In contrast, the New Testament uses this term or its equivalent (kingdom of heaven) more than a hundred times. This was the dominant theme in the ministry of Jesus and his use of the term seems to have oscillated between the primary concept of the rule or reign of God and the secondary sense of the realm over which he will exercise this rule (Luke 17:21 and Mark 14:25). Jesus on no occasion intimated that the kingdom actually existed prior to the beginning of his ministry (Luke 16:16). God's kingship is not unlike his providential care of his total creation: "Dominion belongs to the Lord and he rules over the nations" (Ps. 22:28). But his kingship is also eschatological: "In the time of those kings" (i.e., at a certain juncture in history) "the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that will never be destroyed . . . it will itself endure forever" (Dan. 2:44).

Old Testament History and Eschatology. God's kingship is identified with Israel, a people with whom he established a covenantal relationship that also involved a redemptive purpose: "All peoples on earth will be blessed through you [Jacob] and your offspring" (Gen. 28:14). Israel is to be "a light to the nations" within the sequence of history, extending the knowledge of God's salvation "to the ends of the earth" (Isa. 42:6; 49:6). In order that God might accomplish this he promised a NEW COVENANT that guaranteed Israel an imperishable communal existence (Jer. 31:31–37) and a messianic hope that would make possible the realization of her redemptive mission (33:14–22; Isa. 42:1–9). Israel's obedience in history will be related to the establishment of an eschatological order beyond history—"the age to come"—in which God's kingly rule will be fully manifested (Hab. 2:14) and in

which his new order will bring perfection to all creation.

Messianic Hope. This involves three separate and specific strands of prophetic expectation, and all three are related to God's redemptive purpose for the nations. First, a distinctly earthly kingdom shall arise within history through a "Messiah"—a physical descendant of David who will bring renewal to Israel and to all the world (Isa. 9:6, 7; 11:1–12:7). Second, this kingdom will also come as an abrupt intrusion into history, not unlike an apocalyptic visitation accompanied with cosmic upheaval. The key personage is likewise a "Messiah" and is described as "one like a Son of Man" possessing "authority, glory, and sovereign power." His kingdom "will never be destroyed." He will be worshiped by "all peoples, nations, and men of every language," and will bestow on "the saints of the Most High" this "everlasting kingdom" to be theirs "forever and forever" (Dan. 7:13, 14, 18, 22). The third strand focuses on a Servant of the Lord, neither openly messianic nor evidently supernatural, but one who is an innocent, willing person who vicariously suffers without protest and dies in order to make his people righteous. The Old Testament does not conflate these strands of prophetic revelation, hence an aura of incompleteness characterizes the Old Testament and inevitably arouses anticipation of more to follow (Luke 2:25, 38). But it must never be forgotten that in essence God will visit his people, and his kingdom will not be the result of historical forces, such as human achievement.

New Testament: The Gospels. The ministry of Jesus in the New Testament began in the context of John the Baptist's renewal movement in Israel. Expectations were aroused by his announcement of the coming of the kingdom and of One who would baptize "with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (Matt. 3:1–12). Then Jesus came forward and publicly identified with Israel through submitting to John's baptism. During this act of obedience he was both approved by his Father and anointed for ministry by the Holy Spirit (Mark 1:9–11). Almost immediately thereafter the Holy Spirit "sent him out into the desert" to confront and demonstrate his superiority over the devil (1:12, 13). In the months that followed his ministry was virtually identical with that of John; both spoke of the coming kingdom. The Baptist's imprisonment brought this renewal ministry to an abrupt end. From that time on Jesus went to Galilee and preached: "The time has come. The kingdom of God is near. Repent and believe the good news" (Mark 1:14). By this he was announcing the glorious fact that the kingdom of God was now accessible to all those who would submit themselves to his rule. And since Jesus immediately thereafter began to call people to discipleship and his service ("I will make you fishers of men"), it follows that involvement in the kingdom of God (living under his rule) includes public proclamation and evangelism (Mark 1:16–20).

When Jesus returned to Galilee "news about him spread throughout the whole countryside" (Luke 4:14). His earlier renewal ministry in Judea had opened synagogues to him. "Everyone praised him" (v. 15). But when he began to identify himself with the Servant role prophesied by Isaiah and intimated that the gospel of the kingdom was also for non-Israelites, he encountered violent opposition (vv. 16–30). From this time on, whereas the "common people heard him gladly," the religious leaders became increasingly hostile, a hostility that culminated in his being turned over to the Romans for crucifixion.

The good news of the kingdom that Jesus preached and expounded is admittedly complex, since it represented movement toward the fulfillment of the Old Testament redemptive purpose in "the present age" as well as a radical reinterpretation of that hope with reference to "the age to come." In the present age, despite their rebellion against God, sinful human beings through repentance to God and surrender to Jesus' rule, can experience the new birth and enjoy a foretaste of the liberating kingdom. This included the forgiveness of sin, peace and acceptance with God, vital linkage with the Holy Spirit, valid insight into the Word of God, and joyous anticipation of "the powers of the coming age" (1 Cor. 2:12–15; Rom. 5:1, 2; 8:1–5, 35–39; Heb. 6:4, 5).

Even so, it is significant that Jesus never defined explicitly the term "kingdom of God." When he spoke of the kingdom as having "drawn near," he was affirming that it was an earthly rule in the world and its ongoing history. But when he stated that the kingdom is dynamically moving through human history and sweeping over people violently, he seemed to imply that it is something more than God's personal reign over individuals (Matt. 12:28; 11:12). He appeared to be referring to a new world, a new state of affairs, a new community that finds concrete expression in the world, even though it is both transcendent and spiritual. It is also political in that its full realization puts it on a collision course with all human rule and authority.

This note of spiritual conflict must not be regarded lightly. Satan is determined to thwart the progress of the kingdom. Jesus calmly asserts, however, that divine authority and rule have been given him by the Father (Luke 10:32; Matt. 11:27; 28:18). Furthermore, he will exercise this rule until Satan, sin, and death are brought to a complete end (Mark 9:1; 13:26; 14:62 with Luke 11:20–22).

The mystery of Jesus' person and the spiritual nature of his kingdom were so new and revolu-

tionary that he could only disclose these realities gradually. To most Jews the kingdom of God would come as a stone that would shatter all godless nations (Dan. 2:44). But Jesus did not preach judgment and separation; these were eschatological realities. He came as a sower scattering the "good news of the kingdom" and looking for receptive people. He spoke in parables. These tantalized his hearers and compelled them to come to a full stop, then reflect and ask questions. The more his disciples began to discern who he was, the more they began to understand his teaching. Conversely, the more people resisted him, the more his teaching reduced itself in their minds to "hard sayings" devoid of significance (John 6:60). All they heard were stories, riddles, and paradoxes (Mark 4:11, 12).

The parables speak of the nature, growth, and value of the kingdom, largely under the theme of mission. There are the "growth" parables in which the parable of the sower is so central that Jesus pointed out that failure to understand this parable would render a person unable to understand any parable (Mark 4:13). Then follows a parable of the growth process in the hearts of those who respond to the message of the kingdom (4:26–30). This process eludes understanding and external control. When spiritual maturity begins to manifest itself the parable of the wheat and the weeds brings to the fore a "second sowing" (Matt. 13:36–43) so important that the Lord himself is the only "Sower." This follows because "the field is the world" and the distribution of his servants in it is a responsibility he grants to no other. This implies a deliberate surrender of oneself to him, a willingness to be sent into the locale and ministry that he has appointed.

The kingdom is like a buried treasure and its acquisition merits any cost or sacrifice (Matt. 13:44–46). Its form is hidden, representing the hiddenness of God, working in the hearts of his people scattered throughout the world. Although insignificant in its beginnings (a mustard seed or bit of leaven), on the day of history's consummation it will be like a great tree or a bowl of dough fully leavened. The kingdom represents Jesus' present invasion of Satan's kingdom to release people from bondage (Luke 11:14–22). He desires that they enjoy in part a foretaste of the age to come, as they enter into the life he imparts to them (John 3:3). This includes the forgiveness of their sins (Mark 2:5) and the gift of God's righteousness (Matt. 5:20). The only acceptable response that a person can make is to put oneself deliberately under Christ's rule by repentance, faith, and submission.

Jesus also intimated that the kingdom would be consummated in power and glory, and instructed his disciples to pray for that Day when the will of God would be carried out on earth even as it is in heaven (Matt. 6:10). Because the kingdom had already truly come, Jesus' disciples should manifest the "signs" that confirmed its presence. This is as urgent as the final apocalyptic display of power that will compel "every knee" to bow and "every tongue" to confess that Jesus is Lord (Phil. 2:10, 11).

Although the kingdom is wholly of God, he is pleased to share "the keys of the kingdom" with his people that under his direction their preaching of its "good news" might be determinative of those who participate in his eschatological harvest (Matt. 16:19). Because the kingdom tends through its proclamation to draw into its midst both the good and the bad, the eschatological judgment will separate the wicked from the righteous (the parable of the net; Matt. 13:47–52). On this basis the Lord distinguished the church from the kingdom (Matt. 16:18).

At the Last Supper when Jesus instituted the Eucharist, he gave his disciples a cup he identified as "my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many" (Mark 14:24), thereby establishing linkage between that supper, the new covenant, and the coming kingdom. In this fashion he established the necessity of his death "as a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45). It was his death that made the coming apocalyptic kingdom dependent upon what would take place in history. "God did not abandon history; the eschatological kingdom invaded history in Jesus' life-death-resurrection and continues to work in history through the people of the kingdom" (Matt. 24:14; Mark 13:10; Ladd).

Acts. The resurrection of Jesus gave to his disciples—the believing remnant in Israel—a new sense of their oneness as they received further instruction in the kingdom and awaited its coming (Acts 1:3, 6). Peter's Pentecost sermon reinterpreted the Old Testament hope by speaking of Jesus' exaltation, confirming him as "Lord and Messiah" (2:30–36). In the Book of Acts the "signs" of the kingdom are everywhere present: Jesus by his Spirit is in the midst of his people, the gospel is proclaimed, signs and wonders accompany the witness, evil spirits are exorcised, conversions are frequent, and much suffering is experienced as a result of efforts to do God's will in a world that rebels against him (Matt. 5:10).

Pauline Epistles. Paul builds on Peter's reinterpretation of Jesus' messianic reign and describes it as a present relationship (Col. 1:13) and a spiritual experience (Rom. 14:17), as well as an eschatological inheritance (1 Cor. 6:9–11; Eph. 5:5). Jesus "must reign until he has put all his enemies under his feet" and destroy death, "the last enemy" (1 Cor. 15:25, 26). The end will only come "when he hands over the kingdom to God the Father after he has destroyed all dominion, authority and power" (v. 24). His ultimate goal is that "God may be all in all" (v. 28).

Revelation. The final revelation of God concerning his kingdom is of its eschatological consummation with the devil finally consigned to the lake of fire (Rev. 20:10). Just prior to this we find reference to the second coming of Christ with its rapid sequence of his total triumph over all his foes, his binding of Satan, the resurrection of his saints, his millennial reign, and the final consummation of human history (19:11–20:15). Rather than detail the elements of this controversial section, the Spirit presses on to the portrayal of God's ultimate goal: the age to come with its new heaven and new earth, and his redeemed people from all the families, tribes, languages, and peoples at long last seeing his face (21:1–4; 22:1–5).

ARTHUR F. GLASSER

Bibliography. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God;* J. Bright, *The Kingdom of God;* A. F. Glasser, *Kingdom and Mission;* G. E. Ladd, *Jesus and the Kingdom;* H. Ridderbos, *The Coming of the Kingdom.*

Liberation. Originating in Latin American Roman Catholic circles, discussion on the meaning of liberation after Vatican II shifted from the eternal destiny of a person to the sociopolitical context. The exodus event in which God freed Israel from slavery is seen as the archetype event governing the Old Testament. In it God liberated Israel and showed himself to be a liberating God. The announcement of Jesus that he has come to preach to the poor, to proclaim release to the prisoners, and to free the oppressed (Luke 4:18–20) is seen as the corresponding New Testament archetype. Liberation in this context has taken on a specific orientation: it is the struggle on the part of the oppressed or marginalized for their own freedom once they have become aware of their bondage and the role the oppressors play in the maintenance of that bondage. The forms of bondage may be political, economic, social, racial, or gender related, and a host of liberation theologies call those who are oppressed to rise up and engage in the process of attaining their own freedom and dignity. It is maintained that while the oppression may be personal, it will always require redressing structural issues, since the very fabric of human societies tends to engender inequities and injustices. A significant driving biblical metaphor energizing the sociopolitical liberation motif is the establishment of the KINGDOM OF GOD as a liberating force in oppressive societies and situations; the resulting focus is often on the horizontal level (among people) rather than the vertical one (people with God). In this struggle it is assumed that God is on the side of the oppressed.

As developed over the decades since the SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL (1962–65) in Roman Catholic and ecumenical Protestant circles, most of the reflections on and praxis toward liberation were reactions to understandings of DEVELOPMENT, political environments, and the theological ideologies of the past. Often, though not always, oriented in Marxist thought, the tools for understanding liberation are not limited to theology but include ANTHROPOLOGY, ECONOMICS, and SOCIOLOGY. *Development,* it is noted, maintains or even exaggerates the gap between the rich and the poor. Further, it is typically the "developed" who set the agenda rather than those who are marginalized. This, it is maintained, is not genuine liberation but only a continuing form of oppression. *Political struggles* against Western hegemony in COLONIALISM were perceived to be struggles for liberation, but all too often the new regimes which arose in Third World settings after independence simply kept the old inequities intact. Liberation struggles that began initially against colonial rulers have slowly begun to turn against the new oppressive regimes that are often backed by one or the other competing global powers, unconcerned with the masses. Even so, new forms of economic colonialism in which the West economically dominates other countries still require liberation efforts, such as the call for forgiving all Third World international debt. *Theologically* it was noted that any system which did not attack the oppressive status quo was ideologically suspect in and of itself, as it did not embody the aim of true liberation, which is a holistic release of people from all oppression and injustice.

This orientation toward liberation was built in several new theological directions. First, the development of an OPTION FOR THE POOR was a conscious decision to see the poor as the favored of God who are to be the architects of their own liberation and who enjoy a privileged position in part because their WORLDVIEW is not tainted by the desire to remain in power. Second, the sociopolitical liberation of Israel through exodus was a paradigm of God's liberating desire for humankind (though consideration of Israel's conquering actions in entering Canaan are rarely entertained in the discussions). Third, SIN was defined in social terms and not limited to personal, individual rebellion toward God. In parallel fashion, SALVATION was defined as redemption of the whole person rather than some isolated interior "soulish" element of the person, and human beings are to take responsibility for their own liberation. Additionally, because of the violence waged against the poor by oppressors, it was asserted we cannot automatically rule out violence in overcoming them in the struggle for liberation. Finally, true Christian praxis was defined in terms of a lifestyle of moving peoples and societies toward justice for all members, and mission

was recast as committed solidarity with the oppressed in their struggle.

Evaluation. The very fact that evangelical missiology has moved in a more holistic direction in recent years is evidence that some of the critique brought by liberation theologies and the paradigm of liberation has forced evangelicals to turn to the Scriptures for deeper examination and recognition of their own ideological biases in approaching the Bible (*see also* HOLISTIC MISSION). In this sense evangelicals have gained significant insights on liberation from its advocates.

In spite of this, important considerations weigh against taking the contemporary liberation paradigm wholesale. Many who chose to focus on the socioeconomic and political arenas did so because of an incipient or even an outright UNIVERSALISM in regard to salvation. Those who advocated radical VIOLENCE in the struggle for liberation tended to downplay the reality that violence often leads only to more violence rather than genuine liberation. The collapse of Marxism as a political ideology in Europe demonstrated that despite the rhetoric, under Marxist regimes the general population was often worse off than under free market economies. Liberationists also tended to place sole responsibility on the efforts of people in the struggle for dignity and freedom in part because they disregarded the continuing and pervasive effects on sin both in the individual and in cultures and political systems. Political structures established and carried out by fallen humans will always move in the direction of dehumanization, and thus God's desire to create new people, new heavens, and a new earth as part of his redemptive program. Human work toward liberation, while laudable and potentially serving as a type of firstfruits of which God will ultimately accomplish, will always fall short of God's ultimate goal of SHALOM, which will only be established when God finalizes his kingdom.

Paul's picture in Romans 6 is that we are slaves who can choose to serve sin or God. The picture is a dichotomistic one in which economic or political liberation is not our ultimate goal. Instead, our ultimate goal is freedom from sin because of our choice to become slaves to the Master of the universe. Jesus said that those he set free were truly free. This freedom is not a type of antinomian libertarianism, but freedom gained through holding to his teaching and knowing the truth as a result (John 8:31–36). Liberation in this sense is not an abandonment of obligations to serve our Creator, but freedom from the oppression and degradation of sin in our lives and freedom to proclaim that release to others as well.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. K. C. Abraham, *DEM,* pp. 604–6; G. Gutierrez, *A Theology of Liberation;* J. A. Kirk, *Liberation Theology;* A. Nuñez, *Liberation Theology;* J. Pixley and C. Boff, *The Bible, the Church and the Poor.*

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*.

Love of God. The Christian mission stems from the saving love of God for humanity. This divine love is to be associated with the related concepts of his compassion, mercy, blessing, and grace, especially as revealed in Christ.

Since God is love (1 John 4:8) both within himself in the intra-trinitarian self-giving and in his special revelation, his love must be reflected in the act of creation, especially of human beings. Humans were originally God's priest-kings (Gen. 1:26–28; 2:9–17). Their task was to consecrate their assigned rule and realm to him in loving obedience, with a view to realizing God's ultimate eschatological goal for his creation (Dumbrell, 1994).

Their rebellion neither frustrated the divine plan for the world nor negated his love for humanity, his image in the world. Even at the point of excluding them from Eden, the realm of divine blessing, he extended hope for salvation (Gen. 3:16). When the necessity of a general judgment was typified by the Flood, the Lord graciously preserved a remnant. He also promised that his covenant of creation would stand (Gen. 6:18; 8:17–9:17), thereby also expressing his love (Matt. 5:45; Acts 14:17).

From among the disobedient nations, but in the chosen line of Shem (Gen. 9:26–27; 11:20–27), Abraham was chosen both to receive blessing and to be a blessing (Gen. 12:1–3), ultimately through Christ (Gal. 3:8) (*see also* ABRAHAMIC COVENANT). In fulfillment of this promise of blessing to humanity, and with a view to bringing his creation to its goal, God delivered Israel from Egypt. Redeemed Israel's vocation may also be called her mission, for she is called with the world in view (Exod. 19:5). Her role as a priestly kingdom and holy nation is to bear witness to the true and living God by her distinctiveness in worship and moral life as a community under the Law or Mosaic covenant. Chosen Israel was thus called to model for the nations the blessings of the divine love experienced through obedience to Yahweh as king (Exod. 19:5b–6a; cf. 1 Peter 2:9). At best Israel fulfilled this calling very imperfectly, but at certain high points, like Solomon's dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8:41–43, 60) Israel was keenly aware of her proper, Abrahamic role in the world. Only the Messiah (Christ), however, would perfectly manifest the love of God in himself and the divine intention of blessing for the nations.

God's love for sinful humanity resulted in his giving/sending the eternal Son to become the promised Messiah (John 3:16). Jesus expressed this love of God for fallen humanity by his own loving obedience to the Father (John 14:31; Phil. 2:5–8), showing compassion for the hungry, the sick, the demonized, and the tax-collectors and "sinners." To them he brought relief from their suffering and forgiveness of their sins through faith in him. This was a sign and foreshadowing of the future reign of God in blessing, power, and righteousness. His atoning death, "a ransom for many" (Israelites and Gentiles alike), was the crowning expression of God's love for sinners. His resurrection guaranteed the final fruition of this love in the full implementation of the reign (kingdom) of God at his PAROUSIA. That age (or world) to come will be the final realization of his purpose for creation; then it will be fully subdued under his vice-regent, Jesus Christ, and his Body, the church.

The interim between his resurrection and his coming is the appointed time for the Christian mission—the sending of the apostles and others bearing the gospel to all the nations till the close of the age (Matt. 28:16–20; Luke 24:46–48; Acts 1:8). This fulfills the promise to Abraham (Gen. 12:3) in accordance with the love of God expressed in the giving of the Son (John 3:16).

In this way the risen Christ builds the community which has experienced God's love in him through the Spirit (Rom. 5:5–8). Described in bridal imagery (Eph. 5:21–33; Rev. 21:2, 9) the church is not only the creation, through world mission, of God's saving love; it is also the community reflecting this love in its life (e.g., Phil. 2:1–8; 1 Peter 1:22; 1 John 3:11–24; 4:7–12). As such it is the global fulfillment of Israel's vocation—a living sign of the scope of God's saving

love and its instrument, embracing men and women of all peoples and legal statuses (Phil. 2:14–16a; 1 Peter 2:9–12, 17; Gal. 3:28).

The final destiny of those who respond to the reconciling love of God made known to them by the Christian mission is the enjoyment of the final issue of this love for the creation: the life of the world (age) to come, the reign (kingdom) of God in all the fullness of his blessing. This will be creation perfected at last—life in all its fullness where the bride of the Lamb "who loves us and frees us by his blood," will see the face of him who is now also on the throne (Rev. 1:5, 6; chs. 21, 23).

The love of God revealed on the cross has been the core of the message and a fundamental motive for the Christian mission from the time of the apostles (2 Cor. 5:14–21) until the present day.

JOHN A. MCINTOSH

Bibliography. B. C. Berkouwer, *The Church;* W. J. Dumbrell, *The Search for Order: Biblical Eschatology in Focus;* A. Glasser, *Crucial Dimensions in World Evangelization;* H. N. Ridderbos, *Paul;* C. Van Engen, *Growth of the True Church.*

Martyrdom. The role of martyrdom in the expansion of the church is the common thread that links the church of all ages with its suffering Savior. Tertullian, third-century leader in the church of North Africa, wrote to his Roman governors in his *Apology*, "As often as you mow us down, the more numerous we become. The blood of the Christians is seed." But martyrdom is not unique to Christianity. People have sacrificed their lives throughout the ages for a variety of reasons. To define the distinctive meaning of Christian martyrdom requires investigation of the Bible and church history.

Definition. The word *martyr* is an English word transliterated from its Greek equivalent *(martyrus)*. It is closely associated with the word *witness* as used in the Scriptures. The Old Testament Hebrew equivalent is *moed,* which is used in reference to the place where God establishes his covenant with his people.

In the New Testament, the ideas of truth and Scripture are integrated into the verb form *martureō*. Jesus uses it to establish his witness as truth (Matt. 26:65; Mark 14:63; Luke 22:71). John the Baptist links Jesus, truth, and Scripture. Luke speaks of witness to the whole world (Acts 1:8).

The word *martyr* also extends its meaning to include Christ-like values, such as faithfulness, truth, witness, and lifestyle. Eventually, even "death-style" is subsumed. The first Christian-era martyr known is Stephen (Acts 7) who, interestingly, was put to death by "witnesses" for his witness. In Revelation 3:14, the last word is given concerning Jesus Christ who is "the faithful and true witness." The word does away with any distinction of what a true believer might live and die for. Death does not stop the witness given. It merely adds an exclamation point of truth, faithfulness, and love for the glory of God. It is the supreme witnessing act. Neither personal gain nor personal opinion provides the motive for such a death.

Church Growth and Martyrdom. Tertullian also wrote, "For who, when he sees our obstinacy is not stirred up to find its cause? Who, when he has inquired, does not then join our Faith? And who, when he has joined us, does not desire to suffer, that he may gain the whole grace of God?" Current estimates are that roughly 150,000 Christians are martyred each year, down from a peak of 330,000 prior to the demise of communist world powers. Some project that the numbers will increase to 600,000 by A.D. 2025, given current trends in human rights abuses and growth of militant religious systems.

Those inflicting contemporary Christian martyrdom include political regimes with counter-Christian agendas (e.g., official atheistic powers, such as China and the former Soviet Union); sociopolitical regimes enforcing religious restrictions (e.g., Egypt, Sudan); ethnic tribal regimes bent on eliminating minorities (e.g., Sudan, Rwanda, and Burundi) and religious regimes (e.g., Muslim countries in which *Sharia* is the official legal system).

Conclusion. Martyrdom will continue to be associated with the progress of gospel proclamation until the KINGDOM OF GOD is established. Jesus said, "Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword" (Matt. 10:34). The sword was not to be used by his disciples against others, but could be expected to be used against them. Paul said, "All this is evidence that God's judgment is right, and as a result you will be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which you are suffering" (2 Thess. 1:5). Finally, as Augustine wrote in *City of God:* "Despite the fiercest opposition, the terror of the greatest persecutions, Christians have held with unswerving faith to the belief that Christ has risen, that all men will rise in the age to come, and that the body will live forever. And this belief, proclaimed without fear, has yielded a harvest throughout the world, and all the more when the martyr's blood was the seed they sowed."

J. RAY TALLMAN

Bibliography. R. Daniel, *This Holy Seed;* S. Bergman, *Martyrs: Contemporary Writers on Modern Lives of Faith;* J. Hefley and M. Hefley, *By Their Blood: Christian Martyrs of the Twentieth Century; WCE.*

Mercy of God. The English word for mercy is a translation of several different Hebrew and Greek words. For our study, three Greek words are of primary importance: *eleos*, *oiktirmon*, and *splanchna*. These three terms fall within the general semantic range of the English word "mercy" and hence can be visualized as a group of overlapping linguistic circles variously translated as mercy, compassion, or pity.

The biblical concept of mercy is both a feeling and an action. It refers to the deep feelings of pity and the practical rendering of aid. Indeed, it might be more accurate to say that mercy is a feeling that leads to action.

The mercy of God is related to mission in at least three ways. It is an integral part of the message we proclaim; it provides motivation for our service; and it describes the manner in which we carry out the GREAT COMMISSION.

First of all, God's mercy is an integral part of our message. The gospel describes the breaking in of the divine mercy into the world of human misery in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. His mercy is the basis of our salvation. "He saved us, not because of the righteous things we have done, but because of his mercy" (Titus 3:5).

The Bible describes God as "rich in mercy" (Eph. 2:4) and "full of mercy" (James 5:11). He is "the Father of compassion and God of all comfort" (2 Cor. 1:3). It is because of "his great mercy" (1 Peter 1:3) that we are saved. Thus, the mercy of God underlies the whole message of the Bible.

Second, mercy provides motivation for our ministry. Paul appeals to God's mercy as the basis for service. It is the experience of mercy that keeps us pressing on in the work. To the church at Rome he says, "I urge you, brothers, in view of God's mercy, to offer your bodies as living sacrifices" (Rom. 12:1). To the church at Corinth he writes, "Therefore, since through God's mercy we have this ministry, we do not lose heart" (2 Cor. 4:1).

Third, mercy describes the manner in which we carry out the Great Commission. Jesus is our model of mercy ministry. He felt deep compassion both for those who were spiritually lost and for those who were physically needy (Matt. 9:36; 20:34). But these deep feelings of compassion (literally, "moved in his bowels"—what today would be called the heart) always led Jesus to action. It was his mercy that moved him to heal the sick and feed the hungry (Matt. 14:14; 15:32). Through word and deed, Jesus engaged in holistic ministry, meeting the full range of human needs. He was not just a teacher or an evangelist. His was a life poured out in deeds of mercy, ministering to the whole person.

Jesus also taught about the importance of mercy. In the parable of the good Samaritan, Jesus illustrates the meaning of the second great command to "love your neighbor as yourself." He describes the compassionate ministry of the Samaritan as an act of mercy. He then concludes this parable with the command, "go and do likewise" (Luke 10:37). Thus, mercy ministry is a command for the entire church.

The ministry of mercy is primarily a ministry of deeds, focused on meeting the physical needs of humanity. Because of this, it is often contrasted with evangelism. EVANGELISM is seen as the spiritual work of the church while mercy ministry is merely physical. It can be cogently argued that evangelism has a logical priority over mercy ministry because of the eternal consequences of rejecting the gospel. But this is an unhelpful and unnecessary bifurcation (*see also* HOLISTIC MISSION).

Mercy ministry was a significant part of Christ's earthly ministry and remains an important aspect of the church's mission. In fact, Jesus has given numerous "deed" gifts to the church that are explicitly related to mercy ministry: service, giving, mercy, helps and administration (Rom. 12:6–8; 1 Cor. 14:28; 1 Peter 4:10–11). Jesus expects his ministry of mercy to continue through his church. Both word and deed, evangelism and mercy ministry are emphasized in Scripture. They are like the proverbial two wings of an airplane.

However, mercy ministry does not just seek the interdependence of word and deed. It also addresses one's attitudes. On two occasions, after seeing the critical and condemning attitudes of the Pharisees, Jesus rebukes them by quoting from the Old Testament: "I desire mercy, not sacrifice" (Matt. 9:13; 12:7). The scrupulously legalistic Pharisees were preoccupied with external religious rituals but knew little of God's tender mercy or heartfelt compassion.

Furthermore, Jesus contrasts mercy with a judging, condemning, and unforgiving spirit. "Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful. Do not judge, and you will not be judged. Do not condemn and you will not be condemned. Forgive and you will be forgiven" (Luke 6:36–37). Thus, mercy is an attitude that describes how we are to carry out our mission. In the words of James, "mercy triumphs over judgment!" (James 2:13).

RICHARD D. LOVE

Bibliography. E. R. Achtemeier, *IDB,* III:352–54; H. H. Esser, *NIDNTT,* II:593–601; J. W. L. Hoad, *NBD*, p. 761; T. J. Keller, *Ministries of Mercy.*

Mexico City Conference (1963). The first world conference of the newly created Division of World Mission and Evangelism, brought into being through the integration of the INTERNATIONAL MISSIONARY COUNCIL into the life of the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, was held in Mexico City in December 1963. Under the title of

"Witness in Six Continents" its four sections focused on: (1) the witness of Christians to those of other faiths; (2) the witness of Christians to people living in a secular world; (3) the witness of the congregation in its neighborhood; and (4) the witness of the Christian church across national and confessional boundaries. Taken together these clearly set the missionary task in the context of what God was doing in the secular world, with less emphasis on the nature of the church itself. Mexico City abandoned the geographical concept of Christendom because "The missionary frontier runs around the world: it is the line that separates belief from unbelief, the unseen frontier which cuts across all other frontiers and presents the universal church with its primary missionary challenge." It was the first mission conference at which the Orthodox were formally present.

Work on dialogue with people of other living faiths was not significantly advanced at Mexico City, and although the conference endorsed the idea of "Joint Action for Mission," the official history records a slow response and "inadequate attention at Geneva" to this emphasis. The conference was, however, significant in establishing the understanding that, in LESSLIE NEWBIGIN's words, "the home base of the world mission is world-wide, and that the mission field is also world-wide." Accordingly the conference broke new ground in the attention it gave to missionary endeavor in the secular world of North America and Europe.

JOHN H. Y. BRIGGS

Bibliography. R. K. Orchard, *Witness in Six Continents. Records of the meeting of the commission on World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council of Churches, Held in Mexico City, December 8th to 19th 1963;* N. Lossky et al., *DEM,* p. 330; L. Newbigin, *The Ecumenical Advance: A History of the Ecumenical Movement,* 2:193–95.

Millennial Thought. Belief in the earthly reign of Christ before the end of the world and the eternal state. The most notable form of this doctrine is PREMILLENNIALISM, which claims that the Lord will return before the golden age and is based on certain key passages of Scripture, including Daniel 7–11, Ezekiel 37–39, Matthew 24, 1 Thessalonians 4, 2 Thessalonians 2, and especially Revelation 20. There are two other major views, POSTMILLENNIALISM, which states that the Lord will return after the millennium and AMILLENNIALISM, which states that the language of Scripture is too figurative to suggest that there will be a literal reign of Christ on earth.

Although these interpretations have never been without adherents in Western Christianity, in certain periods a particular outlook has predominated. During the first three centuries of the Christian era, premillennialism appears to have been the dominant eschatological interpretation. In the fourth century, when the Christian church was given a favored status under the emperor Constantine, the amillennial position was accepted. The millennium was reinterpreted to refer to the church. The famous church father, Augustine, articulated this position and it became the prevailing interpretation in medieval times.

Despite the fact that the Protestant Reformers accepted Augustinian eschatology, their emphasis on a more literal interpretation of the Bible and identification of the papacy with Antichrist called attention to the prophetic Scriptures. Later scholars especially in the Reformed tradition such as J. H. Alsted (1588–1638) and Joseph Mede (1586–1638) revived premillennialism. During the seventeenth century their view was shared by many of the leaders of the Puritan Revolution in England. However, with the restoration of the Stuart kings this opinion was discredited.

As premillennialism waned, postmillennialism became the prevailing eschatological interpretation, receiving its most important formulation in the work of Daniel Whitby (1638–1726). According to Whitby, the world was to be converted to Christ, after which the earth would enjoy universal peace, happiness, and righteousness for a thousand years. At the close of this period, Christ would return personally for the last judgment. Perhaps because of its agreement with the views of the ENLIGHTENMENT, postmillennialism was adopted by the leading Protestant theologians of the era. New England Puritans, continental pietists, and evangelical revivalists of the eighteenth century all encouraged the emphasis on millennialism. One of the most outstanding missionary spokespersons of this period, JONATHAN EDWARDS (1703–58), was a devoted postmillennialist.

During the nineteenth century, premillennialism again attracted attention. This interest was fostered by the violent uprooting of European political and social institutions caused by the French Revolution. Later in the century millennial enthusiasm found renewed support in the Plymouth Brethren Movement. J. N. Darby (1800–1882), an important Brethren leader, articulated the dispensationalist understanding of millennialism. Its name comes from the practice of dividing history into a series of ages, usually seven in number, which culminate in the millennium. A distinction is made between ethnic Israel and the church, and there is to be a tribulation period at the end of the church age caused by the Antichrist. After these events, Christ will return and rule the world for a thousand years with the help of the saints. This belief, popularized by the *Scofield Reference Bible,* the Bible Institute movement, popular evangelists, and mass media preachers, has become the dominant eschatology of American fundamentalists.

Despite the development of DISPENSATIONALISM, postmillennialism was the great dynamic for much of the missionary enthusiasm of the nineteenth century. America, many claimed, was the agent of God to bring in the last times. Timothy Dwight (1752–1817) anticipated the day when not a single Catholic cathedral, mosque, or pagoda would be left standing. Other spokespersons also merged the language of Manifest Destiny with millennialism and dreamed of the conquest of the world under the same laws and social characteristics as the Anglo-Saxons who would control all of North America. It was this confidence that led JOHN R. MOTT to publish *The Evangelization of the World in This Generation* (1900) and inspired the famous WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE in Edinburgh (1910).

However, the new age did not come and more of those involved in the missionary movement adopted a premillennial view. Rather than trying to bring God's kingdom to earth, they turned to winning individuals to Christ and preaching the gospel as witness to all nations so that Christ will return. Two world wars, genocide, economic depression, the rise of pluralism, the success of liberalism, and the privatization of religion in a secular society convinced them that only a supernatural, cataclysmic return of Christ would help the world. Yet changes in dispensational doctrine, a renewed emphasis on the Spirit of God by charismatic groups, and the concept of reaching whole groups of people with the gospel continue to encourage the postmillennial view. Despite the lively debate over the millennium there is no divergence of opinion among Christians as to the fact of Christ's coming.

ROBERT G. CLOUSE

Bibliography. R. G. Clouse, *The Meaning of the Millennium. Four Views;* R. G. Clouse, R. V. Pierard, and R. Hosack, *The Millennial Manual;* J. A. DeJong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea: Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions 1640–1819;* E. L Tuveson, *Redeemer Nation: The Idea of America's Millennial Role;* T. P. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming: American Premillennialism (1875–1925).*

Miracles in Mission. Contemporary mission endeavor cannot and should not seek to avoid the subject of supernatural power and the miraculous. Neither, on the other hand, should missions today become obsessed with or distressed over the power and activity of evil beings under Satan's control, nor over those who teach about them. The Bible teaches Christ's victory over all the POWERS (authorities), PRINCIPALITIES (rulers), dominions, and demons (1 Cor. 2:6; 15:24; Eph. 1:15–23; Col. 1:15–20, 2:15; 2 Thess. 2:8; Heb. 2:14). Mission today needs to rest assured that God still can and does work miracles.

Areas of Interface between the Miraculous and Mission. Missions interface with the miraculous in evangelism, healing, deliverance, and other areas.

The Miraculous and Evangelism. All evangelism is miraculous but in missions today individuals and groups are opened to the gospel in ways that can only be miraculous. The history of Christianity is replete with accounts of people movements that obviously were instigated and promoted by the Holy Spirit.

Some contemporary missionaries consider warfare prayer and the "binding" of territorial spirits as a major method in evangelistic activities. C. PETER WAGNER defines TERRITORIAL SPIRITS as members of the hierarchy of evil spirits who, delegated by Satan, control regions, cities, tribes, people groups, neighborhoods, and other social networks and inhibit evangelistic breakthrough. John Duncan and Edgardo Silvoso recount how, in Argentina, after prayer, fasting, confession, and confronting territorial spirits, the Lord granted a marvelous gospel breakthrough. John Wimber, who believes in "power evangelism" and miracles in evangelism, does not hold miracles necessary for evangelism. He sees proclamation of the gospel as the "heart and soul" of evangelism.

The Miraculous and Healing. God has used healing to reveal the truth of his message throughout history. The Lord has healed through the prophets (2 Kings 5:1–16), Jesus (Mark 1:40–41; John 4:46–54), the apostles (Acts 3:1–10), New Testament believers (Acts 14:3), and Christian missionaries today. God continues to perform miracles of healing, both to meet the physical needs of suffering people and to reveal the truth of his message.

Belief in divine healing in no way prohibits using modern medicine and using modern medicine does not indicate a lack of faith in God's power to heal. Missions today should allow God to speak both through modern medicine and God's direct healing action.

The Miraculous and Deliverance. Demons (evil spirits, powers) exist and harm, but do not possess in the sense of owning, human beings, whether believers or unbelievers. Jesus and New Testament Christians expelled demons from persons (Matt. 8:28–34; Mark 5:1–20; Acts 5:16; 16:16–18). Contemporary missionaries face expanding needs and opportunities to oppose evil spirits who demonize persons. Deliverance from evil spirits has become a growing phenomenon among evangelical missionaries. Demons who attack people can be expelled and rendered powerless through God's power (*see also* DEMONS, DEMONIZATION; EXORCISM; and SPIRITUAL WARFARE).

The Miraculous and Other Manifestations. Miracles today are evidenced in tongues, knowledge, visions, and other areas (1 Cor. 12–14).

These manifestations, questioned by some, indicate to others the direct action of God. Missionaries must deal honestly and directly with these manifestations.

Principles Relating to Missions and the Miraculous. Several principles relate to miracles and missionary work. First, missionaries should welcome the aid of miracles and other manifestations of SIGNS AND WONDERS in missionary ministry. In regard to supernatural power and the miraculous, missionaries must be careful never to be materialists, disbelieving in supernatural powers, nor magicians, thinking supernatural powers can be controlled by ritual (*see* MAGIC).

Second, missionaries must affirm that miracles, signs, and wonders are not necessary for evangelism or other missionary work. The Holy Spirit continues to grant evangelistic fruit where there are no outward signs of miracles. Signs and wonders can, however, be instrumental in helping people become more willing to hear the gospel.

Third, missionaries must accept that healing is not always God's plan for every person. God speaks through suffering as well as through healing. Missionaries should not, therefore, promise healing as God remains sovereign in granting healing.

Fourth, missionaries must also remember that power resides in the gospel itself, not in miracles (Rom. 1:16; 1 Cor. 1:18). Missionaries must be certain never to make miracles seem imperative for missionary effectiveness. They must remember that miracles, like all other Christian deeds, must glorify God rather than calling attention to humans. When miracles are used to bring fame and notoriety to humans, these "signs" are not of God. Christians may be seen doing miracles but never be doing miracles to be seen.

Finally, missionaries should remember that miraculous events are not always of God. Pharaoh's magicians did signs (Exod. 7:10–22) as did Satan (2 Thess. 2:9). Jesus declared that false prophets would perform miracle (Matt. 24:24). Missionaries must beware of counterfeit miracles. Missionaries must remember that signs and wonders function to convey truth, especially divine compassion. The purpose of signs is that people apprehend the message the signs bring rather than dwell on the signs themselves.

EBBIE C. SMITH

Bibliography. C. E. Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic;* idem, *Powers of Darkness;* D. Bridge, *Signs and Wonders Today;* J. Dawson, *Taking Our Cities for God;* N. Geisler, *Signs and Wonders;* P. G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues;* D. Powlison, *Power Encounters;* E. Rommen, ed., *Spiritual Power and Missions;* T. M. Warner, *Spiritual Warfare;* C. P. Wagner, *Engaging the Enemy;* C. P. Wagner, and F. D. Pennoyer, eds., *Wrestling with Dark Angels.*

Missio Dei. Latin for "the sending of God," in the sense of "being sent," a phrase used in Protestant missiological discussion especially since the 1950s, often in the English form "the mission of God." Originally it was used (from Augustine on) in Western discussion of the Trinity for the *"sent-ness of God (the Son)"* by the Father (John 3:17; 5:30; 11:42; 17:18). Georg F. Vicedom popularized the concept for missiology at the CWME meeting in MEXICO CITY in 1963, publishing a book by this title: *The Mission of God: An Introduction to the Theology of Mission.*

Ecumenicals claim a comprehensive definition of *missio Dei:* everything God does for the communication of salvation and, in a narrower sense, everything the church itself is sent to do. Historically, most evangelicals focused on the more immediate purpose of the Triune God in the sending of the Son: the task of world evangelization, the planting of the church among non-Christians, and the nurture of such churches. More recently, many have acknowledged the holistic nature of the task, though few give it an eschatological reference (*see* HOLISTIC MISSION).

The difference between the two approaches hinges on how the primary and fundamental human problem is defined—whether as a broken relationship with a transcendent God, or as suffering, oppression, and broken human relationships. Views of how the KINGDOM OF GOD is to be fulfilled now or eschatologically, how wide the scope of human salvation will prove to be, and basic assumptions about the authority and interpretation of Scripture are also critical (*see* BIBLE and HERMENEUTICS).

Missio Dei was first used in a missionary sense by the German missiologist Karl Hartenstein in 1934. He was motivated by Karl Barth's emphasis on the *actio Dei* ("the action of God"), over against the human-centered focus of liberal theology at that time; he was also inspired by Barth's 1928 lecture on mission, which related it to the Trinity. Hartenstein used the term again in his "Theological Reflection" on the IMC's WILLINGEN CONFERENCE (1952), published in the German report. Though the documents of the meeting itself grounded mission in the Trinity, it did not use the term *missio Dei.* Nevertheless, in its new, trinitarian-mission(ary) sense the phrase has been widely used since Georg F. Vicedom's book.

Missio Dei came to encapsulate an important change in IMC and WCC thinking, from the TAMBARAM CONFERENCE (1938) emphasis on the mission of the *church* to the Willingen stress on the mission of *God.* The latter meeting quite properly recognized that the true source of the church's missionary task lay "in the Triune God Himself."

The roots of the later, social gospel usage of the term lay in two things: first of all, Willingen's "A Statement on the Missionary Calling of the Church," which exhibited a common theological mistake. It properly defined the church's missionary obligation as "beseeching all men to be reconciled to God," and its concluding section rightly stressed God's sovereign rule even in the "war and tumult" of history, the growth of human knowledge, and in political and social movements. However, it failed to distinguish this preserving, common-grace exercise of God's power from his reconciling, special, redemptive-grace exercise in the history of salvation. Nor did it state the relationship either between preserving and redemptive grace, or between this present age and the age to come (*see* HOPE).

The second and not unrelated factor was the presence of the Dutch missiologist, JOHANNES C. HOEKENDIJK. Hoekendijk was zealous to have the true arena of God's saving action be recognized as the world of human affairs and the human condition, instead of the church. The mission of God (what he sent Christ into the world to do) was to establish SHALOM—"peace, integrity, community, harmony and justice"—or humanization in this world. In other words, the goal was the realization of the kingdom of God on earth. He insisted on redefining the church as a function of the "apostolate," that is, the church as an instrument, of God's action in this world, a means in his hands, by which he will establish *shalom*. This was the basic concept with which the phrase *missio Dei* came to be identified in WCC circles.

At the world conference of the World Student Christian Federation in Strasbourg (1960), Hoekendijk urged that Christians identify with "man in the modern world," that the church become "open, mobile groups" (Bassham) to join the *missio Dei* and push for the realization of *shalom*.

These ideas dominated subsequent WCC reports: *Witness in Six Continents* (Mexico City, 1963), *World Conference on Church and Society* (Geneva, 1966), and especially the Studies in Evangelism report, *The Church for Others* (1967). These included the radical assertion of the thought-pattern expressed in "God-world-church." The latter formula meant that the church should act in partnership with the sending God, not by world evangelization and church planting, but by directly promoting political and economic human good. Since *shalom* is the goal of God's action in the world, and "the world sets the agenda," the church must therefore forsake its existing "heretical structures" and join in God's action. Traditional Christian missions were therefore merely "transitory forms of obedience to the *missio Dei*," and no longer appropriate.

The climax of the impact of Hoekendijk's version of God's mission was to be seen at the Uppsala Assembly, in 1968, which fiercely resisted the admission of words on the need to evangelize the non-Christian world.

Christians certainly ought to join with others in the common grace promotion of social justice, though not as the church, and not exclusively as Christians, but with others (Clowney). Evangelicals have been remiss in not acting strongly or broadly enough for social justice in this century. But the WCC adopted an almost purely sociopolitical concept of the *missio Dei*. It did so on the basis of broad, modern theological assumptions: universal salvation, through the "cosmic Christ"; the church's election being only for the purpose of serving what God was already doing in the world; the ideas of process theology, Tillich's "new being," and Bultmann's demythologizing of the New Testament. Taken together, these meant that the WCC could not affirm that indeed history must come to an end, with Christ's coming, in order to realize the kingdom/*shalom* in its fullness. It lacked (and still lacks) commitment to other vital teachings of the historic Christian faith: the transcendence of God (his distinctness from creation); the reality of an objective, substitutionary atonement to deal with the fundamental human problem, sin, and its forgiveness; and the necessity of proclaiming Christ as the only one to whom one must turn for true *shalom* in this world and the world to come.

In WCC circles today some are questioning the very usefulness of the term *missio De*i, and are seeking a "new link" between mission and church (Hoedemaker). Evangelicals, on the other hand, have struggled so far to match the theological depth and sophistication of the WCC. They need to show that the church is called not merely to expansion, not to become a mere "collection of converts" (Hoedemaker). It is "sent" for a faithful ministry of witness summoning the disobedient to turn to God, looking for success only to the Spirit of God. It must do this from the context of its life, where God is truly worshiped, the faithful built up, and compassion demonstrated. This whole is the true *missio Dei,* and foreshadows the true *shalom* to be realized in full at the Lord's return.

JOHN A. MCINTOSH

Bibliography. N. Goodall, ed., *Missions Under the Cross; Uppsala Report* 1968; R. C. Bassham, *Mission Theology, 1948–1975;* E. P. Clowney, *The Church;* A. F. Glasser and D. G. McGavran, *Contemporary Theologies of Mission;* L. A. Hoedemaker, *IBMR* 19:4 (1995): 166–70; idem, *Missiology,* pp. 157–71; P. Potter, *Life in All Its Fullness;* H. H. Rosin, *Missio Dei;* J. A. Scherer, *The Good News of the Kingdom,* pp. 82–88; T. Stransky, *DEM,* pp. 687–89.

Missiology. Missiology is the conscious, intentional, ongoing reflection on the doing of mission. It includes theory(ies) of mission, the study and teaching of mission, as well as the research, writing, and publication of works regarding mission. Involvement in or the *doing* of mission, however, preceded by several centuries the *scholarly reflection* on mission. Apparently it was the passionate visionary Spanish activist, RAYMOND LULL (c. 1235–1315), who first critically reflected on missions, published his thoughts, and proposed the establishment of colleges for the linguistic and theological preparation of missionaries to Muslims and Jews. Though such a school was established at Majorca in 1276, Lull was unsuccessful in persuading Christian princes to establish similar chairs in the major European universities. No complete catalogue of Lull's voluminous writings exists, but the partial list contains more than 280 titles. Lull may be considered the first missiologist in Christian history.

More than two centuries later the Jesuit missionary to Mexico and Peru, JOSÉ DE ACOSTA (c. 1539–1600), published his treatise *On Procuring the Salvation of the Indians* (1588), a learned discussion of missionary theology and methodology. Another significant missiological work of this period was *On Procuring the Salvation of All Men* (1613) by Thomas à Jesu (1564–1627).

The formal study of missions by Protestants can be traced to the colonial expansion of England, the Netherlands, and non-Iberian European powers. The year Pope Gregory XV created the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda of the Faith, 1622, a small Protestant college for the training of missionaries for Dutch colonies opened as a branch of the University of Leiden. Unfortunately, the college was short-lived. (Five years later the Roman Catholic College of Propaganda opened in Rome.) With their growing awareness of other continents and peoples, a few European Protestant professors of theology began manifesting serious interest in missionary questions. Hadrianus Saravia (1531–1613)—Dutch Reformed pastor-missionary and later professor, who after a period in England became an Anglican—published in 1590 his carefully reasoned challenge to the prevailing Protestant view that the words of Matthew 28:19–20 were meant only for the original apostles. The influence of Saravia is evident in the inaugural lectures of GISBERTUS VOETIUS (1589– 1676) at the University of Utrecht, lectures he entitled *De plantatoribus ecclesiasticus* ("On Church Planting"). Several other Dutch scholars helped pave the way for formal missiological studies, such as Justus Heurnius (1587–1651) and Johannes Hoornbeeck (1617–66), the latter a student of Voetius.

Though a number of missiological works were published in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, no professor of missions was named and the number of courses in missions was very limited. This was true in both Europe and North America until the last half of the nineteenth century.

The writings, correspondence, and widespread influence of the German Pietist leaders, August Herman Francke (1663–1727) and Philip Jacob Spener (1635–1705); the Moravian founder NICOLAUS LUDWIG VON ZINZENDORF (1700–60); the Reformed theologian and philosopher JONATHAN EDWARDS (1703–58); the Baptist missionary WILLIAM CAREY (1761–1834); and the renowned theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834)—contributed to a slowly changing attitude regarding missions as a scholarly endeavor. However, attempts to establish missionary training programs in European or American universities during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were seldom successful. Two serious histories of missions during this period do deserve mention: Robert Millar's *History of the Propagation of Christianity and the Overthrow of Paganism* (1723) and Petrus Hofstede's two-volume work on the history of Christianity in the Dutch East Indies (1779–80).

The nineteenth century brought tangible change. When Princeton Theological Seminary was founded in 1811, it was envisioned not only as a means to prepare young men to be pastors, but also as "a nursery for missionaries to the heathen," a place where students could receive "appropriate training" to fit them for missionary work. The first concrete step to make the study of missions an academic requirement, however, occurred in 1835 when John Breckenridge (1797–1841) was elected professor of pastoral theology and missionary instruction. Though Breckenridge can be regarded as the first Protestant professor of missions, his tenure at Princeton was brief, 1836–38, and it would have been uneventful except for the fact that the course he initiated continued as a part of the curriculum until 1854.

F. A. E. Ehrenfeuchter, professor of practical theology at Göttingen, was one of the earliest European Protestants to include the subject of missions in his lectures in the 1840s and 1850s, and he is credited with publishing the first thoroughgoing theory of mission in Protestant history, *Die praktische Theologie* (1859).

In Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox circles J. B. Hirscher (1788–1865) urged that the study of missions be made an integral part of the study of pastoral theology, and shortly thereafter N. I. Liminsky (1821–91) published what can be regarded as the first scientific analysis of mission in the Orthodox Church.

In 1864 KARL GRAUL (1814–64), director of the Leipzig Mission, proposed that missions be accepted as a legitimate academic discipline in itself. His memorable lecture, "On the Place and

Significance of the Christian Mission in Scientific Studies of a University Considered as a Whole," qualified him to teach in the University of Erlangen. Graul's untimely death prevented his becoming Europe's first Protestant professor of missions, a distinction that was ALEXANDER DUFF's (1806–78) when in 1867 he was named professor of evangelistic theology at the University of Edinburgh. Duff's legacy, however, was mixed. The installation of GUSTAV WARNECK (1834–1919) as professor of the science of missions at the University of Halle in 1896 signaled the momentous changes ahead, for by the turn of the century three other professorships of missions had been established, and in the decades preceding and following the WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE (Edinburgh 1910), the study of missions became a part of the curriculum in an increasing number of schools in both Europe and North America.

The academic study of missions therefore inched its way into university and seminary curricula, first as a part of the study of practical theology and/or church history, and later as a separate department or course of study, partially a result of the growing interest in the history of religions. By the turn of the century the number of essays, books, and journals dealing with mission issues had expanded significantly.

During the first three decades of the twentieth century, the number of courses, professors, and chairs of mission increased dramatically, only to be followed by a leveling off and then a downturn. Since the 1950s the number of universities in Europe and the United States with professorships in missions has decreased, but the corresponding number of seminaries and other schools, professors, and courses in mission-related subjects has increased substantially in the Americas, Africa, and Asia.

Roman Catholic missiological studies have followed much of the same path as Protestants since the time of Hirscher. Yet the number of outstanding missiologists has steadily increased as can be seen in the life and work of such giants as Robert Streit (1875–1930), JOSEF SCHMIDLIN (1876–1944), Wilhelm Schmidt (1868–1954), PIERRE CHARLES (1883–1954), John J. Considine (1897–1983), and a host of contemporary scholars.

Not all mission scholars and thinkers, however, have been professors. Some of the most influential theorists have been administrators, such as HENRY VENN (1796–1873) and RUFUS ANDERSON (1796– 1880). Others have been missionaries, such as WILLIAM TAYLOR (1821–1902), JOHN L. NEVIUS (1829–93), J. HUDSON TAYLOR (1832–1905), ROLAND ALLEN (1868–1947), E. STANLEY JONES (1874–1973), and HENDRICK KRAEMER (1888–1965). Some have been missionaries and later teachers, such as STEPHEN NEILL (1900–1984) and DONALD A. MCGAVRAN (1897–1990). Only during the last third of his life did McGavran become the founder, dean, and professor in the School of World Mission of Fuller Theological Seminary.

Scholarship in mission of course involves much more than theories, professorships, and courses in missions. Equally important are the societies established for the study and support of missions. Often these have been student-led groups such as the Society of Inquiry on the Subject of Missions founded in 1811 at Williams College and replicated at Princeton Seminary in 1815, as well as the Student Christian Movement and the STUDENT VOLUNTEER MOVEMENT (1886). Both the SCM and the SVM became international organizations, and both contributed to a steady stream of mission books and other educational material. The SVM helped shape Protestant missions from 1890 to 1940, recruited thousands of young people for missionary service, and was a major influence leading to the pivotal Edinburgh conference of 1910.

As already implied, much of the scholarly activity in mission resulted directly and indirectly from a number of international ecumenical conferences on world missions held in New York in 1954 and 1900, in London in 1878 and 1888, and in Edinburgh in 1910. The preparatory papers and the addresses delivered provided a wealth of material and insight into the thinking and doing of missions.

The number of annual missions lectureships established in colleges, seminaries, and divinity schools—such as the Student Lectureship on Missions inaugurated in 1891 at Princeton Seminary—increased steadily in the twentieth century. More recent are the Scherer Missions Lectures inaugurated in 1995 at the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago and the Missiology Lectures at Fuller Theological Seminary.

During the 1960s some observers were lamenting the decrease in books dealing with missions. But in the last thirty years the quantity, variety, and scope of published works, books as well as other materials, have increased and the quality has improved significantly. Besides denominational publications, there are publishing houses that specialize in producing books about missions—Orbis Books and William Carey Press are examples. Moreover, a number of secular publishing houses such as Harper & Row/Collins, Lippincott, Viking Penguin, Macmillan, T & T Clark, Steyler Verlag, and E. J. Brill, as well as notable university presses such as Harvard, Chicago, Yale, Illinois, and California are publishing works on missions and missionaries. University publications include not only mission history and biography, but also studies of the role of missions and missionaries in anthropology, economics, and international relations.

Currently, there are scores of JOURNALS OF MISSION AND MISSIOLOGY being published throughout

the world. These include *The International Bulletin of Missionary Research,* the *Evangelical Missions Quarterly,* the *International Review of Mission, Missiology, Missionalia* (Southern Africa), *Indian Missiological Review,* and the *South Pacific Journal of Mission Studies.*

Though there has been a steady stream of outstanding histories of missions, until the last twenty-five years there were hardly any reference works other than Edwin M. Bliss, *Encyclopedia of Missions* (1891, 1904) and B. L. Goddard, *The Encyclopedia of Modern Christian Missions* (1967). The publication of the *Concise Dictionary of the Christian World Mission* (1972) edited by Stephen Neill, Gerald H. Anderson, and John Goodwin, was followed by David Barrett's *World Christian Encyclopedia* (1982), the "A.D. 2000 Series" which includes *World Class Cities* and *World Evangelization* (1986), *Evangelize! A Historical Survey of the Concept* (1987), and *Seven Hundred Plans to Evangelize the World* (1988). Gerald Anderson's comprehensive *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions* (1997) will soon be followed by this work, *The Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions.*

Several centers for mission research are functioning, some for decades, such as the Overseas Ministries Study Center in New Haven, Connecticut. Newer ones include the Mission Advanced Research Center in Monrovia, California, the Oxford Center for Mission Studies and the Center for the Study of Islam and Muslim-Christian Religions, both in England.

Besides the universities and seminaries that offer the Ph.D., Th.D., S.T.D., and Ed.D. in mission studies, a growing number of institutions now have programs leading to a D.Miss. or doctorate in missiology (*see also* Doctoral Degrees in Mission). Moreover, in the past half-century some twelve hundred doctoral dissertations dealing with mission questions have been approved by schools in the United States and Canada.

Mention should also be made of the archival sources available to the serious scholar of mission. Stephen L. Peterson has analyzed those available in North America (IBMR 15 [October 1991]: 155–64), and Norman Thomas of the United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio, is directing a massive international project on documentation, archives, and bibliography. Annotated bibliographies of no less than 10,000 volumes in missiology in all major European languages published from 1960 to 1990 will be available in printed form and on compact disks.

Clearly the bulk of what is noted here relates principally to what has been and is taking place in the West. But as Christians become more numerous in the Two-Thirds World and as they devote more personnel and resources to scholarly endeavors, they will make their own missiological contributions. Mission study centers, for example, already are functioning in such diverse countries as Japan, Papua New Guinea, South Korea, Peru, India, Bolivia, and Brazil.

A great deal of the aforementioned activity can be traced to the increasing impact of professional missiological societies such as the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Missionswissenschaft (1918), the Association of Professors of Missions (1952), the Evangelical Missiological Society (1972), the International Association for Mission Studies (1972), and the American Society of Missiology (1973). These societies meet regularly and most produce their own journals.

Alan Neely

Bibliography. G. H. Anderson, R. T. Coote, N. A. Horner, and J. M. Phillips, *Mission Legacies;* G. H. Anderson, *IBMR* 15 (October 1991): 165–72; O. G. Mykebust, *The Study of Missions in Theological Education* 1 & 2; A. Neely, *Toward the Twenty-first Century in Christian Mission,* pp. 269–83; S. Neill, et al., *CDCWM;* S. L. Peterson, *IBMR* 15 (October 1991): 155–64; B. R. Pierce, *Missiology* 4 (1976): 75–87; J. Verkuyl, *Contemporary Missiology;* A. F. Walls, *IBMR* 15 (October 1991): 146–55.

Mission and Missions. Derived from the Latin *mitto,* which in turn is a translation of the Greek *apostellō* (to send), the term "mission," as an English term with no direct biblical equivalent, has a broad range of acceptable meanings. *The Oxford Dictionary* gives the earliest occurrences of the English word in 1598. By 1729, use of the word in relation to the church focused on the Great Commission: "Jesus Christ gave his disciples their mission in these words, 'Go and teach all nations, & etc.'" (E. Chambers, *Cyclopaedia; or an Universal Dictionary of Arts and Sciences*).

The contemporary secular definition of mission is simply "sending someone forth with a specific purpose." That purpose may be defined broadly (e.g., to represent the interests of the sender) or very narrowly (e.g., to hand-deliver a message written by the sender). With the broadness of the term, our concept of the mission of the church will to a large degree depend on our theological orientation rather than an etymological analysis.

Few would challenge the need for clarity in our definition, for, as Dyrness notes: "mission lies at the core of theology—within the character and action of God himself. There is an impulse to give and share that springs from the very nature of God and that therefore characterized all his works. So all that theologians call fundamental theology is mission theology" (p. 11). At the same time, however, the difficulty of defining mission cannot be overlooked or minimized. "Mission is never something self-evident, and nowhere—neither in the practice of mission nor in even our best theological reflections on mission, does it succeed in removing all confusions, mis-

understandings, enigmas and temptations" (Bosch, 9).

Several questions among the many which could be asked illuminate the contemporary discussion and options: (1) Is mission, most broadly, the whole scope of God's intention in the world or, more narrowly, the God-given MISSIONARY TASK of the church? (2) If our focus is on the task of the church, is mission limited to one core component of the church's work or is it everything that the church does? (3) Is it possible to determine a focus or priority for mission, and, if so, what should that be? At least until the IMC WILLINGEN CONFERENCE in 1952, the answers to these questions for evangelicals appeared to be relatively straight forward. Missions was evangelism and the evidence of successful missions was the extension of the church through the crossing of cultural, geographic, and linguistic boundaries.

In this century, however, we have seen several developments, most of which were birthed in the ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT and brought into evangelical discussion by people involved in both groups. Two of these developments relate to the word mission. First was the recognition that God's mission was broader than the activities of his Church. *MISSIO DEI*, coined as a missiological term by Karl Hartenstein in 1934, was used in the 1952 WILLINGEN CONFERENCE to stress that mission is God's not the church's. Georg Vicedom popularized it in the MEXICO CITY CONFERENCE (1963) and in his text *The Mission of God* (1965). *Missio Dei* focuses on everything God does in his task of establishing his kingdom in all its fullness in all the world. While it includes what the church does, it is not limited to that, for God works both in and out of the church. Thus themes such as "Let the world set the agenda" were driven by a recognition that God is not limited to his work in and through the church and that his mission is seen wherever kingdom values (especially justice and mercy) are being promoted, fought for, or instituted.

The second important development was the dropping of the "s" from "missions" to reflect the unity of the total biblical task of the church. The dropping of the final "s" was formalized in ecumenical discussion when the *International Review of Missions* became the *International Review of Mission* in 1970. By 1972, George Peters, an evangelical teaching at Dallas Theological Seminary, wrote that mission, in contrast to missions, was "a comprehensive term including the upward, inward and outward ministries of the church. It is the church as 'sent' (a pilgrim, stranger, witness, prophet, servant, as salt, as light, etc.) in this world" (Peters, 11). He maintained that missions, on the other hand, is the actual work and the practical realization of the mission of the church. Some evangelicals voiced concerns that dropping the "s" might lead to the loss of commitment to, and action for, world evangelization and church planting.

Evangelical approaches to defining mission have not been unified. John Stott allowed the broadening of the discussion, as long as evangelism was seen as a leading partner in the missionary task. W. Harold Fuller proposed using mission for our purpose and passion, while ministry refers to all that we do. Arthur Johnston opposed any broadening of mission. Ron Sider argued that social transformation is mission. On a pragmatic level, the reality of the disagreement is seen in the titles used for introductory theology courses taught in 78 North American institutions: 31 drop the final "s" ("Theology of Mission") and 46 keep it ("Theology of Missions") (Siewert).

Multiple conferences organized from within the EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT have sought to address the issue of mission and the primacy of evangelism within it. The CONGRESS ON THE CHURCH'S WORLDWIDE MISSION (WHEATON CONGRESS, 1966) was organized to deal with theological and practical issues. Affirming the scriptural foundation for social justice, the declaration of the congress still proclaimed the primacy of evangelism. In the same year the WORLD CONGRESS ON EVANGELISM (BERLIN CONGRESS 1966) was also held. Focused primarily on responding to shifting definitions of evangelism, the integral relationship of evangelism and missions was maintained. In 1970, the FRANKFURT DECLARATION ON THE FUNDAMENTAL CRISIS IN CHRISTIAN MISSION was developed in response to ecumenical shifts in thinking about mission, and it promoted a return to the classic orientation of mission as the presentation of salvation through evangelism. Calls for broadening the evangelical perspective came at the Thanksgiving Workshop on Evangelicals and Social Concern (Chicago, 1973), which issued the "Chicago Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern." This was "essentially an affirmation of God's total claim on the lives of his people, a confession of failure in demonstrating God's justice in society, and a call for evangelicals 'to demonstrate repentance in a Christian discipleship that confronts the social and political injustice of our nation'" (Padilla, 242). At the LAUSANNE CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELISM (1974), John Stott pointed to the broadening of the definition of mission and indicated that he saw no reason to resist this development. Building his paradigm on John's version of the GREAT COMMISSION, he proposed that we see mission as the church "sent" into the world to serve just as Jesus served, including EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY as partners in the missionary task. He did not see fulfilling the Great Commission as completing the directive of the GREAT COMMANDMENT, maintaining both as integral to mission. Laus-

anne proved to be a critical juncture in this respect. By 1989, in fact, the role of the Lausanne Covenant would be noted in the official story of Lausanne II as follows: "It is a watershed in placing social justice within the purposes of the Church's mission (Articles 4 and 5)" (Nichols, 15).

Since Lausanne, three streams have solidified within evangelicalism. One emphasizes the historic orientation of mission as evangelism, and carried on in meetings such as the GLOBAL CONSULTATIONS ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION (GCOWE) organized in 1989, 1995, and 1997. The focus of this stream remains the development of thriving church movements among people groups around the world.

A second stream, following Stott, focuses on integrating a holistic approach to mission, incorporating evangelism and issues of social justice and reconciliation (*see* HOLISTIC MISSION). Consultations such as that in Wheaton in 1983, convened to discuss the nature of the church, gave voice to this group and "laid a sound theological basis for the mission of the Church, with no dichotomy between evangelism and social responsibility" (Padilla, 247).

The third stream, sometimes referred to as the radical discipleship group, and including evangelicals such as Ron Sider, Rene Padilla, and Samuel Escobar, considers social justice to be mission just as evangelism is, and does not give priority to either (*see also* OPTION FOR THE POOR).

Representatives of the three streams have come together from time to time, perhaps most notably at the CONSULTATION ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CRESR 1982), where the partnership of evangelism and social responsibility and the primacy of evangelism were both reaffirmed, though it was noted that "some of us have felt uncomfortable about this phrase, lest by it we should be breaking the partnership" (LCWE, p. 24). WHEATON '83 gave greater weight to the partnership stream, as well as opening discussion on transforming societies through structural intervention as an element of holistic mission. Finally, representatives of all three streams were also present at the LAUSANNE CONGRESS II ON WORLD EVANGELISM (MANILA, 1989). Again, the focus continued to give weight to the idea of partnership with evangelism being primary. Through the declaration and subsequent ongoing reflection, the second stream gained prominence in evangelical mission.

The debate continues and consensus over this complex issue remains a goal to be reached in the future rather than a present reality.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. D. Bosch, *Witness to the World: The Christian Mission in Theological Perspective;* W. Dyrness, *Let the Earth Hear His Voice;* LCWE, *Evangelism and Social Responsibility: An Evangelical Covenant;* W. H. Fuller, *Church in Africa Today and Tomorrow: Proceedings of the A.E.A.M. 4th General Assembly,* pp. 280–98; A. Johnston, *The Battle for World Evangelism;* A. Nichols, ed., *The Whole Gospel for the Whole World: Story of Lausanne II Congress on World Evangelization, Manila 1989;* R. C. Padilla, *The Best in Theology,* 1:239–52; G. Peters, *A Biblical Theology of Missions;* D. L. Robert, *IBMR* 18 (1994): 146–62; J. Siewert, *Directory of Schools and Professors of Mission,* rev. ed.; J. R. W. Stott, *Mission in the Modern World;* C. Van Engen, *Mission on the Way: Issues in Mission Theology;* G. Vicedom, *The Mission of God: An Introduction to a Theology of Mission.*

Mission Theory. "Mission theory" identifies principles which are held to be essential to the successful practice of mission. Over the years, the term has been used in an elastic manner to encompass beliefs, goals, policies, strategies, and procedures involved in the tasks of mission. Some argue that mission (or missionary) theory occupies an intermediate level between theology and policy, because it is shaped not only by theological convictions but also by the fruits of actual experience. In that case, "mission strategy" and "mission policy" are viewed as being nearly synonymous.

A comprehensive framework for mission theory has probably never been fully elaborated. In the Middle Ages, Franciscan and Dominican monks thought carefully about how to do mission effectively, while Roman Catholic thinkers such as JOSÉ DE ACOSTA (1540–1600) and Tomas à Jesu, wrote perceptively in this cross-cultural area in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The Jesuit Acosta produced a monumental mission manual in Peru, under the title *De Procuranda Indorum Salute* (1577), which was translated *as Predicacion del Evangelio en las Indias* ("Preaching the Gospel in the Indies"). Vibrant Dutch Protestants, including Hadrianus Saravia (1531–1613) and Justus Heurnius (1587–1651), also pondered over the essentials of mission. However, Protestant mission leaders in the nineteenth century did not pay much attention to them, if at all. Mission leaders such as the SERAMPORE TRIO drew much more from MORAVIAN and German PIETIST precedents, from their own experience in pre-Victorian India and from the theological well of Jonathan Edwards (1703–58), in developing their mission approach and philosophy.

During Europe's ENLIGHTENMENT era, an Englishman named William Orme urged (1828) that there was a need to develop a theoretical framework for the mission enterprise. Another contemporary of William Carey, during the opening phase of Protestantism's "modern missionary movement," was the German theologian Friedrich E. D. Schleiermacher (1768–1834). Partly influenced by Moravians and German Pietists, Schleiermacher viewed the "theory of mission" as part of practical theology.

Subsequent pioneers of mission studies in Germany, such as the Protestant GUSTAV WARNECK (1867–1944) and JOSEPH SCHMIDLIN (1876–1944), insisted that a full-blown theory of mission was essential to mission studies; but British mission thinkers did not respond to the challenge. As a debtor to the European Enlightenment, Schmidlin, the father of Catholic MISSIOLOGY, equated "practical mission theory" rather narrowly with "missiology" in 1925. He modeled his Catholic mission theory on Gustav Warneck's *Missionslehre* and defined "mission theory" comprehensively as "the scientific investigation and statement of the principles and rules which govern the work of spreading the faith. As the theory of the missionary art, it seeks to answer the questions as to why, whither, how and by whom missions should be undertaken." Probably the last missiologists to develop distinctively German mission theory were WALTER FREYTAG (1899– 1959) and Georg Vicedom (b. 1903).

During the Victorian period, the key idea in Anglo-American mission theory came to be the concept of the INDIGENOUS CHURCH. This was developed simultaneously by two remarkable mission statesmen, an American, RUFUS ANDERSON (1796–1880), and an Englishman, HENRY VENN (1796–1873).

Anderson decried the popular idea that Christian faith and Christian civilization were inseparable. He identified the proper aims of mission as being the planting of self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating churches. In the 1860s, Henry Venn, called for the "the euthanasia" of missions as the final stage of the mission-to-church process. Since he saw "the raising up of a Native Church" as the great object of a mission, he viewed mission as the scaffolding to be removed once a self-responsible indigenous church had emerged. JOHN L. NEVIUS (1829–93), an American Presbyterian missionary to China and Korea, ROBERT E. SPEER (1867–1947) and the Scot, John Ritchie (1878–1952), did much to further general acceptance of "indigenous church principles" in theory and practice until the mid-twentieth century.

Important contributions to the development of missions theorizing have come from the pens of missiologists such as ROLAND ALLEN (1868–1947), a vigorous critic of the Anglo-American mission system who wrote among other classic works *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church and the Causes Which Hinder It* (1927, reissued 1960); WILLIAM E. HOCKING (1873–1966), *Re-Thinking Missions* (1932); HENDRIK KRAEMER (1888–1965), *The Christian Message in a non-Christian World* (1938); J. C. HOEKENDIJK (1912–75), *Kerk en Volk in de Duitse Zendingswetenschap* (1967); DONALD A. MCGAVRAN (1897–1990), *Understanding Church Growth* (1969); and RALPH D. WINTER (1924–).

Jongeneel opines that the term "theory of mission(s)" was replaced by the term "theology of mission(s)," particularly after the Second World War. This appears to be corroborated by changes in the classification system of the *International Review of Missions* [IRM], the premier missiological journal in mission studies during the first two-thirds of the twentieth century. The IRM's classification system was set up by J. H. OLDHAM in 1912 and it operated until 1963, when its categories were radically changed by LESSLIE NEWBIGIN in line with the thinking of the CWME MEXICO CITY CONFERENCE (1963). Until then, the "Theory and Principles of Missions" had featured as one of its major classification categories. Thereafter, the term "theory of mission" or "mission theory" sank out of view. Only the term mission "principles" was retained in the bibliography field of mainstream mission. Thus "the concept of mission theory and what it symbolized" evidently disappeared from general usage by the mid 1960s.

In the face of such a trend, serious work has been done recently in the U.S. to develop a new level of scholarly discourse on mission theory. After giving decades of attention to the subject, Wilbert R. Shenk, in his presidential address to the AMERICAN SOCIETY OF MISSIOLOGY in June 1995, outlined seven elements necessary for development of "a general theory of mission." He argued that "a general conceptual framework" would have to do the following:

1. Situate the mission process historically and empirically as an inter-cultural movement, including the agents and agencies, and the host culture and peoples. . . .
2. Identify and critically evaluate the main model(s) by which mission has been and may be prosecuted. . . .
3. Account for the impact of the mission on the host culture and the impact of the culture on the mission, i.e., as reflected in modifications and innovations the mission makes in response to the cultural context.
4. Correlate the development of the modern world system with the development of the mission, especially the impact of modern communications and the economic system. . . .
5. Trace the influence the various strands of renewal, revival, and revitalization [not all necessarily Christian in nature] that touch the churches, often with long-range implications.
6. Maintain a dialectical relationship between mission praxis and the biblical theological foundation of mission. . . .
7. Hold in tension local mission and God's

> mission to all people so that theory geared to the local context will be developed that will draw forth the fullness and richness of the particular in light of God's ultimate saving purpose . . . (1996, 41).

In light of this, Shenk has distinguished very clearly between the development of "mission theory," which must involve deep theological insight, and the business of mission strategizing (or planning). Vividly aware that "a strategy always reflects the culture and historical moment in which it is formulated" (1993, 219), he has underscored the "ambivalence" that "has characterized discussion of strategy in mission studies." He reminded Christian thinkers that their best formulations still fall far short of representing God's ways of advancing his kingdom.

Such warning was not intended to deter God's people from exploring the unfathomable patterns and dimensions of God's mission. Rather, it is a prophetic spur to missiologists to be doubly alert to the significance of what God is doing in the world, and the world church, today.

During the last quarter of the twentieth century, major contributors to our understanding of the dynamics of effective, cross-cultural Christian witness and service have included the South African, DAVID J. BOSCH (1929–94), especially his *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (1991); the Puerto Rican, ORLANDO E. COSTAS (1924–87), with his *Christ Outside the Gate: Mission Beyond Christendom* (1982); the Gambian, Lamin Sanneh, especially his *Translating the Message* (1989) and *Encountering the West* (1993); and the Scot, ANDREW F. WALLS, a compendium of whose influential writings has been published under the title *The Missionary Movement in Christian History* (1996), of which his essay "Missionary Societies and the Fortunate Subversion of the Church" deserves special mention. At the end of the twentieth century, international Christian leaders consequently find themselves challenged by new frameworks from which to address missional situations, under rubrics such as a missiology for the West, CONTEXTUALIZATION of the gospel, Two-Thirds World missions, mission in the city, and reaching the unreached.

A. CHRISTOPHER SMITH

Bibliography. R. Allen, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?;* G. Anderson et al., eds., *Mission Legacies;* R. P. Beaver, ed., *To Advance the Gospel. Selections from the Writings of Rufus Anderson;* J. B. Jongeneel, *Philosophy, Science, and Theology of Mission in the 19th and 20th Centuries,* Part I; D. A. McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth,* rev. ed.; J. L. Nevius, *Planting and Development of Missionary Churches;* J. M. Phillips and R. T. Coote, eds., *Toward the 21st Century in Christian Mission;* W. R. Shenk, *IBMR* 5:4 (1981): 168–72; idem, *Missiology* 24:1 (1996): 31–45; J. Verkuyl, *Contemporary Missiology. An Introduction;* A. F. Walls, *Evangelical Quarterly* 60:2 (1988): 141–55; M. Warren, ed., *To Apply the Gospel: Selections from the Writings of Henry Venn.*

Missionary. Few terms within the evangelical missiological vocabulary generate more diverse definitions. For some, "everybody is a missionary," but STEPHEN NEILL is right in saying that if everybody is a missionary, nobody is a missionary. A few argue that a select category of persons are honored with this title; but still others discard it totally and substitute "apostolic messenger" instead.

The Biblical Root and Uses. In the New Testament the Greek term *apostellō* (with a related one, *pempō*) emerges in two major categories: as a broadly used verb, the sending in one form or another and by different senders (132 times), and as a more specifically used noun, the apostolic person (80 times). The senders (either verb or noun) include a variety of people (including a negative one, Herod; Matt. 2:16), God (John 20:21), Christ (Luke 9:2), the church (Acts 15:27), the Spirit (*pempō* in Acts 13:4). The sent ones include the Spirit (1 Peter 1:23), Christ (Matt. 10:40; John 20:21), the apostles (Mark 3:15; Luke 6:12–16), other authorized representatives of the churches (2 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:25; Rom. 16:7), angels (Rev. 1:1), and servants or employees (Acts 10:17). The core New Testament meaning clusters around ideas related to sending and or crossing lines, to those being sent, the sent ones—whether messengers or the Twelve, or the others who serve with some kind of apostolic authority or function. The New Testament affirms that the apostolic messenger (the missionary) becomes the person authoritatively sent out by God and the church on a special mission with a special message, with particular focus on the Gentiles/nations.

Other Jewish records show this term (a derivative of the Hebrew *saliah*) describing authorized messengers sent into the diaspora: to collect funds for Jewish uses; or taking letters from Jews or Jewish centers with instructions and warnings, including how to deal with resistance. The New Testament adopts some of these ideas, as well as a broader one from Greek culture with the concept of divine authorization. It then injects new meaning into the missionary apostles (life-long service, Spirit-empowered, with particular focus on the missionary task) referring to the original Twelve (plus Paul) as well as other authorized messengers. This is the core of the Christian apostolic person and function. There is no evidence of this office being authoritatively passed on from generation to generation.

The Term through Church History. Ironically as the Latin language takes over Bible use and

church life, its synonym, *mitto*, becomes the dominant word. From *mitto* we derive the English word "missionary." Therefore an "accident" of linguistic history has replaced the original Greek concept with all of its richness and depth. In the immediate post-apostolic era, the term was used of itinerant ministers, and in that form was known to Irenaeus and Tertullian. James Scherer argues that there is no New Testament connection that would utilize apostolic concepts and functions in the corporate life of the churches of that later period. "The functions of the apostolate were merged into the corporate ministry of the church."

Roman Catholic usage emerged by 596 when Gregory the Great sent the Benedictine monk AUGUSTINE OF CANTERBURY to lead a missionary delegation to the British Isles. The Roman Church also used the term in reference to their orders (as sent ones), starting with the Franciscans in the thirteenth century, and later other orders. This was established in 1622 when the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith was instituted. Hoffman writes, "According to the letters patent it gave to apostolic laborers overseas, missionaries were those sent to announce the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to teach the gentiles to observe whatever the Roman Catholic Church commands, to propagate the Catholic Faith, and to forewarn of the universal judgment." Today Catholics use the terms missionary, missioner, missionate, and mission apostolate in a variety of ways, including ". . . anyone engaged in some manner in the establishment of the Church where it had not been established," as well as teachers, medical personnel, agronomists and others serving holistically. Within Catholicism the broadest meaning is now also applied ". . . to all apostolic Christians collaborating with Christ in bringing about the total redemption of all mankind, and indeed of all created nature . . . in a word, all those engaging in the mission of bringing Christ to all being and all being to Christ."

The Protestant REFORMATION, partially in reaction to the Roman positions, minimized the term and concept of the missionary. It reemerged with greater significance within German PIETISM at Halle, itself a reaction to the Reformation excess. Thus the Moravians used the term for their broad-spectrum enterprise, and then it was adopted by CAREY, JUDSON, MORRISON, and LIVINGSTONE and their successors.

The Term Used Today. We have mentioned the diverse Catholic uses of this term. In secular circles the term "mission" still has a variety of uses: diplomatic, commercial, or military missions. Some Protestants have argued for their own particular coinage applied in the broadest way for all Christian activity as "mission" and subsequently all Christians are missionaries. Some evangelicals use the slogan "everybody is a missionary" to reject an apparent special category, but also because they desire to universalize missionary responsibility.

Singaporean Jim Chew encourages us to substitute "cross-cultural messenger." To him, this special servant " . . . is not a temporary but an abiding necessity for the life of the church, provided always that the movement of mission is multidirectional, all churches both sending and receiving." However, Chew sustains the position that "missionary" is simply a generic term for all Christians doing everything the church does in service to the KINGDOM OF GOD. We do a disservice to the "missionary" by universalizing its use. While all believers are witnesses and kingdom servants, not all are missionaries. We do not glamorize or exalt the missionary, or ascribe higher honor in life or greater heavenly reward, and neither do we create an artificial office.

This focused conclusion comes from a biblical theology of vocations (God has given us diverse vocations and all are holy, but not all the same); a theology of gifts (not all are apostles nor all speak in tongues—1 Cor. 12:29) and therefore not all Christians are missionaries; and a theology of callings (the Triune God sovereignly calls some to this position and task; *see* MISSIONARY CALL). These men and women are cross-cultural workers who serve within or without their national boundaries, and they will cross some kind of linguistic, cultural, or geographic barriers as authorized sent ones.

WILLIAM DAVID TAYLOR

Bibliography. D. Müller, *NIDNTT*; 1:126–35; J. Chew, *When You Cross Cultures;* T. Hale, *On Being a Missionary;* J. H. Kane, *Understanding Christian Mission,* 3rd ed.; R. Hoffman, *NCE* 9:907; G. W. Peters, *A Biblical Theology of Missions;* J. A. Scherer, *Missionary, Go Home!*

Missionary Call, The. All Christians are called to the service of the church as witnesses for Christ in every part of their lives. But the missionary call is more than this. It is a special and unique call to full-time ministry. Simply put, the missionary call is the command of God and the setting apart by the Holy Spirit of an individual Christian to serve God in a culture, a geographical location, and, very likely, in a language different than the missionary's own. The personal recognition of this call comes with a growing conviction that God has set the recipient apart for this service. The result of this conviction is an intense desire to obey and to go wherever God leads.

"Missionary call" is an extrabiblical term, yet it refers to a sovereign act of God in the life of a person to bring that person to a point of decision to serve God in a missionary capacity. Since the phrase is not found in the Bible, there has been some confusion as to what a missionary call en-

tails. In the history of missions, we observe that God's call of his people to missions is as diverse as the missionaries themselves. This means that one cannot generate a checklist which, if completed, would produce or prove a missionary call. However, such a call is based on concrete circumstances and experiences such that, after identifying the call in one's own life, one can look back and observe God's sovereign guidance and control in the process leading to the call and personal recognition of it.

What are proper foundations for receiving a missionary call? (1) Belief in and commitment to the lordship of Jesus Christ such that it produces unconditional love for him and obedience to his will. (2) A commitment to obey the will of God in our walk with him. It is understood that if we are not seeking to obey his will in general terms, then he will not reveal his specific will for us, as, for example, in a call to missionary service. (3) Openness to the leading of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit leads as he wills, according to the uniqueness of the individual's gifts and personality. Each Christian must be sensitive to the leading of the Holy Spirit in his or her own life, for the Spirit leads each person uniquely. (4) Belief in the Word of God as authoritative and a commitment to obey the principles and guidance laid down in it. (5) An understanding that the GREAT COMMISSION was given by Jesus to all Christians, and therefore each person should be involved in helping to fulfill this command. God works sovereignly in the normal issues and activities of life to lay these foundations of faith, obedience, and desire. Their reality in a believer's life is an act of God's sovereign grace.

Given the foundations for receiving a missionary call, there are certain attitudes and activities that help prepare one for receiving this call. These are normally developed over time as the Holy Spirit leads the potential missionary to the place in life in which he or she is able to respond positively and maturely to God's call.

One significant attitude is a hatred of sin. A person should strive to mortify sin, to put it to death in the life, and to bring every thought captive to make it obedient to Christ (2 Cor. 10:5). This attitude, with appropriate actions, shows a person's desire to obey God rather than self. Additionally, the one called should have open eyes, seeing beyond his or her own world of relationships and circumstances, seeing the world as God sees it, lost and without hope.

There should also be an open heart, a soft heart for the lost, like God's heart (John 3:16; 2 Peter 3:9). Jesus gave up his life because of God's love for the lost (Rom. 5:8), and believers are to have this same attitude (Phil. 2:5–8). There should be open ears, a sensitive listening to the Holy Spirit. This is developed through careful listening to the Word of God and obedience to its commands. As God's commands and guidance from the Word are carefully applied, we become more sensitive to the Spirit's quiet leading. And so we are able to hear when he calls. Christians must also have open hands demonstrated through an involvement in some kind of work for the Lord. Finally, we should have the attitude Isaiah demonstrated in his response to God's call. "Here am I, send me!" (Isa. 6:8). This shows willingness to go anywhere as the Lord commands.

As is clear from the above, there are obvious activities that will help prepare Christians for God's call and enable them to move rather than hesitate when such a call comes. These include: (1) praying for the lost of the world, for their countries, and for the church, the missionaries and the ministries in those countries; (2) giving to missionaries and to mission programs and ministries; (3) going on short-term ministry opportunities in a different culture away from the security and comfort of home; (4) reading missionary biographies and newsletters and books and journals on missions; (5) serving under the oversight and encouragement of a local body of believers who will help in the identification and development of spiritual gifts and ministry skills; and (6) gaining broad ministry experience, giving attention to ministry in areas in which God gives wisdom, fruit, and joy.

As revealed through many missionary testimonies, a person's missionary call may be impressed on the mind and heart as one listens to a message or a testimony, reads a passage of Scripture, prays for the lost, reads an article or book, hears of a particular or general need, or is personally challenged to go. God is not limited in the means or methods he will use to call his missionaries to serve him on the mission field. Complementary to this realization must be the recognition and confirmation of a local body of believers (Acts 13:2). The church is Christ's agent on this earth, and he will use the church to confirm the call and to send the missionary with the needed support.

The proof of the missionary call for any individual is that God has seen fit to allow the individual to serve him on the mission field. There are those who feel that they have received the call but are never able to go. This can be the result of such things as ill health, family obligations, or lack of resources. The Lord works his sovereign will to further his kingdom in many ways. Those who are prepared to go but are unable to may serve a vital part of the missionary endeavor through their work of support and spreading the vision for missions.

THOMAS L. AUSTIN

Bibliography. E. P. Clowney, *Called to the Ministry;* H. R. Cook, *An Introduction to Christian Missions;* J. H. Kane, *Understanding Christian Missions.*

Missionary Task. Defining the missionary task of the church is central to missionary reflection. But it is more than that. It is also a crucial responsibility of the church, for a church unsure or misdirected about its mission can hardly achieve it. And yet rarely in church history has there been agreement on what the missionary task of the church is.

Following the early expansion of the Western church, the Middle Ages saw centuries of introversion that all but eliminated missionary activity, including later, among the reformers. Then came the Moravians, followed by what has been called the GREAT CENTURY OF MISSION. Nineteenth-century Protestants in Europe and North America gained a new missionary vision and were, for the most part, united in what the missionary task was—specifically, they grounded it in the commission Christ gave the first great missionary, Paul as "Mission to the Gentiles, to whom I now send you, to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among those who are sanctified by faith in me" (Acts 26:17, 18). The twentieth century was, if anything, an even greater century for missions, but from the start the unity of vision began to disintegrate. As the conviction weakened that people without Christ were lost, the definition of mission began to change. "Missions" became "mission," meaning purpose, and the old passion for classical evangelistic missions was swallowed up by the other good things a church must do. Consequently, from Europe and mainline churches in North America the stream of missionaries began to dry up, until by the end of the century it was a mere trickle.

Upon the gradual withdrawal of traditional missionaries nondenominational agencies and newer denominations (like the Assemblies of God and the Christian and Missionary Alliance) took up the slack for what may be history's greatest surge of evangelism, following World War II. How did these forces of the last half of the twentieth century define the task? As the initial evangelistic thrust into new territories was successful, the focus of missionaries typically shifted to serving the new churches in pastoral, educational, and other helping roles until the de facto definition of "missions" became, "sending people away from the home church to serve God in some capacity elsewhere, especially cross-culturally." Thus the popular understanding of "missions" moved gradually in the same direction as the earlier drift, defining missions as "all the good things a church does," as DONALD MCGAVRAN so aptly put it, but with this spin: all the good things a church does *away from home.*

An even broader definition of "missions" and "missionary" began to emerge. In the effort to get all disciples fully involved in witness, it was said that "everyone is either a missionary or a mission field." *All* disciples are sent as missionaries to their own world. Does it make any difference to define the missionary task one way or another? Is it helpful to distinguish clearly among the tasks of the church? Is it necessary? History would seem to teach that it does indeed make a great deal of difference. In fact, failure to focus clearly on the New Testament understanding of missions seems to have always marked the beginning of the end of missionary enterprise.

The original, basic missionary task of the church was to send certain evangelistically gifted members to places where Christ is not known to win people to faith and establish churches. That this is a biblical definition can be demonstrated in two ways: (1) the meaning of the term used for " missionary" and (2) the example of those who heard Christ's final instructions.

Apostles. The term "apostle" (literally "one who is sent") was used in several different ways in the New Testament (*see* APOSTLES). It was used in the historic root meaning of any messenger (John 13:16; Phil. 2:25). But another nuance was emerging in New Testament times, meaning "one sent as an authoritative representative of the sender." In this meaning it is used supremely of Jesus, sent for our redemption (Heb. 3:1). When Christ finished his apostleship he passed that role on to others, called variously "the disciples" (though the ones highlighted were among hundreds of other disciples), "the twelve" (though there were more than twelve, with Matthias, Paul, and Jesus' brother, James, added to the select group), and "the Apostles," those sent with divine authority to establish Christ's church. Thus the term referred to a unique office, the founders of the church. But the term was used of others, too, people like Barnabas (often included in the apostolate), Timothy and Silas, Andronicus and Junia (Rom. 16:7), Epaphroditus (Phil. 2:25) and, indeed, the whole missionary team (1 Thess. 2:6). In this use, "apostle" refers not to an *office* (the "twelve" founders), but to a *role,* the role of pioneering. Paul describes this role clearly when he describes his ambition to proclaim Christ where he has not yet been named (Rom. 15:20; Haldane, Hodge, Murray, and Calvin all clearly identify this apostolic role). "All who seemed to be called by Christ or the Spirit to do missionary work would be thought worthy of the title . . ." (Plummer, 84). Lightfoot wrote the seminal exposition of this meaning of "apostle" in his extensive footnote on Galations 1:27. We call these pioneer church-starting evangelists, "missionaries," from the Latin translation of the Greek *apostolos.* They are sent by the home church to win people to faith and establish churches where there are none.

This apostolic role continued after the original apostles died. Eusebius, writing of the time from A.D. 100–150 speaks of "numberless apostles" or "Preaching Evangelists" who were living then. He described them:

> They performed the office of Evangelists to those who had not yet heard the faith, whilst, with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the books of the Holy Gospels. After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations, with the grace and cooperation of God. (Schaff, 68)

Thus, from the beginning, there was a missionary function distinct from other roles in the church. It was distinct from the witnessing responsibility all Christians have, even distinct from that of evangelistically gifted Christians winning non-Christians who live nearby. These, rather, are *sent* ones, sent to those out of reach of present gospel witness. And their role is distinct also from what other "sent ones" do. These are "missionaries" who pastor the young church and who assist it in various other ways, but they do not have the apostolic function of winning to faith and starting churches. Failure to distinguish this task from other tasks may have the appearance of elevating their significance but in historic perspective it only serves to blur and diminish the original missionary task of the church. A full team is needed to reach the unreached, of course—those at home who send and colleagues on the field who reinforce the apostolic thrust in supportive ministries. But the original missionary task of the church is fulfilled through pioneer apostolic church starting evangelists. The first evidence for this is the way the term "apostle" was used in the New Testament and in the years immediately following. But there is other, even stronger evidence.

The Acts of the Apostles. One function of the Book of Acts is to demonstrate clearly what the missionary task of the church is. Christ gave what we call the GREAT COMMISSION on at least three occasions, probably on four, and perhaps on five. This, along with the demonstration of his own resurrection, was the only theme to which he returned in his several encounters with the disciples in the six weeks before he ascended. Clearly this "sending" was uppermost in his mind. What did he intend that those sent should do? Acts gives the answer of how those who received the commission understood it. Evangelism begins with incarnating the transforming gospel as we see from the first commissioning on the night of the resurrection: "As the Father sent me, so send I you" (John 20:21). If there were any doubt as to the implications of this command, John himself gives a commentary in his first letter: "As he is, so are we in this world" (1 John 4:17). But demonstrating the love of God (1 John 4:7–17) does not exhaust the evangelistic assignment. In fact, to live a good life without telling how we do it is bad news, not good news. So the second element in the commission is proclamation and witness, explaining what one has experienced personally: "Go into all the world and preach the gospel . . ." (Mark 16:15). This gospel ". . . shall be proclaimed to all nations . . . and you are witnesses . . ." (Luke 24:47, 48), and "You shall be witnesses to me. . . to the uttermost parts of the world" (Acts 1:8). But on these four occasions Jesus says nothing about winning to faith and establishing churches. Only once does he do that: "Go therefore and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them . . ." (Matt. 28:19). He even goes beyond evangelism to the final fruit of evangelism: ". . . teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you . . ." (v. 20). Here the pastoral and teaching role is included! How tragic if obedient children gathered in his family were not the end result of the missionary task.

In this way, four of the great commissions don't even extend to winning people to faith—just incarnation, proclamation, and witness. The first step of evangelism, to be sure, but hardly the whole of it. And the fifth great commission goes far beyond the initial task of evangelism, encompassing all the church was meant to be. Thus, Christ is clear enough on the initial stage and the final stage, but how do we find out what he intends for the in between? That is where the example of the churches' obedience to that commission comes in: *The Acts of the Apostles*. The early history of the church was given, in part, to demonstrate what Christ intended. And the picture emerges clearly and quickly: a select few were sent out from home churches to places where Christ was not known to win people to faith and gather them into local congregations. And that is the missionary task of the church. Paul and his missionary band first of all lived authentic lives, demonstrating the power of the gospel. In that context they immediately and constantly talked about it, explaining the gospel, urging their hearers to accept it. Thus they won people to faith and organized churches. Soon the responsibility for pastoring and teaching was turned over to others and, once the missionary task in that place was completed, the missionary band pressed on to regions beyond.

We derive our definition of the missionary task, then, from the New Testament term used to define the role, and from the New Testament example of those who fulfilled that role: the missionary task is to go, sent as representatives of

the home church, to places where Christ is not known, winning people to faith and establishing congregations of those new believers.

ROBERTSON MCQUILKIN

Bibliography. L. W. Caldwell, *Sent Out: Reclaiming the Spiritual Gift of Apostleship for Missionaries and Churches Today;* C. Clark, *ERT* 13 (October 1989): 344–82; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians;* A. Plummer, *DAC,* 1:82–84; P. Schaff, *The Oldest Church Manual Called the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles";* W. Schmithals, *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church.*

Motive, Motivation. One's motives for seeking missionary service must be correct ones. Some Christians are fascinated with the romance of travel, the idea that missions is the highest form of Christian service, the intrigue of another culture, or the desire to do good. These are all inadequate motives, which pale when compared with the centrality of biblical motives.

The missionary is one who is "sent." Although humans are involved in the process, the missionary must sense that the Holy Spirit is sending him or her.

God's dealings with Abraham (Gen. 12:2–3) are an early biblical indication that God desires to call, bless, and send his people, so that "all peoples on earth will be blessed" through them. This is repeatedly indicated to Abraham (Gen. 18:18; 22:16–18), as well as to Isaac (Gen. 26:4) and Jacob (Gen. 28:13–14). It is apparent that God did not intend Israel to be the sole recipient of his grace and love. Rather, Israel was to be a channel and a conduit through which his love could flow "to all nations on earth." At high moments in Israel's history, this focus was renewed (1 Kings 8:43; Ps. 96:3).

The five GREAT COMMISSION passages of the New Testament give us strong motivation for mission. Even Jesus' disciples finally caught on. Peter, in Acts 3:25, points back to God's promise to Abraham: "Through your offspring all peoples on earth will be blessed." Paul echoes the same thought in Galatians 3:8. It is apparent that God's plan has always been to wrap his message up in his people and then send them to reach others. This is the bedrock motivation for mission. We go in obedience to his will.

Another motivation that has propelled Christians to missionary service has been the needs of the world. The number of UNREACHED PEOPLES is a stimulus to missionary activity. Other Christians have been moved to do missionary work because of the hunger, sickness, or poverty around the globe. Acts 13:1–4 indicates that leadership in the church has a role to play (under the direction of the Holy Spirit) in setting apart persons for missionary service.

God's guidance to individuals in the form of a MISSIONARY CALLING is also a powerful motivation for mission. As he did with Abraham, so God still speaks to individuals. The nature of a call is the subject of great debate. Certainly we may say that such a call varies among people. For some it may come as a thunderclap; for others, it comes like the gradual dawning of a new day. However it is defined, most churches and mission agencies desire that a person should have a clear sense that God is leading him or her to apply for missionary service. This motivation often is the only anchor that will hold the new missionary steady during the dark testing times of CULTURE SHOCK and other problems on the field.

Biblical motives must be central for missions. The needs of the world may beckon us, the romance of other cultures may intrigue us, but in the end the primary motivation for mission must be because "Christ's love compels us" (2 Cor. 5:14).

CHARLES R. GAILEY

Bibliography. P. A. Beals, *A People For His Name;* C. Van Engen, *Mission on the Way.*

New Covenant. The term *new covenant* is usually used in contrast to the *old covenant* of Moses found in the Old Testament (John 1:17). But the Old Testament contains more than one covenant, and most are related to mission. God made a covenant with Noah (Gen. 8:21–9:17) on which Paul based his appeal to his audience at Lystra (Acts 14:14–18). This cosmic or Noahic covenant, made with human beings in creation, is one part of the salvation story (Rom. 1:19–20), incomplete in itself and yet of continuing validity in evangelism. God covenants not to destroy again sinful humankind by a flood, promises to sustain life on earth, warns against sin, and establishes the cycle of seasons. This state of humanity is an expression of God's will.

God's covenant with Abraham (Gen. 12:3; *see* ABRAHAMIC COVENANT), his election of Israel to be the mediator of his salvation to the nations (Exod. 19:5–8), and his covenant with David to establish his eternal kingdom through David's descendant (2 Sam. 7:11–16) all look forward to the new covenant. Jeremiah foretold of the coming of this new covenant, when external rules would be replaced by the internal control of the living Spirit of God (Jer. 31:33–37).

The choice of Abraham and the election of Israel do not mean that the peoples of the earth are ignored or rejected. Neither, however, do any of the old covenants require that Israel seek actively by specific missionary activity to proclaim God to the nations. God's movement toward the nations is always with reference to their relation to Israel as God's people. As the nations see God's action in judgment and salvation in Israel, they

may then share in the blessing of the elect nation. (Ps. 67:1–2).

Karl Barth comments:

> . . . it is precisely the covenant of Yahweh with a unique Israel, of Israel with a unique God . . . far from being an end in itself . . . that has meaning, revelation, real and dynamic import for the relation between God and *all* peoples, *men* of all peoples. (Blauw, 1962, 28)

Jesus comes as the elect and covenanted Servant of God who will "restore the tribes of Jacob . . . (be) a light for the Gentiles . . . (and) bring my salvation to the ends of the earth" (Isa. 42:1; 49:6).

The early ministry of Jesus in the New Testament, with occasional exceptions, was focused on reaching and renewing the "lost sheep of Israel" (Matt. 10:6). But he was also building a new community—a community of the covenant. This becomes clear during the last week of his earthly ministry when he instituted the Last Supper. Two things are of particular importance in the Matthean account (Matt. 26:26–30). By speaking of the "blood of the covenant," Jesus was reminding his disciples how Moses ratified the old covenant by sprinkling the blood of bulls on the altar and the people (Exod. 24:6–8). The blood of the new covenant—of Jesus' pending sacrifice—was "poured out for *many* for the forgiveness of sins." This covenant then went beyond blessing for Israel. It was for the peoples of the world. As believers everywhere celebrate the Lord's Supper, they are reminded of Jesus' sacrifice and of the need to make him known everywhere until Christ's return.

Paul elaborates on this by pointing out how the sacrifice of Christ destroyed the barrier between Jews and Gentiles (Eph. 2:11–22). This truth became the theological foundation enabling the early church to break out of its Jewish cocoon and realize that no people were "impure or unclean"—all could receive salvation through trust in Jesus who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

The author of Hebrews repeatedly refers to the blood of Christ and his one sufficient sacrifice—the central content of the new covenant—as being far superior to every feature of the old covenant. He notes the redemptive aspects of this covenant: forgiveness of sins (7:27, 8:12), being redeemed from sin (9:15), freedom from guilt (10:2), cleansing from an unclean conscience (9:14), a living way into the presence of God (10:22), and an eternal inheritance (9:15). The blessings of the new covenant are to the end that "we may *serve* the living God" (9:14).

With the theological foundation established by the new covenant, Jesus summoned his disciples to the mountain top in Galilee. Here he reminded them that they, as the beginning of the new covenant community, had a weighty responsibility, to reach out in a centrifugal mission activity, making disciples of all peoples. He assured them of his total authority and his eternal presence for this task. This new ministry was not merely a matter of obedience. It required the activity of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of the new covenant (John 29:22; 2 Cor. 3:6, 17–18).

With confidence, then, the disciples proclaimed that "God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36). Initially uncertain of the cultural expectations to be placed upon Gentile believers, they finally concluded that God had no favorites (Acts 10:34) and salvation was only through the grace of Jesus Christ (Acts 15:11). God's chosen servant, with whom he had made a covenant (Isa. 42:6), was the only source of salvation (Acts 4:12) and the "one mediator between God and humans" (1 Tim. 2:5). Under this banner, the message of salvation was spread throughout the Roman Empire (Acts 1:8; 28:28–31).

The question "what about those who have never heard" was not raised explicitly by the early believers. They assumed that they and those to follow them would take the message everywhere. With great zeal and sacrifice missionaries through the ages have sought to complete Christ's GREAT COMMISSION. Now that we know the task may not be completed in the foreseeable future, some missiologists are rethinking the "cosmic covenant" that God made with Noah. Is there a wider hope by which the unevangelized may receive the blessings of the new covenant without explicitly naming the name of Jesus? Even as through God's common GRACE some in the Old Testament—Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek, Job, Naaman, Rahab—had a relationship with God, is this probable, or even possible, now?

Thinkers like John Hick and Paul Knitter have opted for radical PLURALISM or UNIVERSALISM which affirms that all the unevangelized will be saved. The traditional evangelical view is that there is no hope for salvation for those who have not heard the message of Jesus and placed their hope in him. The "wider hope," now espoused by a number of evangelicals, posits the possibility of evangelization at or after death or universally accessible salvation apart from evangelization. The latter view is called "inclusivism" by its adherents who believe that salvation comes only through Christ as God works through general revelation and providence. The unevangelized need not have explicit knowledge of Christ and the sacrifice of the new covenant in order to be saved. John Sanders states, "God's salvific will is universal, and that is clearly manifested in the universal covenants of Genesis, which were neither revoked nor replaced by later covenants" (1992, 218).

The more recent statements of these views, theoretical at best, cannot negate the call of Christ in the new covenant actively to make disciples of all the peoples of the world. "He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not only for ours but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2).

RALPH R. COVELL

Bibliography. J. Blauw, *The Missionary Nature of the Church;* H. Maurier, *The Other Covenant: A Theology of Paganism;* A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament;* A. McCaig, *ISBE,* I:795–97; J. Sanders, *No Other Name.*

Option for the Poor. There has long been a recognition that the poor (economically, politically, and socially marginalized people) hold special attention and affection in God's eyes. The phrase "option for the poor" or "preferential option for the poor" is of relatively recent coinage. Roman Catholics began wrestling with issues related to poverty in the SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL (1962–65). Catholics in Latin America, who felt that the work at Vatican II did not go far enough, convened in Medellín, where the emphasis was changed from seeing the poor as the objects of the mercy of the church to seeing them as the subjects of their own history (González, 19). The actual phrase "preferential option of the poor" did not appear until the 1970s, reportedly used by Gustavo Gutiérrez in a lecture given in Spain in 1972 (ibid.). Since then the term has been used primarily in liberation and conciliar theological circles but also increasingly in evangelical missiology.

The concept behind the term is one that demands a radical paradigm shift. The poor are not to be seen as objects of mercy, but as people who are particularly gifted by God to represent his justice to the rest of the world. The "option" for the poor is not optional, but required by the very nature of God's compassion and incarnation in Jesus. Because Jesus came to preach liberty to the poor, they have an advantage in reading the Scriptures. They are not weighted down with the presuppositions and agendas of the rich and are freer to read and interpret the text as its primary audience. Such reading requires the recognition of structural issues that create and perpetuate poverty and new tools of analysis to understand and change those structures.

Evangelical use of the term traces its roots to the LAUSANNE CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELISM (1974) and the eventual wrestling of evangelicals over EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (see Walker). A shift toward holism within the evangelical movement (*see* HOLISTIC MISSION), prompted in part by reflections from both non-Western evangelical theologians (e.g., Vinay Samuel, Rene Padilla, and Samuel Escobar) and Western evangelicals (e.g., Ron Sider and Jim Wallis), has resulted in greater empathy for the option for the poor (*see also* LIBERATION THEOLOGIES MISSIOLOGY). It is now not uncommon to see the phrase "option for the poor" across the spectrum of missiology. Evangelicals who have committed themselves to this agenda have in the past been referred to as radical evangelicals, though the language of opting for the poor has been gaining momentum in mainstream evangelical missiological circles in recent years.

What is God's view of the poor? They are people and part of his creation. They have oppressors who keep them poor. While they are sinners, they are also in significant ways sinned against by those who oppress and subvert justice against them. God does "opt" for them in the sense of siding with them in demanding impartiality and justice. He cares for their spiritual and material needs. The same attitude should be found in the church (e.g., James 2:2–6). That the poor teach us about God or enjoy special spiritual status is true in the sense that their humble circumstances force them to see more realistically their broken condition before God. That they are somehow automatically saved or members of God's church simply by virtue of their socioeconomic status, however, cannot be sustained in light of the overall biblical evidence. The poor are in need of having the Good News preached to them and thus the thrust of Jesus' statements about his mission in Luke 4:18–20.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. R. M. Brown, *Reading in the Bible Through Third World Eyes;* R. D. N. Dickinson, *DEM,* pp. 806–10; D. Dorr, *Option for the Poor: A Hundred Years of Catholic Social Teaching;* J. L. González, *Poverty and Ecclesiology,* pp. 9–26; F. Herzog, *DEM,* pp. 804–5; D. S. Walker, *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 79 (1992): 53–62.

Parousia. Early Christians lived in the expectation of the prompt return of the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Thess. 4:16–18; 4:8; 2 Peter 3:3ff.). This belief flowed naturally out of their definition of the KINGDOM OF GOD as both a present reality and a future expectation. Both Judaism and Christianity are characterized as forward looking in their faith and practice. They believe human history cannot resolve the complex morass of human existence. Only God can. The parousia of Christ is for Christians the ultimate answer to death, evil, injustice, and chaos. What, then, is the relationship of the future appearance of Christ and world mission? Does a belief in the parousia encourage or paralyze the mission of the church?

The New Testament and the Parousia. While the parousia is uniquely Christian, some of the language and concepts in which it is couched are Jewish. During the Old Testament and intertestamental periods Jewish expectations of the kingdom became increasingly prominent. They believed the kingdom would appear in history as a

gift from God. The Day of Yahweh was one of a number of phrases used to express this belief.

Jesus taught that the kingdom was present in his ministry and the New Testament writers believed that the kingdom had come through the incarnation, including the death and resurrection of Christ and the coming of the Holy Spirit (Matt. 12:28; Luke 2:17; 1 Cor. 15:23). Jesus also taught his disciples to expect a future coming of the kingdom (Luke 22:16, 18). Paul, the Gospel writers, James, and Peter taught explicitly that Jesus would appear a second time (Titus 2:13; John 21:22; James 5:8; 1 Peter 1:5). The word *parousia* means coming or appearance. The New Testament uses a number of words for the second advent such as coming, appearance, reveal, presence, and day (of Christ, God, Lord). Words such as appearance/coming *(parousia)* and day of the Lord were used to express this belief. At times the language and belief of Jesus and the early church was characterized by a note of imminence. But there was a uniform avoidance of date setting (Acts 1:7; Mark 13:32).

The Problem of the Delay. Modern critical study of the New Testament has in general been characterized by a belief that the delay of the parousia led to a crisis in early Christianity. When theology of imminence was followed by continued delay, so the argument goes, the church became disillusioned, resulting in an abandoning of the imminent expectation of the parousia. The hypothesis became a controlling presupposition of much twentieth-century scholarly study of the New Testament.

One of the obvious problems with this hypothesis is the notable absence of data in the New Testament and the early church fathers (2 Peter 3 and John 21:18ff.). The failure of these writers to talk about this problem seems to indicate there was no major problem in the delays of the parousia. That Jesus and the early Christians believed in imminence cannot be doubted. This being so, why did the delay of the parousia prove inconsequential?

Sociological studies show that movements that engage in date-setting, such as the Seventh-Day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses, may continue to grow and thrive in spite of eschatological disappointment. As for early Christianity it can be shown that although Jesus taught imminence, as did the apostles, their faith was deeply anchored in two things: a belief in present salvation and a total involvement in mission (Matt. 24:14; 28:20; Acts 1:6–11; Gal. 2:7–8; Rom. 1:14–16; 15:23–24). These early Christians were experiencing the "already" through the empowering presence of God in the resurrection and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit for life and witness. Any supposed delay of the parousia served a good purpose (2 Peter 3:9).

Mission and Parousia. There is a vital relationship between the parousia and mission. Alongside the church's belief in imminence was belief in worldwide mission. Jesus clearly and specifically called the Twelve and Paul to engage in mission to the world. The delay of the parousia caused no paralysis in mission, rather, as the church became universal its belief in the parousia was a motivating factor in mission (Matt. 24:14; Acts 1:6–11). The church engaged in mission, not to bring in the kingdom, but as an act of faithfulness to their king who was coming. World mission gives meaning to the church's life between the crucifixion/resurrection of Christ and the second coming of Christ. For those who had experienced the blessings of the age to come while living in this present age, their desire was to make this Good News known to the unreached while awaiting the completion of their salvation (Rom. 15).

While the place of the parousia in the life of the church has ebbed and flowed throughout the history of the church, the early church believed fervently in both imminence and world mission. Properly understood, the parousia of Christ motivates Christians for mission. Those who firmly believe that God will complete the not yet of the kingdom will be energized to preach the gospel to every people group in the world.

HAROLD E. DOLLAR

Bibliography. O. Cullmann, *The Theology of the Christian Mission,* pp. 42–54; G. E. Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom;* W. H. Mare, *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation,* pp. 336–45; A. L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament;* S. P. Saunders, *Gospel in Context* 2:4 (Oct. 1979): 3–17; J. A. Scherer, *Missiology* 18:4 (1990): 395–413.

Postmillennialism. Postmillennialists believe that the kingdom of God is already being realized in the present age through the proclamation of the gospel and the saving influence of the Holy Spirit. As a result, the whole world—the majority of the members of all nations including Israel, that is—will be christianized at a future, presently unknown time. Christ will return at the end of the millennium, an age of unknown duration marked by justice and peace. The new age will not be essentially different from the present and will come about as more people are converted to Christ. The postmillennialist view is the only one of the three significant eschatologies based directly on the charter of Christianity, the GREAT COMMISSION (Matt. 28:19–20), interpreting it not only as a command, but also as a promise and as prophecy.

The roots of modern Protestant world missions lie to a great extent in the work of Calvinist, Puritan, postmillennial preachers in England and America, as well as that of Lutheran, pietist, postmillennial pastors in Germany.

The first modern Anglo-Saxon missionaries (preaching to indigenous American Indians) were motivated by a Calvinist, postmillennial hope. That postmillennial expectations led to the establishment of practical missionary activity is true not only for Calvinist Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, but also for Calvinist Baptists such as WILLIAM CAREY whose major work, "An Enquiry into the Obligations of Christians . . ." (1792), initiated the final awakening of Protestant missions. Postmillennial expectations can be discovered in the sermons held at the founding of the LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY in 1795, of the New York Missionary Society in 1797, of the Glasgow Missionary Society in 1802, and to a certain extent of the CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY in 1799. Many Calvinist mission leaders such as JOHN ELIOT, ALEXANDER DUFF, DAVID LIVINGSTONE, HENRY MARTYN, RUFUS ANDERSON, and HENRY VENN expressed a postmillennial hope.

American and British revival movements were seen as the first indications of a wider wave of conversion, expected to soon engulf the whole earth. Not only Jonathan Edwards, but also English (Isaac Watts, Philipp Doddridge) and Scottish theologians (John Willision, John Erskin) related postmillennial hope to revival and to the idea of missions.

The close relationship between postmillennialism and missions can be traced through the ideas of the Reformed Puritans of America and England back to the optimism of the Reformed theologians John Calvin, Ulrich Zwingli, Theoldor Bibliander, Martin Bucer, Peter Martyr, and Theodor Beza, even though none of them expressed a postmillennial system. This had, however, already occurred in the Reformation period in England, then by leading Puritan theologians such as John Cotton, John Owen, Matthew Henry, and Samuel Rutherford. For all of these Reformed thinkers since the Reformation, the kingdom of God still had a long period of time before it, in contrast to the immediate expectations of the end of the world of Lutheran orthodoxy.

It is therefore not surprising that postmillennialism, with its emphasis on reaching all peoples with the gospel, has been integrated only into Reformed confessions of faith (Calvin's Genevan Catechism, 268–270, Larger Catechism of Westminster, 191, Congregationalist Savoy Declaration 1658, art. 26.5). Postmillennialism offers the best explanation as to why the dogma of double predestination should not detract from missions but supports them.

Rufus Anderson was the first theologian to again emphasize the love for the lost as motivation for missions rather than postmillennial expectations, even though he clearly expressed a postmillennial belief. As late as 1909, W. O. Carver observed that the postmillennial view was still the most influential motivation for missions. Not until the end of the First World War did postmillennialism lose its preeminence. Following HUDSON TAYLOR it had, in the area of world missions, however, been gradually superseded by FAITH MISSIONS, which were strongly influenced by PREMILLENNIALISM.

A missionary-minded postmillennialism strongly emphasizing Old Testament Law became prominent in Calvinist circles since the 1970s through the Christian Reconstruction movement, best represented by Kenneth L. Gentry's book *The Greatness of the Great Commission.*

Similar developments can be observed in German-speaking evangelical missions, for Philipp Jakob Spener, and August Hermann Francke, the founders of German PIETISM and its growing missions movement, based their activities on postmillennial ideas. All of Spener's works, including his major work *Pia desideria* (pious wishes) are characterized by expectations of a better future. He radically rejected the pessimistic orthodox Lutheran interpretation of history including the expectation of Christ's immediate return. Postmillennialism maintained its dominant position in German pietism until Johann Albrcht Bengel began to combine premillennialism with postmillennialism by teaching the idea of two millennia. His pupils then completely rejected postmillennialism in favor of premillennialism and taught that missions should not be carried out until the millennium (for example, Johann Tobias Beck [1804–71]). Many state church mission societies, such as the BASEL MISSION (Theodor Oehler and Hermann Gundert, for example) continued to think in a postmillennial context.

THOMAS SCHIRRMACHER

Bibliography. C. L. Chaney, *The Birth of Missions in America;* K. L. Gentry, *The Greatness of the Great Commission;* I. Murray, *The Puritan Hope: Revival and the Interpretation of Prophecy;* P. Toon, ed., *Puritans, the Millennium and the Future of Israel: Puritan Eschatology 1600–1660.*

Power, Theology of. The power of God is a major theme of Scripture. Two central Old Testament metaphors graphically depict this power. First, God is the *Creator* who made from nothing what is. From the beginning of the world God is seen ruling over his creation by right of being its Creator. Humans, because they are made by God, should consider themselves to be "sheep of his pasture" (Ps. 100:3). Second, God is the *liberator* of covenant people elected to be in relationship to him. The Jewish confessional declares God's mighty acts of deliverance: "We cried out to the Lord, the God of our fathers, and the Lord heard our voice and saw our misery, toil and oppression. So the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm,

with great terror and with miraculous signs and wonders" (Deut. 26:7–8).

In both of these metaphors the power of God is not conveyed indiscriminately but *in relationship*. Genesis 3 describes God the Creator searching for fallen humanity, calling, "Where are you?" This searching reveals the nature of God. He seeks to reestablish an intimate relationship between himself and his creation rather than merely exercise his power to punish. God's deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt was covenant deliverance: God delivered from oppression those with whom he had developed a relationship (Exod. 3:23–24). Based on this relationship (Exod. 20: 1), God called Israel into an exclusive relationship with him (Exod. 20:2–7). Throughout the Old Testament God is contrasted to the gods of the nations by the use of rhetorical questions demonstrating his incomparability. Moses, for example, praised God, asking, "What god is there in heaven or on earth who can do the deeds and mighty works you do?" (Deut. 3:24; cf. Pss. 77:13; 89:6).

In the New Testament God's power became incarnate in the person of Jesus Christ. His birth was by the power of God through the Holy Spirit so that he might be called "the Son of God" (Luke 1:35). As God's Son, Christ manifested "the power of the Spirit" in his ministry (Luke 4:14, 18, 36). The metaphors of creation and liberation can also be used to describe the power of God in Christ's life. As *re-creator,* Christ came "to seek and to save what was lost" (Luke 19:10). Sin separated humanity from God, but God in Christ has re-created those who believe to become new. As *deliverer,* Christ came "to destroy the devil's work" (1 John 3:8), to free those demonically oppressed and possessed. Christ was appointed "with the Holy Spirit and power" to heal "all who were under the power of the devil, because God was with him" (Acts 10:38). Finally, by his resurrection Christ is declared to be God's Son (Rom. 1:4) and has been exalted to God's right hand, where he stands above all principalities and powers (Eph. 1:18–23).

God's ministry in Christ was not an indiscriminate demonstration of power for the sake of power but rather power operating in divine relationship and through divine intention. Blind Bartimaeus, although chastised by the multitudes, continued to cry out in faith, "Son of David, have mercy on me!" (Mark 10:46–52). The Roman centurion demonstrated a remarkable faith in the power of Jesus to heal from a distance (Matt. 8:5–13). The father of the young boy possessed of an evil spirit responded to Jesus' statement that "Everything is possible for him who believes" by saying, "I do believe; help me overcome my unbelief!" (Mark 9:22–24). These works of power thus "presuppose faith both in him who does the work and in those on whose behalf they are done, so that a personal relationship is demanded" (Grundmann, 1985, 189).

Since the FALL OF HUMANKIND, God's rule has been challenged by SATAN. Satan, an angelic being cast down from heaven because of rebellion (Rev. 12:9; Van Rheenen, 1990, 264–66), created a dominion which stands in opposition to the KINGDOM OF GOD. The *gods* of the Old Testament, *demons* of the Gospels, and *principalities and powers* of Pauline literature are various terminologies describing the forces of Satan (*see also* POWERS, THE). Although described by these various terms, they all reflect the forces of the devil, who "has been sinning from the beginning" (1 John 3:8). Humans were created free to choose either the dominion of Satan or the kingdom of God (Gen. 2:16; 3:1–5).

Sometimes God's power is not apparent in a world largely controlled by Satan (1 John 5:19). Followers of God ask, "Why do you hide your face?" (Ps. 44) or "God, my Rock, why have you forgotten me?" (Ps. 42). Christians, participating in the sufferings of Christ (1 Peter 4:13), cry out in anguish, pleading for God to intervene (Rev. 6:9–11). During these times of suffering, Christians stand in faith, acknowledging God's ultimate sovereignty.

Not only is God's power quantitatively greater than Satan's, the quality is also different. Satan's power is debasing—contorting the disobedient who follow the cravings of their own sinful nature (Eph. 2:3). God's power, based on his great love, raises believers above these earthly cravings into heavenly realms (Eph. 2:4–6). Paul's prayer in Ephesians 3:14–21 interweaves God's power with his great love. Arnold writes, "Christ . . . roots and establishes the believer in his own love and strengthens the believer to follow the pattern of that love (3:16–17)." He succinctly contrasts Christian perspectives of power and love with pagan Ephesian perspectives: "In magic, many of the recipes and spells were used for the purpose of gaining advantage over people—winning a chariot race, attracting a lover, winning at dice, etc. God's power enables the believer to love after the pattern of Christ. The seemingly impossible demands of this kind of love require divine enablement in order for them to be fulfilled" (1989, 100).

Humans frequently misuse the power of God and contort it for their own selfish, egocentric purposes. The Willowbank Report says, "Power in human hands is always dangerous. We have to mind the recurring theme of Paul's two letters to the Corinthians—that God's power, seen in the cross of Christ, operates through human weakness (e.g., 1 Cor. 1:18–2:5; 2 Cor. 4:7; 12:9, 10). Worldly people worship power; Christians who have it know its perils" (Stott and Coote, 1980, 327). The power of God must never be used to give glory to human personalities or human in-

stitutions. Ultimate power is of God, and its use in defeating Satan must only give glory to God.

There is always significant distortion of the Christian message when Christianity is reduced to power. God's power must always be seen in a broad eschatological framework: God, who has already defeated Satan through the death and resurrection of Christ, will consummate his work at the end of time. Currently believers stand between the times: Christ, who has come, will return at the end of time.

These theological perspectives on power should guide Christians to understand both Prayer and Spiritual Warfare. Prayer should never be understood primarily in terms of power but rather as relating to God who is the source of all power. The difference between the two is significant. If prayer is understood as power, Christians will readily seek power words or rituals rather than personally relating to a sovereign God and waiting for him to act in his own time. Likewise, these understandings help us comprehend the nature of spiritual warfare. Spiritual warfare is not about fighting Satan; he has been defeated by the triumphal resurrection of Jesus Christ. Spiritual warfare rather is standing firm in Christ's mighty power. It is accepting God's victory through Christ by faith and allowing God's redemptive power to work through Christ.

Gailyn Van Rheenen

Bibliography. C. E. Arnold, *Ephesians: Magic and Power,* W. Grundmann, *TDNT Abridged,* pp. 186–91; J. R. W. Stott and R. Coote, eds. *Down to Earth: Studies in Christianity and Culture;* G. Van Rheenen, *Communicating Christ in Animistic Contexts;* idem, *Missiology* 21:1 (January 1993): 41–53.

Praxis. Praxis is the outgrowth of a commitment to a dynamic hermeneutical methodology that interacts with the concrete historical reality on the one hand and the biblical text on the other. This dialectical process is foundational to respond adequately in an integral manner to the spiritual and physical needs of hurting people.

The motivation for such a contextual hermeneutic likely finds its roots in Aristotle's distinction between pure contemplation and human action which, expressed in concrete terms, forms the intention to put theory into action. Later, praxis was discussed as one of the early themes of Liberation Theology by theologians such as Gustavo Gutiérrez and Juan Luis Segundo. These two theologians, and others, enlarged the theme along two significant lines. First, practice should correspond with integrity to God's liberation of humankind. Fidelity to an interplay between theology and action provides the framework for Christian vocation. Second, praxis is rooted in efficacious love toward the poorest and most downtrodden. Praxis will unmask the unjust ideological basis for the existing social structures by promoting actions that are in accord with the authentic values of faith and theology. Thus liberation theology aimed to put praxis theology to the service of social transformation.

Theologians like Segundo candidly admit the debt that liberation theology and their perspective of praxis owe to Karl Marx. Most liberationists, however, shy away from the idea that they accepted wholesale use of Marxist categories. Still, the lurking presence of Marx in liberation theology frequently has caused evangelicals to understand this type of praxis as Marxism garbed in theological language. Several perceive unacceptable implications that generally accompany this process, including the poor being the initial and often the only point of involvement (*see* Option for the Poor), and the use of Social Science analysis heavily influenced by Marxist categories. Evangelicals contend that insufficient emphasis has been placed upon the fallen nature of humankind. They may view the process as offering a situational hermeneutic that forces an application of the social context upon Scripture rather than seeking a theology produced by a reading of Scripture.

It is critical, then, to define carefully and precisely the way in which praxis may be used in evangelical theology. The underlying spiritual reality of a God who acts in human history provides a dynamic model which can and should be accepted as a legitimate point for theological reflection and basis for action on the part of evangelicals.

The purpose of praxis is to allow the Bible to speak to the ever-changing world in which action on behalf of others takes on concrete form. Further, the interplay between human action and theological reflection rooted in Scripture allows the Bible itself to stand as an authority over previous human-made interpretations of the Scripture and frees the Bible to shed fresh light on, and provide renewed motivation for, engaging in this dialectical process. Evangelicals can find a certain "praxis of faith" related to their social and personal conditions, a way of enacting or putting to work this faith experience nurtured by a constant reading of the Bible. Such faith is at the same time examined by the efficacy of what Christians do in everyday life. More specifically, praxis cannot be seen as mere pragmatic action, nor a praxis that evaluates individual action as it solely relates to personal morality and holiness. Praxis moves beyond this limited though invaluable personal action to reflect theologically upon, and relate to, economic and social structures that sustain unacceptable conditions as well. Theology and practice are mutually supported, tested and corrected by the other. A praxis theology recognizes the need for a more distinctive ethic where the message of the biblical text and the compulsion of the Spirit directs

one to respond creatively to the context in whatever form that may take.

It is possible that evangelicals can find in this praxeological hermeneutical method a way to keep their theological reflection integrally tied to concrete human experience, to the meaning of Scripture, and to pastoral action. Praxis moves beyond a theoretical agenda to the very essence of theological ethics.

DOUGLAS PETERSON

Bibliography. D. A. Carson, *Biblical Interpretation and the Church;* O. Costas, *Theology of the Crossroads in Contemporary Latin America;* idem, *Christ Outside the Gate*; C. B. Johns, *Pentecostal Formation;* J. B. Metz, *Faith in History and Society;* J. Miguez-Bonino, *Toward A Christian Political Ethics;* G. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral;* D. Petersen, *Not By Might Nor By Power.*

Premillennialism. Belief that Jesus Christ will return to earth in glory, ushering in a thousand-year reign of peace, after which a new heaven and earth will replace the old ones, as foretold in the Book of Revelation. The exact nature of events such as the battle between the forces of righteousness and the forces of Satan (the battle of Armageddon), the "rapture" of believers to meet Christ in the air, and the features of the millennial kingdom vary according to different interpretations of the Bible. Although various interpretations of the second coming have existed throughout church history, modern premillennialism emerged during the mid-1800s from British and American movements to interpret biblical prophecies literally.

While millennialism of different types has encouraged missionary activity, premillennialism became a hallmark of evangelical missions from the late nineteenth century on. Prominent American pastors, including A. B. SIMPSON, A. T. PIERSON, A. J. GORDON, DWIGHT L. MOODY, Martin Wells Knapp, and C. I. Scofield, concluded from their study of the Scriptures that preaching the gospel worldwide was vital preparation for Christ's second coming. With the second coming believed imminent, believers felt compelled to evangelize non-believers, both to save all the souls they could before Christ's return cut off opportunities for salvation, and to fulfill the conditions outlined for his return in Matthew 24:14, "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come." Premillennial support for missions gained a wide audience through YMCA and Christian conventions, Bible studies, periodicals, and the best-selling book *Jesus is Coming* (1878) by Chicago businessman William E. Blackstone. *Jesus is Coming* sold over a million copies in forty-eight languages.

Premillennial thinking not only encouraged verbal proclamation in denominational missions like the Presbyterians and Baptists, but it caused the formation of numerous faith missions and independent agencies from the 1880s to the present. Premillennialists tended to focus their energies on evangelism rather than on teaching, medicine, or other aspects of Protestant missions. Nondenominational faith missions such as the AFRICA INLAND MISSION and the Central American Mission stressed cross-cultural evangelism among specific groups such as Jews, the unreached interiors of Africa and Asia, or nominal Catholic lands. When Pentecostalism emerged in the early twentieth century, its adherents also adopted premillennial motivations for missions. Early Pentecostals believed that the Holy Spirit had endowed the gifts of tongues to complete the task of world evangelization in preparation for the second coming. For example, the Azusa Street Revival (1906–13) under pastor William J. Seymour sent Pentecostal missionaries around the world (*see* PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT).

During the twentieth century, premillennialism remained a powerful motivation for world evangelization. For example, the Oriental Missionary Society (*see* OMS INTERNATIONAL) under Charles and then Lettie Cowman stressed house-to-house evangelism of every villager in Japan, and later "Every Creature Crusades" in Latin America, hoping to proclaim the gospel to the entire world before Jesus' return. CAMERON TOWNSEND, founder of the WYCLIFFE BIBLE TRANSLATORS, believed that translating the Bible into every language would help finish world evangelization and hasten the second coming. Founding student participants of the Urbana Missionary Conventions (1946) sought to complete the GREAT COMMISSION in preparation for the second coming. Premillennial motivations for mission received worldwide recognition when in 1974 three thousand evangelical leaders adopted the Lausanne Covenant, which became a basic statement of faith for evangelical missions. The last article of the Lausanne Covenant states, "We believe that Jesus Christ will return personally and visibly, in power and glory, to consummate his salvation and his judgment. This promise of his coming is a further spur to our evangelism, for we remember his words that the Gospel must first be preached to all nations. We believe that the interim period between Christ's ascension and return is to be filled with the mission of the people of God, who have no liberty to stop before the End" (*see also* LAUSANNE MOVEMENT).

As evangelicalism and Pentecostalism spread throughout the non-Western world, many indigenous Christians adopted premillennial motivations for missions, such as those expressed at the COMIBAM *(Congreso Missionero Ibero Americano)* missions conference of Latin American evangelicals in 1987. Just as in the late 1800s when many American evangelical Christians hoped to evangelize the world by the year 1900,

an idea captured in the slogan "the evangelization of the world in this generation," so also in the late 1900s evangelicals worldwide sought to complete the task of world evangelization by the year 2000. Under international leadership, the AD 2000 and Beyond Movement held a series of global consultations to encourage "A Church for Every People and the Gospel for Every Person by the Year 2000." The idea of planting a church in every people group by the year 2000 carried premillennial overtones for many who believed that world evangelization was a prerequisite for the second coming.

DANA L. ROBERT

Bibliography. D. Bryant, *The Hope at Hand;* J. A. Carpenter and W. R. Shenk, eds., *Earthen Vessels. American Evangelicals and Foreign Missions, 1880–1980;* J. A. De Jong, *As the Waters Cover the Sea. Millennial Expectations in the Rise of Anglo-American Missions 1640–1810;* G. E. Ladd, *The Blessed Hope. A Biblical Study of the Second Advent and the Rapture;* T. Weber, *Living in the Shadow of the Second Coming. American Premillennialism 1875–1925.*

Presence Evangelism. We often think of evangelism as consisting entirely of words, as being exclusively the verbal communication of a message. Frequently, however, the Christian message will have its intended impact only if our verbal communication of the gospel is accompanied and enhanced by our good deeds. Information alone is typically insufficient to persuade people that the gospel is true; it matters to them who is transmitting the information. Before accepting the message as credible, they must first be convinced of the credibility of the messenger. As Marshall McLuhan put it in the 1960s, in many respects the medium is the message. Christian presence, therefore, must accompany Christian proclamation.

In New Testament times, presence and proclamation typically functioned together to bring people to faith in Christ. As Jesus proclaimed the KINGDOM OF GOD, he "went around doing good" (Acts 10:38). The believers in Jerusalem sold their possessions in order that they might share with all who were in need; as a result, they "[enjoyed} the favor of all the people," and "the Lord added to their number daily those who were being saved" (Acts 2:45, 47). The apostle Peter counseled believers to live such good lives that, after seeing their good deeds, pagans would glorify God (1 Peter 2:12). New Testament evangelism, therefore, consisted not only of proclamation (kerygma), but also of fellowship *(koinonia)* and service *(diakonia).* And today, also, as Christians demonstrate love, unity, good works, and a commitment to justice, their witness becomes more convincing. The fruits of the gospel in the lives of Christians serve to authenticate the gospel. It is appropriate, therefore, that Christian missionary efforts have often included medical and educational components, as well as efforts to combat social injustice.

Presence alone, however, is insufficient. St. Francis of Assisi once said, "Preach the gospel at all times, and, if necessary, use words." But if people are to experience salvation in Christ, they must be told the way of salvation; it is always necessary, at least eventually, for words to accompany our good deeds. During the early part of the twentieth century large numbers of mainline Protestant missionaries began to opt for presence alone, apart from proclamation, which they equated with sectarian proselytization. Many in conciliar circles today similarly advocate humanization without proclamation. In reaction against this unbalanced approach to mission, evangelicals sometimes swing to the opposite extreme, advocating proclamation without presence, and accusing those committed to social concern of succumbing to theological liberalism. A consensus is growing among evangelicals, however, that, to be balanced, mission must include both dimensions. Paragraph 5 of the 1974 Lausanne Covenant declares that "we should share [God's] concern for justice and reconciliation throughout human society and for the liberation of [people] from every kind of oppression." It goes on to argue that, rather than being mutually exclusive, social concern and evangelism are both part of our Christian duty. An official commentary on this paragraph of the Lausanne Covenant argues that social involvement is both a bridge to evangelism and the partner of evangelism. "They are like the two blades of a pair of scissors or the two wings of a bird." Jesus' words explained his work, and his works dramatized his words.

Gospel content, therefore, is most compellingly communicated within a context of credibility.

RAYMOND P. PRIGODICH

Bibliography. B. Bruce. *Bridging the Gap: Evangelism, Development and Shalom; Evangelism and Social Responsibility: An Evangelical Commitment. The Grand Rapids Report;* B. J. Nichols, ed., *In Word and Deed: Evangelism and Social Responsibility.*

Proclamation Evangelism. Proclamation is at the very heart of New Testament evangelism. People need to be told the gospel. In the GREAT COMMISSION, Jesus sent his followers not only to be salt and light in the world, but to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins to all nations and to function as his verbal witnesses (Luke 24:47f.). And after asking, "How can [people] believe in the one of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without someone preach-

ing to them?" the apostle Paul replied that "faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word of Christ" (Rom. 10:14, 17).

But what exactly is to be included in the message that we have been commissioned to proclaim? Paul preached that of first importance was the death of Christ for our sins, along with his burial and resurrection, as verified by his postresurrection appearances (1 Cor. 15:1ff.).

And how ought we to proclaim the gospel? Scripture makes it clear that there is no one best way to tell others about Christ. Rather, we need to look for the way that is best in each given situation. Jesus' approach was unique in each of the twenty-eight different evangelistic encounters recorded in the Gospel of John. The apostle Paul, too, regularly tailored his approach to fit his audience, becoming "all things to all [people] so that by all possible means [he] might save some" (1 Cor. 9:22). There simply is no "one-size-fits-all" evangelistic strategy that is equally effective in every situation and with all kinds of people. Our proclamation needs to be personalized, contextualized, and keyed to people's felt needs.

We often tend to associate proclamation especially with public preaching to large audiences. The New Testament, however, gives examples not only of mass evangelism, but also of small-group evangelism, household evangelism, and personal evangelism, each having its appropriate place. There are scores of additional methods and combinations of methods that we can utilize to proclaim the gospel, including the printed page, audio and video recordings, the MASS MEDIA, STORYTELLING, and drama. However, when deciding on a particular method or medium for the proclamation of the gospel, it is important that we assess its appropriateness for a given audience and its likely perceived credibility and degree of impact in a given context.

Much debate has taken place in recent years concerning the relative merits of confrontational versus relational evangelism (*see also* LIFESTYLE EVANGELISM). Research clearly indicates that unbelievers most often respond to the gospel within the context of a personal relationship with a Christian believer. The more impersonal and intrusional the WITNESS, the lower the rate of positive initial response and long-term followthrough. Actually, the function of an impersonal witness to the gospel tends often to be more pre-evangelistic than evangelistic; that is, seeds are planted which might only later bear fruit within the context of a more relational witnessing situation (*see* PRE-EVANGELISM).

Proclamation is frequently contrasted with two other approaches to evangelism: presence and persuasion. Evangelism is typically most effective when all three approaches are utilized consecutively. Before we ever open our mouths, it is often essential that we demonstrate by our lives and our good deeds what it means to be a Christian, establishing the credibility of both the message and the messenger. Then, having earned the right to be heard and having aroused people's interest, we can begin to proclaim to them the gospel of Christ. However, proclamation alone is insufficient. We want not simply to communicate truth on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, but to persuade people to act upon the truth. We want not only to be faithful in proclaiming the message, but to be successful in actually making disciples. Using the terminology of DONALD MCGAVRAN, we want our witness to be based not just on a theology of search, but on a theology of harvest. And this is where persuasion comes in.

In 2 Corinthians 5:11 Paul wrote, "Since we know what it is to fear the Lord, we try to persuade [people]." Then later in the same chapter he wrote, "We implore you on Christ's behalf: Be reconciled to God" (v. 20). We see in this passage that Paul accompanied his proclamation with passion. And we, too, need both to proclaim the gospel, so that people will hear and understand, and to engage in persuasion, so that people might actually believe and be converted.

We need to be careful, of course, that our persuasion does not become manipulation; that our pleading does not become coercion. We need always to respect the integrity of the person and not apply undue pressure in order to secure results at any cost. Also, although in our witness there is a place for emotion, we need to guard against allowing emotion to degenerate into shallow emotionalism, lest people make only superficial decisions for Christ, based strictly on the emotion of the moment, rather than on a deliberate, well-thought-out act of the will.

RAYMOND P. PRIGODICH

Bibliography. J. C. Aldrich, *Life-Style Evangelism: Crossing Traditional Boundaries to Reach the Unbelieving World;* L. Ford, *The Christian Persuader;* M. Green, *Evangelism in the Early Church;* P. Little, *How to Give Away Your Faith;* J. Peterson, *Evangelism as a Lifestyle;* J. Stott, *Christian Mission in the Modern World;* C. Van Engen, *You Are My Witnesses.*

Receptivity. The dynamic state of a person or people in which, if presented with the Christian gospel in terms they can understand, they will respond favorably to this gospel.

Receptivity or responsiveness to the gospel is obviously demonstrated when people respond to the gospel by a faith commitment to Jesus Christ, are incorporated into congregations, and become responsible, reproducing believers. The degree of receptivity can be measured easily

after a population has been presented with the gospel over time. However, it is more difficult to measure in advance.

The prediction of receptivity is one of the major concerns that faces missions in making decisions about either opening a new ministry or closing an existing one. Individual missions have developed research instruments for evaluating receptivity. Many of these instruments share a set of common assumptions. Two key assumptions include: (1) If some people in a community are responding to the gospel, others may be expected to respond as well. (2) If the people are experiencing significant WORLDVIEW change or worldview dissonance, or if they have experienced significant social, economic, or political changes, they may be expected to be receptive to the gospel (*see also* ANOMIE).

Receptivity is a dynamic condition that changes over time with a given person or a whole population. The variables that lead to one's being open to begin to move through the process of change to become a mature Christian vary over time. Two key sets of variables interact, but need to be assessed differently. The first set of variables relate to sociocultural concerns and the second to spiritual concerns.

Sociocultural concerns relate to a wide range of issues, including homogeneity/heterogeneity of the community, the rate of worldview change, previous knowledge of and attitude toward the Christian gospel, past experience with people who are perceived to be Christian, and the level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the present religious system.

Spiritual issues relate to the kinds of spiritual commitments the people have made. The history of the spiritual commitments of a person or a people sets the stage for the receptivity of the person or the people.

Receptivity affects the whole conversion process. David Krawthwol provides a descriptive sequence of the attitudinal change process. At each stage of the change process—receiving, responding, valuing, organization around values, and characterization by a set of values—the person or the community makes decisions (*see also* CHANGE, SOCIOLOGY OF). While the term "worldview" was not widely used when Krawthwol described this process, the process could be described as worldview change or the process of conversion. At each stage a person must be willing (receptive) to continue in the process. One may in the accepting of a new idea or in the acceptance of the gospel stop or stall the process, or may accelerate the process.

EDGAR J. ELLISTON

Bibliography. D. Krawthwol et al., *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives The Classification of Educational Goals Handbook II: Affective Domain;* D. McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth.*

Reconciliation. The Christian faith is fundamentally relational. It affirms that God has acted once and for all—decisively—in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ to bring the created order back to its original purposes. Pastor and homiletician Gardner C. Taylor argued that "the Bible has but one theme, that is, that God gets back what belonged to him in the first place."

This involves not merely the restoration of persons, the environment, and even the cosmos, but also the quality of relationships that they enjoyed at creation—the divine order in the heart of God as revealed in the Genesis account of beginnings.

In the beginning, God enjoyed full fellowship with humanity, unmarred by SIN. So too, there was harmony and PEACE in the relationships between humanity and CREATION, and between the first man and woman in the Garden of Eden. When sin entered the world, all of these relationships were damaged—sin separated humanity from a holy God. It also brought alienation between humanity and the ENVIRONMENT. Finally, it brought estrangement among people themselves, substituting blame and distrust for mutuality and complementarity (*see also* FALL OF HUMANKIND).

Reconciliation describes the process through which God works to restore these relationships. In the Book of Colossians, it is depicted as a cosmic process through which God in Jesus Christ reconciled "to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross" (1:20). Here God brings nature into right relationship with himself through Christ, as well as showing his victory over demonic 'principalities and powers.' The souls of sinners are reclaimed as they trust the merits of Christ's blood.

The apostle Paul also depicts his ministry as a ministry of reconciliation. In 2 Corinthians 5:17–19 he affirms that there is new life in Christ, and that this life is "from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself and gave us the ministry of reconciliation; that is, in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses against them, and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation."

He goes on to describe his ministry as that of an AMBASSADOR OF GOD, representing him and pleading with persons on his behalf to be reconciled to God. In this sense, the missionary enterprise is one of representing Christ to a world in need of reconciliation to God, not merely the inculcation of doctrine or the spread of propositions. Rather it is the full-fledged acceptance of one's role as an ambassador for God's kingdom, preaching the gospel of reconciliation with God—the invitation to follow Christ as he brings all things into subjection to God. Missions at its core involves the proclamation and demonstration of the LOVE OF GOD for his creation, and the

invitation to respond to his love through accepting his Son as Lord and Savior.

If reconciliation is a cosmic process, then missions involves the invitation to participate fully in the whole of the process. That is, the restoration of right relationships in the created order—the environment and surrounding interplanetary and interstellar space—and right relationships between human beings.

Paul recognizes this in pointing to the new fellowship created between Jew and Gentile in the body of Christ. This reconciliation in Christ he also calls "peace" (Eph. 2:14). Christ has "broken down the dividing wall of hostility by abolishing in his flesh the law of commandments and ordinances, that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace." (vv. 14–15) To the Galatians, he wrote that in Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek . . . slave nor free . . . male nor female" (3:28).

These latter passages have assumed great importance in contemporary conversations concerning missions because of the increased relevance of cultural CONTEXTUALIZATION in missions studies. As we have given greater weight to cultural contexts and become more clear about imperialism and power relationships, we have witnessed the need for a more sophisticated conversation about reconciliation across ethnic and cultural lines. Indeed, in the United States, missions organizations are looking at issues of cultural context not merely as a concern in overseas missions, but also working on how racial and ethnic reconciliation is to be sought within their own country.

At one level, the issue is, in the words of theologian Miroslav Volf, the "sacralization of cultural identity," the literal merger of cultural and religious commitments that gives people more of a sense of belonging to their cultural group than to Christ. Among racial and ethnic minorities, oppression can give the sense that loyalty to one's ETHNICITY is a stronger bond than that to other believers. And to those in the majority, the wedding of religion and culture often appears matter of fact, since they are the group in power and lack the critical distancing that comes from marginalization (*see* MARGINAL, MARGINALIZATION).

Some suggest that Christian faith is color-blind, in that God is "no respecter of persons." Others point to cultural difference as something to be celebrated—a rich diversity reflecting the creative genius of God. Few would opt for a segregated church which overemphasizes cultural or ethnic norms (*see also* HOMOGENOUS UNIT PRINCIPLE). Indeed, it may be that the ways in which Christians engage in the process of interpersonal and interethnic reconciliation within the church set an important agenda for worldwide missions on a planet beset by ongoing ethnic strife. Recent attempts at contextualizing theology, owning up to imperialistic cultural theologies, and the confession of our "ghettoization" of marginalized ethnic churches (by persons in both the majority and the minority) are steps in the right directions.

More radical ideas such as the recent practice of identificational or representational REPENTANCE (seeking the forgiveness of entire groups—such as the 1995 Southern Baptist apology for its attitudes on race and slavery—are still being debated (*see also* POWERS, THE). What cannot be debated is the ongoing work of God in Christ, as laid out in Scripture, to bring back what belonged to him in the first place.

HAROLD DEAN TRULEAR

Bibliography. R. P. Martin, *Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology;* L. Sanneh, *Religion and the Variety of Culture: A Study in Origin and Practice;* M. Volf, *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation;* R. Washington and G. Kehrein. *Breaking Down Walls: A Model for Reconciliation in an Age of Racial Strife.*

Redemption and Lift. DONALD MCGAVRAN introduced the phrase "redemption and lift" to the field of missiology in his classic work, *Understanding Church Growth.* McGavran defined redemption as "Christ's saving activity in the human heart," in which Christ enters, makes a person a new creation, and leads the individual to repentance (1980, 296). This new life brings the person into church fellowship and mission activities, creating a secondary improvement, "lift." McGavran described lift as the great benefits new Christians gain from a congregation which provides medicine, education, technology, wealth, protection, and loving friendships. New Christians become middle-class members of the Christian community who "share in the general sense of well-being" even though they had not done so well in times past. This is what McGavran called "lift" (1980, 297).

McGavran warned of the danger of the "redeemed and lifted" becoming socially separated from former community relationships. While new converts may be persecuted and pressured by their former communities, McGavran warned that it is the church that often insists on a Christian's separation from the world. Having done mission work among people trapped in the Hindu CASTE system of India, McGavran seemed concerned about the dangers of a Christian caste system. On the mission field he observed that new Christians tended to become personally "cleaner" and acquire new attitudes toward germs, dirt, flies, and waste disposal. As they avoided civic affairs and non-Christian festivals, the gulf between Christians and former associates deepened to the point that effective communication ceased (1980, 298–99).

McGavran thus pondered: How might the church redeem and lift Christians without separating them from receptive sections of society? His solution was twofold: (1) Stress the open Bible and Spirit-filled life as essential aspects of redemption. Rather than rely on ivory tower specialists, put the Bible in the hands of people through literacy classes in churches. (2) View "lift" as a derivative aspect of redemption and, although a necessary derivative, the emphasis should be placed upon redemption (303).

McGavran described redemption and lift as a universal phenomenon not limited to the church geographically. David Barrett has since reported that about one-third of the world is made up of Christians who receive nearly two-thirds of the world's annual income and spend 97 percent on themselves (Barrett, 1983, 148). This trend continues as we approach the twenty-first century (Barrett, 1995, 25), illustrating that redemption and lift remain crucial issues in missiology today.

PAUL HERTIG

Bibliography. D. Barrett, *IBMR* 7:4 (October 1983): 146–51; idem, *IBMR* 19:1 (January 1995): 25; D. McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth,* rev. ed.

Repentance. Repentance is the central message that the church is to bring to the world (Luke 24:47). It is a characteristic of the life of the church, and is one of the primary goals of the church's mission.

The key terms in the Old Testament are *nâham* and *shûbh*. The former word carries the root idea of "to pant, sigh, or groan." It speaks of lamenting and grieving and when it is aimed at one's own character it has the idea of repenting. The latter word speaks of turning from sin to righteousness (2 Chron. 7:14). Through Israel, God calls all nations to repent.

The key New Testament terms are *metamelomai, metanoeō,* and *epistrephō. Metamelomai* stresses the emotional aspect of care, concern, and regret. It can refer to genuine repentance (Matt. 21:29, 32) and may also refer to a regret and remorse that is not accompanied by an abandonment of sin (Matt. 27:3). *Metanoeō* is used to note the need to "have another mind" by changing one's opinion and purposes (Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:15; Acts 2:38). The dominant idea of *epistrephō* is a change of mind that may result in accompanying emotions and consequent reformation.

Elements of Repentance. True repentance has intellectual, emotional, and volitional elements. Intellectually it involves a change of mind about God, sin, Christ, and oneself. The resultant change of mind views God as good and holy; sin as evil and injurious before God and people; Christ as perfect, necessary, and sufficient for salvation; and oneself as guilty and in need of salvation. Such repentance is an essential element of missionary proclamation.

Repentance involves a change of view, a change of feelings and a change of purpose. The emotional aspect may be seen in the passionate pleas found in David's repentance (Ps. 51:1, 2, 10, 14), and in Jesus' testimony of the tax-gatherer's feeling of remorse that led to faith (Matt. 21:32). However, when the emotional element stands by itself it is not true repentance (Matt. 27:3; Luke 18:23, cf. 2 Cor. 7:9–10). The sorrow that leads to repentance is a sorrow for *sin,* not only for its consequences. The volitional aspect of repentance is seen in the turning to God in faith (1 Thess. 1:9), and is an anticipated outcome of the church's mission among the nations.

Elaboration of Meaning. Repentance may be defined as a change of mind that is produced by the Holy Spirit leading to trust in God. Repentance is a part of true faith (Acts 20:21). It is not meritorious in itself, for Christ's death fully satisfies God's righteousness (Rom. 3:25). While repentance may lead to such outward acts as confession of sin and restitution, these are evidences of repentance and not the repentance itself. Repentance is an inward act that results in outward manifestations. Psalm 51 is an illustration of true repentance. The resulting attitude of repentance is reflected in Jesus' call to become like a child (Matt. 18:2–4) as well as in the first four Beatitudes (Matt. 5:3–6).

Subjects and Objects of Repentance. God has commanded the world to repent in order to avoid his judgment (Acts 17:30). His patience and kindness move him to be slow to wrath (Rom. 2:4; 2 Peter 3:9). God does not repent in the sense of changing his immutable perfection (1 Sam. 15:29), but his roused emotion may prompt him to a different course of action in carrying out his sovereign plan (Exod. 32:14; Jonah 3:10). It may imply God's sorrow or grief over humanity's sin (Jer. 6:6).

Unbelievers and believers may be appropriate subjects of repentance. The mission of the church is to carry out God's declaration to the world to repent and trust in Christ. The church is to exemplify a repentant lifestyle (Ps. 119:128). Jesus' command to take up one's cross is another way of describing this attitude, elaborated in Romans 6:11–13.

Repentance may have a variety of objects. Scripture speaks of repenting from trusting in money (Acts 8:22) as well as from a lack of trust in God's Word (Zech. 1:6). It also speaks of repentance from dead works (Heb. 6:1), idols (Ezek. 14:6), and leaving one's first love (Rev. 2:4–5). Repentance involves dealing with anything that hinders one from living under the authority of God (James 4:1–10) and being reconciled to other believers (Luke 17:3–4). Biblically, missionary proc-

lamation must include a call to unbelievers to "repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38; 3:19; 17:30; 26:20).

Preaching of Repentance. Repentance is a key theme in the proclamation of the church to a lost world that stands in need of the Savior. It was characteristic of the prophetic preaching (Jer. 8:6; Ezek. 14:6), John the Baptist (Matt. 3:2), Jesus (Matt. 4:17), the Twelve (Mark 6:12), Peter (Acts 2:38), and Paul (Acts 20:21). It is a message that is to be proclaimed to all peoples (Luke 24:47).

Reformed theology stresses the fact that repentance is a gift of God and a result of regeneration (Acts 5:31; 11:18; 2 Tim. 2:22). Arminian theology stresses the human element in repentance and regeneration. God is recognized in the latter as the primary cause and the person as the less principal cause. In both theologies the human responsibility of declaring God's Word is embraced as the means that God's Spirit uses to work repentance (Luke 10:30).

Results of Repentance. Christ's commission to the church to declare the message of repentance is motivated by God's kindness as God yearns for all peoples to taste the benefits that result from repentance. The Scriptures give the sad examples of the impenitent who refuse to live in agreement with God. Those who do repent become special objects of God's compassion. Repentance leads one to the experience of life (Acts 11:18), joy (2 Cor. 7:9), truth (2 Tim. 2:25), forgiveness (Acts 2:38), and the rule of God (Matt. 4:17). Repentance averts the wrath of God (Jonah 3:4–10) and leads to rejoicing in heaven (Luke 15:7, 10). An unrepentant church will no longer reflect the light of Christ (Rev. 2:5) that alone can lead the world to repentance.

William D. Thrasher

Bibliography. J. Goetzmann and F. Laubach, *NIDNTT,* I:353–59; V. P. Hamilton, *TWOT,* II:909–10; O. Michel, *TDNT,* IV:626–29; E. Würthwein and J. Behm, *TDNT,* IV:975–1009.

Resurrection of Christ. The resurrection of Christ from the dead determines the nature of Christianity and defines its uniqueness. Of all religious systems, Christianity alone has made the bodily resurrection of an historical person the centerpiece of its message and faith. Mission as a centrifugal activity traces its dynamic directly from the resurrection. Resurrection and mission cannot be separated.

Resurrection and Scripture. The resurrection finds its origins deep in salvation history, even if there are very few verbal references to it in the Old Testament outside Daniel 12:2. Paul, as a Jewish scholar, was the first Christian to write about the resurrection. Paul's salvation experience, the mission to Jews and Gentiles, and discipling have their origins in his belief in and experience of the resurrection.

If the truth of the resurrection finds few verbal references in the Old Testament, how can Paul say that his preaching of the resurrection is "according to scripture" (1 Cor. 15:4)? For Paul and the early church the gospel is a salvation-history story, that is, the theme of resurrection is implicit in Israel's story of promise and fulfillment. The resurrection is at the heart of this story and gives the story significance and meaning.

Paul preached the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The longest chapter in all of Paul's epistles is on the resurrection (1 Cor. 15). His confidence in the resurrection was grounded in the testimony of numerous witnesses. Paul mentions witnesses such as Peter, the Twelve, James, the apostles, and more than five hundred, most of whom were still alive when he wrote. Finally, he was convinced of the resurrection because of having personally seen the risen Jesus (cf. 15:8 with 15:5–7). For Paul, an historical bodily resurrection was the bedrock of Good News. "If only for this life we have hope in Christ we are to be pitied more than all men" (1 Cor. 15:19).

All the New Testament writers agree with this emphasis on the resurrection. All of the Gospel writers conclude their accounts of the life and ministry of Christ with accounts of the resurrection of Jesus from the dead (Matt. 28; Mark 16; Luke 24; John 20–21). Luke takes the story one step further and recounts how the resurrection message was preached. For instance, Luke's summary of Peter's first sermon on the day of Pentecost gives more space to the resurrection than to any other subject (Acts 2:22–36).

The theme of resurrection is a dominant theme in Acts, finding its way into all parts of Luke's narrative (1:2, 25; 2:22–36; 3:15; 4:10, 33; 5:30; 7:56; 9:4; 10:40; 13:30–37; 17:3, 31–32; 22:7ff., 26:14ff., 23). Along with these explicit references to the resurrection are many other references where Luke ties the resurrection of Christ to hope as the center of the law and prophets and to Israel's general hope in the resurrection (23:6; 24:15; 21b; 26:22; and 28:20b).

Mission and Resurrection. For many the best proof of the historical resurrection is the existence of the Christian church. Within three centuries of the resurrection Christianity had become the dominant religion within the Roman Empire. This growth has continued unabated and today the Christian church numbers almost 2 billion, larger than Islam and Hinduism combined.

The biblical records intertwine resurrection and mission. The resurrection is both the green light for centrifugal missions and the impetus to carry out mission. Paul ties his apostolic commission as an apostle to the Gentiles with his ex-

perience with the resurrection of Christ (Gal. 1:16; 1 Cor. 15:8). John, Luke, and Matthew make it clear that mission was Jesus' central concern after his resurrection. Matthew shows the resurrected Jesus royally enthroned as the Lord of the nations, commissioning the apostles in Galilee with authority to engage in discipling the nations (Matt. 28:16–20). John reveals Jesus almost breathlessly rushing back to the upper room, and, after a hurried shalom says, "As the Father has sent me, I am sending you" (John 20:21).

Luke relates resurrection and mission in a number of ways. First, he shows its relationship to all of Scripture and to Jesus' incarnation (Luke 24:19–27, 37–44). Second, the resurrected Jesus blesses the commissioned apostles as he ascends to heaven (Luke 24:45–51). Third, Jesus appears to the apostles over a period of forty days, thereby confirming his resurrection as he expounds on their future mission. He concludes this period of time by giving as the fundamental consequence of the resurrection, not the founding of a kingdom with Israel as its center, but the founding of a worldwide mission with Spirit-empowered believers at the center (Acts 1:1–11). Finally, Luke concludes by showing that apostleship included preaching the resurrection and fulfilling the call of worldwide mission (Acts 1:12–26).

Scripture places the greatest importance on the relationship of resurrection and mission. Without the resurrection there is no gospel. Without mission the resurrection remains useless. The resurrection of Jesus makes mission and message possible.

HAROLD E. DOLLAR

Bibliography. D. C. Allison, *The End of the Ages Has Come;* H. Berkhof, *Christ the Meaning of History;* D. J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission;* O. Cullmann, *Salvation in History;* X. Leon-Dufour, *Resurrection and the Message of Easter;* P. Perkins, *Resurrection: New Testament Witness and Contemporary Reflection;* N. E. Thomas, ed., *Classic Texts in Mission and World Christianity.*

Sacrifice. The call to follow Christ is a call to sacrifice because it involves a willing abandonment of self in favor of Christ. Christians should be willing to "give up everything they have" (Luke 14:33) as disciples of Jesus Christ (see Matt. 4:20, 22; Mark 10:21, 28, 52; Luke 5:28; John 1:43; 21:19, 22). In fact, on several occasions Jesus stressed that Christians are to give up their own life in deference to him (Matt. 10:37–39; Mark 8:34–38; Luke 17:33; John 12:25–26). Jesus is our hidden treasure and pearl of great value for which we willingly sell all that we have (Matt. 13:44–45). As such, forsaking everything else for Jesus is ultimately no sacrifice at all—it is the wisest choice. Missionary martyr JIM ELIOT understood this and said, "He is no fool who gives what he cannot keep to gain what he cannot lose" (Hampton and Plueddemann, 1991, 16).

Paul, the great missionary, spoke of "Christ Jesus my Lord for whose sake I have lost all things" (see Phil. 3:5–9). Paul was willing to sacrifice and suffer because Christ had become his Lord and Master. The lordship of Christ over us leads us to understand that we no longer belong to ourselves, but rather to him who bought us with his own blood (see Luke 6:46; Rom. 14:7–9; 1 Cor. 6:12–20; 1 Peter 1:18–19).

Paul expressed it well when he defined his identity in the following way: "the God whose I am and whom I serve" (Acts 27:33). He belonged to God so he had to serve him! Until the lordship of Christ becomes a central tenet in our WORLDVIEW, the call to sacrifice in his behalf will be extremely difficult. But once the knee bows to Christ and he is enthroned in our lives, sacrifice can become joyous service to our King! Even suffering for his sake can become something for which we "rejoice" (Rom. 5:3, see also Matt. 5:11–12; 2 Cor. 4:17; 11:23–33). Missionary pioneer J. HUDSON TAYLOR understood this and wrote, "What we give up for Christ we gain. What we keep back for ourselves is our real loss" (ibid., 119).

If a degree of sacrifice, then, is to be expected of all disciples, it should be even more so a hallmark of Christian missionaries. On behalf of the gospel, they are often called to forsake many things that are otherwise biblically allowable: cherished relationships, life-long dreams, comfortable living conditions, personal goals and plans, homeland cultures and models of ministry, relative anonymity, financial security, and many personal possessions. They do this willingly, while understanding that such sacrifice may not be appreciated even by those whom the Lord has called them to serve. Why endure such things? The worth of souls, the sanctification of sinners, and the example and glory of Christ are the reasons expressed by missionaries as being sufficient to counter whatever afflictions, persecutions, or deprivations they may face in their labors.

But where is the corresponding devotion to sacrifice for the missionary cause among Christian laypeople in our day? In a day of unparalleled affluence, many Western Christians are amassing luxury upon luxury and struggling to save for the future while millions of men and women made in God's image perish for lack of gospel knowledge. It is little wonder that non-Western missionaries are taking the place of Western missionaries in their Great Commission-centered living.

May the Holy Spirit break our hearts and bow us before Christ the Lord so that lives of sacrifice become the rule instead of the exception in our

churches! Otherwise we will languish in our luxuries. As the psalmist cried out:

> "May God be gracious to us and bless us and make his face shine upon us, that your ways may be known on earth, your salvation to all nations" (Psalm 67:1–2).

ED GROSS

Bibliography. V. Hampton and C. Plueddemann, *World Shapers.*

Salvation. The scriptural words for "salvation" in Hebrew and Greek refer to deliverance from any danger or distress. This article is concerned with salvation in its missiological context. So, it deals with salvation only as it relates to the rescue of humans from the cause and effects of SIN.

The History of Redemption. Sin entered the world through Satan's tempting of the first humans (Gen. 3; James 1:13). Adam and Eve yielded to Satan and chose to rebel against God by sinning. The effects of sin on Adam and Eve were: the loss of fellowship with God, the corruption of their entire being, their exposure to God's wrath and punishment including a life of misery, inevitable death and eternal separation from him (see Gen. 3:8, 24; Isa. 59:1–2; Gen. 6:5; Rom. 3:1–10; 8:7–8; Eph. 2:1–3; Job 5:7; Isa. 57:21; Rom. 5:14; 6:23; *see also* FALL OF HUMANKIND). Adam stood as the representative of all his descendants. The consequences of his decision not to follow God were to affect forever his descendants and the world for good or for evil. All humankind has been affected by the consequences of the sin of its representative, and the fruit of which has been transmitted to each one through the process of birth (see Rom. 5:12; 1 Cor. 15:22; Ps. 51:5; 58:3; John 3:6). As a result, none of Adam's heirs are perfect. They are under God's righteous judgment (Ezek. 18:4; Rom. 1:18–20; 3:23).

The Bible, though, reveals from the very beginning God's response to sin as a gracious plan to reverse the horror of evil. Sin's instigator, Satan, would be crushed by one of Eve's male descendants (Gen. 3:15). Through subsequent revelations and the initiating of symbolic animal sacrifices, God taught the descendants of Adam that he loved them and would accept them if they dealt with their sins according to his will (Gen. 4:1–16; 6:8–9; Job 1:1–5; Heb. 1:1). His gracious plan of redemption has always been applied to sinners through the channel of FAITH (Gen. 15:6; Heb. 2:4; Rom. 1:17; 3:19–26; Eph. 2:8, 9). And true, saving faith was always distinguished from a temporary or merely intellectual faith—which could not save (Heb. 11; Luke 8:13; James 2:19).

Later in Moses' record of human history, God called Abraham and promised to produce a nation through him and through his descendants God would bless all the nations (Gen. 12:1–3; 15:1–6; 17:6–7; Rom. 4:18–22; *see also* ABRAHAMIC COVENANT). The rest of the Old Testament is a complex history of how God in his providence graciously fulfilled that promise in ways that teach, help, and encourage believers of all ages (Rom. 15:4; 1 Cor. 10:6, 11; 2 Tim. 3:14–16).

He gave to Abraham many children (see Gen. 12–50) who "were fruitful and multiplied greatly and became exceedingly numerous, so that the land [of Egypt] was filled with them" (Exod. 1:7). Though they were populous enough to be a nation, they needed to have their own land, culture, and leadership to become a lasting, viable nation (see Exodus through Joshua). God led them to the land of Canaan through Moses and established them in the Promised Land through a faithful and courageous leader: Joshua [whose name means "The Lord Delivers" and in Greek is the name Jesus]. Though warned of the consequences, the children of Israel rebelled against the Lord and his prophets and were sent into exile. In God's wonderful grace they were miraculously returned from exile into their own land, rebuilt their temple, and awaited the coming of the Promised One (see Judges through Malachi).

When the time was perfect "God sent his Son, born of a woman, born under law" (Gal. 4:4a). He was the reality toward which all the Old Testament animal sacrifices symbolically pointed. So upon seeing him, John declared, "Look, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!" (John 1:29). Jesus was "the Lamb slain from the creation of the world" (Rev. 13:8). It was he who revealed his future coming to Abraham (John 8:56), to Moses (Deut. 18:15; Heb. 11:26), to the wandering Israelites (Heb. 4:2), to David (Acts 2:25–31), and to many others. Jesus taught that the Old Testament pointed to him (Luke 24:25–27, 44) and it was not until his followers understood this that they could understand the [OT] Scriptures (Luke 24:45) because "these are the Scriptures that testify about me," he claimed (John 5:39).

An angel told Joseph to name Mary's son "Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). To accomplish salvation Jesus had to live perfectly under God's law as a human and then willingly substitute his own life as a payment for the penalty that sin demands (Heb. 2:14–15; 2 Cor. 5:21). So, Jesus lived perfectly under the law—without ever sinning (Heb. 4:15; 1 John 3:5). He alone could look at his enemies and say, "Can any of you prove me guilty of sin?" (John 8:46). And at the end of his perfect life, in the most amazing expression of love ever shown, he subjected himself to the wrath and curse of God on the cross, dying in the place of sinners (Rom. 5:8; Gal. 3:12–14; Matt. 27:45–46).

It was only through a perfect God-Man, substituting himself and paying the debt that sin demands from God's justice, that human sinners

could be saved. There is no other possible way of salvation (John 14:6; Acts 4:12; Rom. 3:19–26; Gal. 2:21; 3:21). All that Jesus did, he did "to seek and to save what was lost" (Luke 19:10).

Following Jesus' substitutionary death, God raised him from the dead, proving to all that he accepted his Son's life and sacrifice, and forever establishing the truthfulness of all of Christ's claims (Rom. 1:4; Acts 2:22–24; Phil. 2:5–11). After appearing to hundreds of disciples over a period of several weeks, Jesus physically ascended into heaven. The apostles who saw all of these things were transformed by the Spirit into courageous witnesses who traveled throughout the world proclaiming the good news of salvation through Jesus and making disciples. They taught the disciples to do the same until the return of Jesus (Acts 1:1–11; 1 Cor. 15:1–8; Acts 2–4; 8:1–4; 14:21–23; 1 Cor. 10:31–11:1; Phil. 4:9; Matt. 24:14). As the Son of Man, Jesus is now seated at the right hand of God's throne where he sovereignly directs the affairs of all creation and represents his children until his return (Matt. 28:16–20; Heb. 7:22–26; 1 John 2:1; 1 Thess. 4:13–18).

This brief summary of the Old and New Testament story is given to show that the Bible is primarily a Book that reveals the history of salvation. Scripture is the story of God's saving love. It primarily depicts how God prepared the world for the First Coming of his Son and what he has done and is doing to prepare the world for the Second Coming of Jesus Christ.

Missiological Application. The term "salvation" in the Scriptures is a complex concept, not used solely of the conversion of individuals. Salvation in its broad scriptural use is something that has a past, present, and future sense. God's children have been saved (Rom. 8:24; Eph. 2:8; Titus 3:5), are being saved (1 Cor. 1:18; 2 Cor. 2:15), and shall be saved (Rom. 5:9–10; 13:11; 1 Thess. 5:8; Heb. 9:28; 1 Peter 1:4, 5). Western evangelicalism strangely stresses the past tense with almost no emphasis on the present and future. Missionaries and missiologists should question how significantly Western culture has influenced today's quick-and-easy, low commitment presentations of the gospel.

Scripture also speaks of salvation as impacting one's entire being forever. God's children have been, are being, and shall be saved from sin, self, and Satan. The process of salvation, then, is lifelong and consummated only when believers are perfected in the likeness of the Savior at the resurrection. This challenges the emphasis of some who equate salvation with merely "making a decision for Christ." It is far more than a simple decision to not want to go to hell sometime in the future. While it involves a personal choice, a true commitment to Christ is not merely a momentary, spiritual issue regarding one's eternal destiny and having little to do with here and now. True conversion will affect all of life. Its many implications should be articulated by the witness and understood by the hearer before a call for commitment is ever made.

Paul was concerned with some who misrepresented Jesus because the preaching of another Jesus also produced another gospel—one that could not save (see 2 Cor. 11:4; Gal. 1:6–9). Missiology must be greatly concerned with how Jesus is proclaimed today since it is only through him that salvation can occur. Jesus declared that the correct perception of him and his saving work was as the Messiah promised by God (Matt. 16:13–17).

According to the Old Testament, the promised Messiah would save his people by fulfilling three functions: he would be a divine Prophet (Deut. 18:15), Priest (Ps. 110:4; Isa. 53:4–12; Zech. 6:13) and King (Ps. 2; 2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:3–4). The apostles used the messianic Old Testament passages to prove that Jesus was the Messiah and to describe the salvation that was offered through him (see Acts 2:29–31, 36; 3:17–18, 22–23; 4:25–27). Instead of saying, "Accept Jesus as your personal Savior," the apostles proclaimed that the multitudes should accept Jesus as their divine Prophet, Priest and King.

Is this an insignificant difference from the way evangelism is often done today? Not so if today's presentation carves away Christ's role as Prophet and King over his children. Many might gladly accept him as their sin-bearing Savior who might not be so quick to accept him as their Guide and submit to him as their King! Missionaries and missiologists should take a close look at who the Jesus is that is being proclaimed and what level of commitment is being made by those who are responding.

The GREAT COMMISSION involves salvation and is a command to make disciples (Matt. 28:18–20). In the early church every believer was expected to quickly become a disciple (Acts 6:1; 14:21–23). Summarizing how disciples are made, Jesus mentioned the importance of BAPTISM. Though it does not suit today's evangelical custom, the New Testament very closely relates conversion and baptism as linked together in the normal process of salvation (see Acts 8:12; 18:8; 22:16; Rom. 6:3; 1 Peter 3:21). When asked by a crowd what they should do to be saved, Peter responded, "Repent and be baptized . . . for the forgiveness of your sins" (Acts 2:38). Did Peter understand how to evangelize? The Holy Spirit thought he did and saved 3,000 people! Why did Peter combine baptism with repenting? Perhaps he was seeking to fulfill the Great Commission as he had been taught. Baptism in the New Testament, though not an *essential* component for salvation (*see* John 3:16, 36, etc.), was an *important* element of the process of true conversion

and was normative in the early church. Missionaries and missiologists should explore much more fully the place of baptism, public confession, and church commitment as important elements of New Testament discipling. They should continually warn the church of the consequences of exporting Western styles of evangelism that do not follow apostolic patterns.

EDWARD N. GROSS

Bibliography. G. D. Congdon, *EMQ* 21:3 (1985): 296–99; M. Erickson, *BibSac* 152 (1995): 3–15; idem, *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 33 (1991): 5–15; idem, *Interpretation* 49 (1995): 255–66; E. Gross, *Christianity Without a King: The Results of Abandoning Christ's Lordship;* C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology;* H. Kasdorf, *Christian Conversion in Context;* J. Morikawa, *American Baptist Quarterly* 12 (1993): 122–26; B. Nicholls, *ERT* 15 (1991): 4–21; J. Orr, *ISBE*.

Satan. The basic meaning of the word "satan" is "accuser"; the verb from which it derives is used six times in the Old Testament (Pss. 38:20; 71:13; 109:4, 20, 29; Zech. 3:1) with that meaning. The term can also mean "adversary" or "slanderer." In Zechariah it refers to an accusation made by Abishai against Shimei, which is true but not slanderous. However, in the five Psalm passages it is used of slander. Context determines its meaning.

The noun is used occasionally in the Old Testament of humans. David is the first human in the Old Testament called a "satan" (1 Sam. 29:4), meaning in context "an adversary." Others include Abishai (2 Sam. 19:22), Solomon's military enemies (1 Kings 5:4), Hadad of Edom (1 Kings 11:14), and Rezon of Syria (1 Kings 11:23, 25).

It is also used of celestial beings in the Old Testament. In Job 1 and 2, Satan is referred to fourteen times in the role of God's adversary in the discussion about Job. In Zechariah 3:1–2, Satan stands at the right hand of the angel of the Lord to accuse Joshua the high priest. Of the almost twenty celestial references to Satan as an adversary of God, every instance but one uses the article "the" with the word referring to "the Satan." This designates a particular adversary. The one case in which a celestial satan is not hostile to God is in Numbers 22:22, where that adversary is an angel (32) who is acting on God's behalf. Of the Old Testament references to celestial adversaries only once is the word used without an article and thus appears to be a proper name: "Satan stood up against Israel and incited David to number Israel" (1 Chron. 21:1).

Satan is referred to much more frequently in the intertestamental literature, the Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha, than in the Old Testament. This may be because of the feeling that God had abandoned the Jews because of their sin, destroying the temple with its Most Holy Place. The Jewish people thus transcendentalized God and allowed for much more evil activity between heaven and earth than in earlier religious belief. Surrogate terms such as Asmodeus, Azazel, Belial, Satanail, Mastema, and Semjaza are commonly used in this literature to designate Satan.

The Hebrew (Old Testament) word "satan" never appears in the New Testament, which uses instead a transliterated form of the Aramaic word *satanas* in its thirty-five occurrences. However, the Aramaic term is usually translated Satan in English versions of the New Testament, the same as the Hebrew word in the Old Testament. Equally often in appearance in the New Testament is the Greek word *diabolos,* translated devil. This is not a different term, only a Greek translation in the Septuagint of the Hebrew word satan. Thus, its meaning is the same. In Revelation 12:9, both terms, Aramaic and Greek, are used to refer to the great dragon John saw in his revelation: "and the great dragon was thrown down, that ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan." The word "devil" never appears in the Hebrew Old Testament.

Unlike the Old Testament, the New Testament always uses the word "satan" (adversary) to refer to Satan, the greatest enemy of God and Christ. Almost half (15) of the 35 occurrences of the word in the New Testament are in the Gospels. It appears only twice in Acts, 10 times in Paul's letters, and 8 times in Revelation.

The New Testament, like the intertestamental literature, uses other words for Satan (2 Cor. 12:7) and the devil (Matt. 4:1). These include Beelzebul (Mark 3:22), Belial (2 Cor. 6:15), and possibly Abaddon and Apollyon (Rev. 9:11). Additionally, metaphors are frequently used to describe Satan, including the terms Strong Man (Matthew 12:29), Evil One (Eph. 6:16), the Destroyer (1 Cor. 10:10), the Tempter (Matt. 4:3), the Accuser (Rev. 12:10), and the Enemy (1 Cor. 15:25).

Some animal metaphors are used of Satan: the Serpent (Rev. 12:9), the Dragon (Rev. 12:7), and the Lion (1 Peter 5:8; 2 Tim. 4:17). He is also referred to in cosmic terminology as the Prince of Demons (Matt. 9:34), the Ruler of this World (John 12:31), the Prince of the Power of the Air (Eph. 2:2), and the God of this World (2 Cor. 4:4).

The origin of Satan is never revealed in the Bible. Since dualism is not an acceptable biblical postulate for a co-eternal existence of God and Satan (Satan is referred to in the Bible only in male terminology, as are also the angels), Satan's origin must be accounted for as a created being. Isaiah 14:12 speaks of the "Day Star, son of Dawn" as "fallen from heaven" and Ezekiel 28:13 contains the phrase "you were in Eden, the garden of God . . . with an anointed guardian cherub . . . on the holy mountain of God . . . and the guarding cherub drove you out from the midst of the stones of fire . . ." Some see the ori-

gins of Satan in these passages. However, in the immediate context, Isaiah is writing a taunt against the king of Babylon, and Ezekiel is describing the fate of the king of Tyre. Whether these are allegorical allusions to Satan as well is debatable.

Somewhat parallel passages in the New Testament may provide some insight into the question of the origin of evil angels. Peter speaks of angels sinning and being "cast into hell committing them to pits of nether gloom to be kept until the judgment" (2 Peter 2:4). The expression "cast into hell" is literally in Greek "tartarize them." Jude writes: "And the angels that did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling have been kept by him in eternal chains in the nether gloom until the judgment of the great day" (Jude 1:6 RSV).

Since Matthew refers to the devil and his angels, it is conceivable that the devil is himself a disobedient angel and the destiny of both is the "eternal fire" which is "prepared for them" (Matt. 25:41). Thus their destiny, if not their origin, is clear. However, Genesis has Satan present in the beginning of human creation tempting Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden (Gen. 3:1; cf. 2 Cor. 11:3). He is in the form of a serpent on this occasion. That the serpent is indeed Satan is clearly stated in Revelation 12:9: "And the great dragon was thrown down, that ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world—he was thrown down to the earth, and his angels were thrown down with him" (cf. Rev. 20:2).

Satan's power has always been limited by the will of God. Job was allowed to be afflicted by Satan, but only to the extent allowed by God. Even though Satan has the power of death (Heb. 2:14), the use of that power is subject to the will of the Almighty. Even though Satan had the kingdoms of the world within his power and could deliver them to Jesus at his temptation (Matt. 4:9), that power was derived from God (Luke 4:6) and these kingdoms are under his influence only because they have chosen to sin and follow Satan rather than God. "The whole world is in the power of the evil one" (1 John 5:19 RSV). But, "The Evil One cannot touch" those who are born of God and do not "go on sinning" as a way of life but remain dedicated to serving him (1 John 5:18).

Satan is responsible not only for tempting humans to sin against God but also for leading cosmic powers to influence the church toward disunity which Jesus said would cause the world to disbelieve in him (John 17:21). Thus, Paul writes that through the church the manifold wisdom of God is made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places (Eph. 3:10). In the first four chapters of this Ephesian letter Paul is arguing for the unity of Jews and Gentiles in the body of Christ, among other reasons because of its comic implications. The price of a divided church is a disbelieving world.

Satan is popularly but erroneously called Lucifer. This name does not appear in the Bible. The English term Lucifer is a translation of the Hebrew and Greek words for "light bringer." The English word is actually a transliteration of the Latin word *luciforos* meaning "light bringer," which refers to the morning star or day star, Venus. The word appears in Isaiah 14:12 where Isaiah tauntingly calls the king of Babylon "Day Star, son of Dawn" because symbolically he has fallen from his position of power in the evening so soon after having arisen in the morning. In the history of biblical exegesis this passage was connected with Luke 10:18 in which Jesus said, "I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven" and the word Lucifer came to be widely used as another name for Satan.

With the recent rise of interest in Satan and satanism in the West (*see* SATANIST, SATANISM), as well as an awareness of spiritual orientation of much of the rest of the world, it is crucial for missionaries from every culture to be aware of Satan and his schemes. Though there are excesses, the contemporary rise of the SPIRITUAL WARFARE movement is therefore a welcome development in mission. A mission theology of Satan and his work across cultural contexts is in the process of formation, and ensuring that it is biblically founded rather than experientially formed will remain a priority for missiologists in the future.

JOHN MCRAY

Shalom. Hebrew word meaning wholeness. It is translated into English using such terms as completeness, soundness, peace, well-being, health, prosperity, and salvation. It implies a state of mind that is at peace and satisfied, and social relationships characterized by harmony and mutual support. It is based on three fundamental principles: this world and all in it belongs to God; all humans share equally in God's loving concern (God shows no favoritism to some people or nations); and the reign of God in creation and in human communities leads to peace, justice, and truly fulfilled lives. *Shalom* is a transcultural and timeless concept, but like other such symbols it finds its expression in the concrete situations of real life in real cultures and real history. In the Old Testament, the focus is more on earthly wholeness. In the New Testament, the dimension of eternal life comes into sharper focus.

One attribute of *shalom* is *agape,* the identification with and unconditional commitment to the other (*see* LOVE OF GOD). This is not a response to the desirable, lovable, or admirable, but to the needy, undesired, unloved, and enemy.

Shalom initiates action, accepts vulnerability, bears suffering, and always hopes for the best. The supreme manifestation is Christ's crucifixion. A second attribute is righteousness. In Scripture, true *shalom* and righteousness flow from right relationships with God (Isa. 60:17), and reflect his character of righteousness, love, justice, peace, and perfection. There can be no *shalom* while one persists in sin and evil (Isa. 48:18; 54:13), and the renewal of righteousness is essential to the restoration of *shalom.* A third attribute is PEACE. This is not, as the modern world sees it, simply freedom from feelings of guilt, serenity, and peace of mind, nor merely the absence of war. It actively seeks harmonious, mutually edifying relationships in community life. A fourth attribute is the concept of health. *Shalom* communicates the sense of human well-being in which physical, emotional, mental, moral, and spiritual health are inextricably intertwined. Unlike the Western WORLDVIEW, which differentiates between spirit and body, spiritual and material realities, the Hebrew worldview views humans as whole beings in which spiritual, moral, mental, and physical attributes are inextricably intertwined. A fifth attribute is *koinonia. Shalom* speaks of social fellowship and communal harmony among friends, parties, and nations.

Shalom is an essential part of God's cosmic plan, and is one of the threads running through Scripture linking cosmic, human, and individual histories into a single, coherent story. It began at CREATION, when God saw all he had created and it was good. Only man by himself was not good (Gen 2:18), because he was not in community.

The fall shattered this harmony (*see* FALL OF HUMANKIND). In the biblical worldview, sin is at root the breaking of *shalom,* the severing of relationships. It began with the break in right relationships with God when humans put themselves as the center of their being and worshiped themselves. It led to broken human relationships between genders (Gen. 3:15), brothers (Gen. 4:8), and human communities (Gen 11:9). The result was jealousy, hatred, ethnocentrism, rivalries, injustice, violence, and war.

The establishment of *shalom* is at the heart of God's plan of SALVATION. In Christ, God reached out to save fallen humans and to reconcile them to himself. Salvation begins with forgiveness with God through Christ Jesus, and finds expression in the restoration of human relationships to God, and to one another in the church, the body of Christ. *Shalom* is associated with a peace covenant, in which this restoration of relationships and righteousness takes place (Num. 25:12; Isa. 54:7–8; Ezek. 34:5).

The final and full manifestation of *shalom* will occur when Christ returns and the kingdom of God is established over all creation. Then *shalom* and righteousness will reign in Zion (Isa. 60:17; Ps. 85:8–9), and violence and destruction will occur no more. *Shalom* is both a present reality in the life of the believer and the church, but also a future culmination in which all creation will be restored in harmony under the reign of Christ.

Shalom is of the essence of the KINGDOM OF GOD. It symbolizes the presence of God, who works to restore the entire creation to fulfill the purposes for which he created it. In the signs of this kingdom, such as salvation, reconciliation, and healing, people see the presence of God in this world, bringing life out of death, love and peace in the midst of hate and violence, and meaning to meaninglessness. Nature itself is included in God's salvation, for it will be a part of the new heaven and new earth that are essential in God's work to restore *shalom* throughout all his creation.

Shalom is to characterize the *ekklesia,* the CHURCH, the assembly or gathering of God's people. It is the test and hallmark of the church's divine nature as the outpost of the kingdom now on earth—the community that emerges when the covenant relationship between God and his people is restored, and that gives expression to the harmony intended by God. This church is not a social institution, although it finds expression in social forms. It is the community of the Spirit open to all who turn to God for reconciliation. At its heart is *koinonia,* the fellowship and harmony that give rise to a new saved and saving community based on the covenant of love that binds people together in mutual submission to one another. It is a new community that breaks down the walls of language, race, class, gender, and nationalism. It is also called to make peace, to seek social justice, provision for the needy, including widows, orphans, and the poor, and protection of the exploited and oppressed. Above all, it is apostolic, sent into the world with a divine commission to proclaim that the rule of God is at hand, that Jesus is Lord, and that people should change their ways and love in the light of the new reality and form new communities of followers.

Shalom is to characterize the life of the individual Christian, unlike the West, which sees autonomous, free individuals as the fundamental units of human reality, and differentiates between personal and social systems. Scripture sees individuals as fully human only as they are a part of communities of *shalom,* and healing as rooted in the community. Dan Fountain points out that "God's plan for the world is this: That all persons everywhere, in every nation, know God's saving health and be delivered from disobedience, disruption, despair, disease and all that would destroy our wholeness."

PAUL G. HIEBERT

Bibliography. B. Bradshaw, *Bridging the Gap: Evangelism, Development and Shalom;* D. E. *Fountain, Health, the Bible, and the Church;* S. Hauerwas and W. H. Williamon, *Resident Aliens: Life in the Christian Colony;* S. N. Kraus, *The Community of the Spirit;* C. Van Engen, *God's Missionary People.*

Signs and Wonders. Biblical expression that refers to God's powerful and miraculous interventions in creation. In Scripture, these acts were performed by God through his servants and included miraculous healings, demonic expulsions, control over natural phenomena, and POWER ENCOUNTERS. Signs and wonders usually occurred in conjunction with the proclamation of God's message in the Old Testament or with proclamation of the KINGDOM OF GOD in the New Testament. The purpose of the signs and wonders was to reveal the glory of God and his grace and power, to authenticate God's message and messenger, to confirm Jesus Christ as the promised Messiah, and to usher in the kingdom of God. The healings and demonic deliverances of Jesus and the disciples were considered part of the gospel itself. In the Book of Acts, signs and wonders followed the apostles and accompanied the verbal proclamation of the gospel. There is a pattern of growth and expansion of the church that followed these recorded miracles in Scripture. In many cases PERSECUTION followed the period of growth.

Records and references to different types of signs and wonders were prevalent in the writings of the early church fathers. From the fifth century until the twentieth century, reports of miracles, however, decreased, although there are numerous accounts of miracles and power encounters in conjunction with frontier missions. For example, power encounters, demonic deliverance, and healings are attributed to missionaries such as BONIFACE (680–754) and ULFILAS (c. 311–383).

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the scientific, rational, Western WORLDVIEW shaped the missionary perspective of supernatural phenomena (*see also* ENLIGHTENMENT). Emphasis was placed on verbal proclamation without any distinctive manifestations of God's supernatural power, and supernatural phenomena were explained in nonsupernatural terms. Recently, however, many missionaries have found the need to combine the preaching of the gospel with some form of power manifestation to reach the people (*see also* POWER MISSION and POWERS, THE). This is most prominent in areas and cultures that adhere to some form of supernatural worldview. In many cases, these signs and wonders are followed by conversions and explosive church growth.

A renewed emphasis on signs and wonders brought forth by the charismatic and Third Wave movements has reestablished the need and place of signs and wonders in the evangelism process. This topic has become widely debated among theologians and missiologists. The two main questions in the discussion are: Do signs and wonders still exist today as they did in biblical times? What part should they play in evangelism and missions today?

On one end of the spectrum is the cessasionist view that signs and wonders ceased with the age of the apostles since their purpose was to confirm the message preached by the apostles. Signs and wonders may occur today at the initiative of God in areas were the gospel is introduced for the first time. However, such occurrences are very rare. Generally it is assumed that healings and other signs and wonders are no longer seen today and that verbal proclamation of the gospel is sufficient.

On the other end of the spectrum is the Pentecostal view that every Christian and church should experience and minister with signs and wonders. Healings, deliverance, and power encounters are part of the gospel message. Effective evangelism occurs where the gospel is proclaimed with power, and the signs and wonders that accompany such evangelism are the same as those in the New Testament. John Wimber popularized one expression of this position and played a key role in the increased use of signs and wonders among Western missionaries.

A third view affirms the presence of signs and wonders as important tools of evangelism and church growth, yet does not see them as normative. Proponents of this view affirm the need for signs and wonders in mission, but caution against an overemphasis and unbalanced view. They caution that in practice, signs and wonders have often taken center stage, at the expense of the verbal gospel message. Furthermore, they warn that it is easy to fall into a formula approach, an evangelical form of magic. Finally there is the concern that often miracles are reported and claimed where there are none. Signs and wonders are affirmed, but there is a need for an overall balance in the reliance on the miraculous in evangelism.

The debate remains as to the nature and place of signs and wonders in evangelism and mission. The conclusion of these questions is based primarily on the paradigm from which these issues are addressed. The evidence shows that many of those ministering with signs and wonders have and are experiencing conversion growth. This is especially the case among resistant peoples. The proclamation of the gospel in conjunction with signs and wonders has been the deciding factor for the conversion of many.

MARK WAGNER

Bibliography. G. S. Grieg and K. N. Springer, eds., *The Kingdom and the Power;* E. N. Gross, *Miracles, Demons, and Spiritual Warfare: An Urgent Call for Discernment;* P. G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues;* C. P. Wagner, comp., *Signs and Wonders Today*; V. J. Sterk, *Missiology* 20 (July 1992): 371–84; D. Williams, *Signs, Wonders, and the Kingdom of God;* J. Wimber, *Power Evangelism.*

Sin. There is perhaps no concept more central and strategic to the Christian message than that of sin. The concept of sin is central to the biblical narrative of salvation history. It is central to the Christian explanation of suffering and death and is a crucial component of the meaning of the cross. It is key in any evangelistic presentation of the gospel and essential to the call for repentance and faith, in salvation, in sanctification, and in biblical eschatology. And it is foundational to the missionary mandate. It is because of sin and the eschatological consequences of sin, that missionaries go forth preaching a message of judgment and hope.

Missionaries cannot afford simply to take for granted their use of the concept of sin, for at least two reasons. On the one hand missionaries often go to societies in which a sense of sin, and a language for speaking of sin, seem to be markedly absent. On the other hand, many missionaries come from increasingly post-Christian societies where the concept of sin and judgment has come under attack and strong disapproval. Missionaries themselves are increasingly disapproved of as supposed purveyors of an unhealthy sense of sin and guilt. It is important, then, for missionaries to carefully reconsider their understanding and use of the concept of sin.

One might suppose that the concept of sin is simple, not complex, easy to translate and explain in other languages. Such is not the case. When accurately understood, sin carries a heavy load of meaning. Built into the meaning of that one word are ethical/moral, theological, anthropological, and eschatological implications.

Ethical/Moral. The language of sin presupposes a vigorous notion of good and evil, right and wrong, true moral obligations, normative ideals, and absolute standards. To violate what is ethical and good, to transgress against another person, to fail to exemplify the oral character traits one should, is to sin. Theft, murder, adultery, incest, slander, drunkenness, envy, and witchcraft are spoken of as sins.

At one level this is not a particular problem for missionaries, since all cultures have discourses of moral condemnation—discourses which presuppose notions of good and evil, right and wrong. At another level, missionaries face two distinct problems. First, cultures differ in terms of the ethical and moral norms and ideals which are recognized or stressed. Missionary messages about sin may thus presuppose notions of good and evil, right and wrong which contradict the consciences of those to whom they speak. This has many practical and profound implications for missionaries who hope to make the conscience of their listeners an ally rather than a foe (for a full treatment of such implications, see Priest, 1994).

Second, the biblical themes of God as the source of moral standards and of moral evil as disobedience to God, are implied by the biblical language of sin—but are not necessarily shared by the cultures of the world.

Theological. Dictionaries stress that "sin" is a religious term. "Sin" differs from "immorality," "evil," or "crime" in that it implies a vertical Godward dimension—a theological orientation. Sin is "against God." The Genesis 3 narrative of original sin focuses not on a horizontal relationship (theft, adultery, murder), but on the vertical one, relationship to God. The prohibition, "Don't eat the fruit!" was of a nature to factor out all other issues except the simple issue of relationship to God. The narrative is one a child can grasp. But the vertical and horizontal are linked. After God is rejected, then Cain kills Abel.

In Psalm 51 David cries out to God, "Against you, you only have I sinned. . . ." David has committed adultery, lied, and murdered faithful Uriah. He has sinned against many, but it is the horror of his failure toward God which grips him. In the Bible God is the central equation, the fundamental fact, the integrating factor of the universe. The ten commandments begin with God, and on that foundation move to the horizontal. ETHICS and morality are grounded in theology. Whatever else sin entails, it is rebellion against God.

Missionaries often discover that the society to which they go is more likely to link morality to the ancestors than to God. While many societies will have a vague notion of a high god, such a god is distant and not intimately concerned with people's ethical behavior. Instead of assuming a strong sense of God and a linkage between God and morality, missionaries must help to construct and re-articulate who God is, as well as the linkage of God and morality. The sense of sin is greatest where the sense of God is greatest (cf. Isa. 6). But the willingness to face God with our own sin will come only where a powerful message of love and grace makes such possible.

Missionaries in secular societies face their own difficulties. Here several centuries of effort have gone into denying that God is necessary to ethics and morality. As a result, the term "sin" has been moved to the margins of moral discourse. Nonetheless, as many philosophers have recognized, the effort to provide foundations for

morality and ethics apart from a transcendent source, has utterly failed. The astute apologist will find it possible to present a persuasive witness that God is essential as the foundation of morality, and move from there to the gospel—including discussion of sin.

Anthropological. The concept of sin, as used in Scripture, implies truths about people. It implies, first of all, a high view of human personhood. It would not be meaningful to apply the word "sin" to a tornado, a snake, or a dog. People are active moral agents with free will. Sin is presented in Scripture as evil which is actively chosen by culpable human agents. Such agents are not simply products of heredity or environment. They are active in choosing between good and evil.

The concept of sin also implies a terrible truth about the human condition. Subsequent to the first primordial sin, all humans enter the world as sinners. "Sinful" is an adjective which applies not just to acts, but to people. It is not just that people occasionally commit sinful acts. They are themselves sinful. Sin is not simply episodic (like crime), but a pervasive on-going condition. People are sinful at the deepest levels. Repeatedly the Bible stresses that the outward acts simply reveal something about the inner state: the dispositions of the heart, such as lust, covetousness, and pride.

The concept of sin points to both freedom and captivity. People who actively and freely choose that which is wrong find themselves also to be "slaves" to sin. These twin themes are both important to any presentation of the biblical view of the human condition. Again, such a presentation must take into account what the relevant culture says about human nature, in order to more effectively articulate and communicate the biblical view. For example, one may have to counter the claim of human determinism—that humans are therefore not accountable—or the claim that humans are by nature good, and not sinful.

Eschatological. The word "sin" carries with it the idea of culpability and deserved punishment. "In the day that you eat of it, you shall die." "The wages of sin is death." The very language of sin carries with it the idea of deserved and future judgment. While the wicked may flourish in this life, the implication is that there is moral harmony and justice in this world, and the wicked will be punished. The concept of sin carries with it implicitly the notion of deserved and coming punishment. Sin points to the coming judgment. Sin points to HELL.

Missionaries often express frustration when they cannot find a word for "sin" in the language of the people with whom they work—little realizing the heavy load of meaning carried by that one word, and the unlikelihood of finding a single word with the same load of meaning in any culture except one heavily influenced by Christianity. Indeed there was no Hebrew or Greek word which carried the same range of meaning as our English word "sin." Instead there were many words drawn from everyday moral discourse with which to speak of sin. Dynamically equivalent vocabulary exists in every culture. Instead of looking for a single word and expecting that word to carry the full load of meaning, the missionary will need to pay attention to the meaning itself, and communicate that meaning into the language and culture. A deep knowledge of language and culture will discover fully adequate lexical and symbolic resources for communicating biblical truths concerning sin.

ROBERT J. PRIEST

Bibliography. W. T. Dye, *Missiology* 4:1 (1976): 27–41; C. von Furer-Haimendorf, *Man (N.S.)* 9 (1974): 539–56; J. Grimes, *Notes on Translation* 22 (1945): 11–16; J. A. Loewen, *Culture and Human Values;* L. Noble, *Naked and Not Ashamed: An Anthropological, Biblical, and Psychological Study of Shame;* R. J. Priest, *Missiology* 22:3 (1994): 291–315.

Social Sciences. Specialization and integration in the social sciences are relatively recent developments in the larger academic disciplines in comparison with studies of the humanities (e.g., philosophy, literature) and the natural sciences (e.g., physics, chemistry). That they are *social* evidences the people component; that they are *sciences* shows commitment to certain methodological presuppositions across each of the fields. While there are several ways of classifying and categorizing disciplines in the social sciences, for the purposes of this article and in their relationship to mission and missiology they include ANTHROPOLOGY, COMMUNICATION, ECONOMICS, EDUCATION, LINGUISTICS, MODERNIZATION theory, POLITICS, PSYCHOLOGY, RELIGION, RESEARCH, and SOCIOLOGY. Anthropology is the study of humankind in individual and multiple cultural contexts; communication, the process of information flow among people; economics, the realities of exchange and use of exchange instruments in the world; education, the process of imparting information from one generation to the next, usually in formal contexts such as schools; linguistics, the development and use of language; modernization, a conglomeration of trends with social impact (from TERRORISM to URBANIZATION); politics, the study of political power within cultures and countries; psychology, the study of the mental processes and mechanisms of people; religion, the study of the various ways people express their faiths; research, the issues of how to uncover information concerning human societies (e.g., through QUALITIATIVE RESEARCH) and sociology the study of the way people associate and relate to each other. Obviously there are significant areas of overlap among each of these disci-

plines (e.g., ANTHROPOLOGY OF RELIGION, HISTORY OF MISSION, SOCIOLINGUISTICS, urban anthropology, psycholinguistics, and so on).

Until recently, evangelical Christians in general were suspicious of the social sciences. This stemmed at least in part from an association of these fields of study with sociocultural evolutionists such as Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer, anti-Christian psychologists such as Sigmund Freud, and economic and sociopolitical theorists like Karl Marx. Additionally, many in the social science fields treat religion as only one aspect of human life, often a peripheral aspect, rather than recognizing it as being at the core of who we are as people.

The presumed conflicts between the social sciences and mission are not unfounded, for most schools of the social sciences rely on nonbiblical assumptions of knowledge and truth, methodology and measures, universe and humanity. Further, at least in the early developments of the disciplines, they often exhibited an unreserved optimism concerning human nature and future destiny.

Interaction of the Social Sciences within Mission. Following the pattern of formation and development of disciplines in the natural sciences, social scientists began by seeking to establish disciplinary distinctiveness for public recognition and after a period of formulation, flourishing, and full-blown growth, the current trend is interdisciplinary integration instead of isolationist specialization. Today social scientists learn from related disciplines, benefit from research done in other fields, borrow and exchange methodologies and techniques from one and another, and are beginning to collaborate in metadisciplinary projects.

For the past several decades, various disciplines and products of the social sciences have been accepted and utilized by Christians for mission. For example, many missions departments in Bible schools and seminaries have anthropologically trained faculty and offer courses in missionary anthropology. With increasing regularity, missionary candidates are screened by psychological testing prior to their acceptance by the organization and field appointments. Missionaries receiving language learning training are exposed to descriptive and applied linguistics. Many are trained in communication studies to enhance their ability to share Christ with non-Christians in culturally relevant ways.

The encouraging trend is that many godly Christian scholars with expertise in the social science disciplines are working toward integrating their academic excellence with Christian faith for mission purposes. As a result, and as mentioned above, an increasing number of Christian workers involved in mission receive basic training in mission-related subjects (e.g., anthropology, linguistics) as part of their ministry preparation. Though missiology has been a recognized academic discipline in Europe since the turn of this century, the first contemporary conservative evangelical institution in North America to have official degree programs in missiology was the School of World Mission at Fuller Theological Seminary, beginning in September of 1965. Increasingly higher level academic programs (Ph.D.s in particular) are utilizing intercultural studies as their guiding orientation, incorporating formal studies in the social sciences at the advanced level.

It is true that Christians are not of the world but are sent to the world to evangelize (John 17). Concerned Christians are utilizing knowledge and techniques of several related disciplines in the social sciences (ethnogeography, ethnohistory, statistics, communication science, etc.) to answer the following types of questions: What are the social structures and undergirding cultural values that drive people of a given culture? How do they see the world and communicate their thoughts and feelings about their perceptions to others? How do people associate with each other and what rules govern role and status in a given society? What social and cultural dynamics are involved in religious conversion? How are people motivated, and how do they make decisions? What are the means of social change in a culture? What is the impact of urbanization on traditional religion and WORLDVIEW? Many more such questions could be stated. All focus on the human realities with which every culture must grapple. The social sciences help missiologists understand the people of a culture and thus assist fostering SHALOM in a given community.

Theories and insights of the social sciences can enhance the Christian's knowledge of how to remove barriers and to build bridges in communicating the gospel to a given group of people. Factors of resistance to the gospel, which include religious background, cultural tradition, language limitations, social structure, and psychological orientations, are to be seriously considered as they impact the missionary task of sowing the gospel seed. Effective applications of the study of these and other important social issues should lead to programs and strategies in mission action. In the midst of seeing the importance of the social sciences, however, the missionary cannot lose sight of the fact that ultimately it is God who brings about the growth of his church. While through history he has chosen to honor careful and prayerful research, thought and planning in outreach ministry, it is still true that he alone draws people to himself and enables their response to Christ.

The interdisciplinary use of the social sciences in missiology has proven to be helpful and fruitful in the CHURCH GROWTH MOVEMENT, a driving

force behind the use of the HOMOGENOUS UNIT PRINCIPLE, the understanding of ethnolinguistic peoples and MASS MOVEMENTS, the efforts to evangelize the UNREACHED PEOPLES, and the 10/40 WINDOW.

The current trend of interdisciplinary integration in the social sciences provides an excellent opportunity for Christians to benefit from their insights and implementation. The increasing number of professionally trained social scientists who are also productive workers for the gospel will contribute much to world evangelization, and missionaries will do well to be trained in the various disciplines of the social sciences in preparation for the task of calling those who do not yet know Christ to worship the King of kings.

ENOCH WAN

Bibliography. R. G. Clouse, ed., *Wealth and Poverty: Four Christian Views on Economics;* J. Engel, *Contemporary Christian Communications: Its Theory and Practice;* idem, *How Can I Get Them to Listen?;* K. Franklin, *Current Concerns of Anthropologists and Missionaries;* S. Grunlan, *Christian Perspectives on Anthropology;* S. Grunlan and M. Reimer, eds., *Christian Perspectives on Sociology;* D. J. Hesselgrave, *Planting Churches Cross-Culturally: A Guide for Homes and Foreign Missions;* idem, *Cross-Cultural Counseling;* P. G. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries;* idem, *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues;* P. Hiebert and E. H. Meneses, *Incarnational Ministry;* D. Kitagawa, *Race Relations and Christian Mission;* C. Kraft, *Christianity in Culture;* idem, *Communication Theory for Christian Witness;* idem, *Anthropology for Christian Witness;* A. Tippett, *Introduction to Missiology.*

Sovereignty of God. Though an emphasis on the sovereignty of God is frequently associated with Calvinism, God's sovereignty, or God's supreme power and authority, are conspicuous biblical themes in both the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. Creation is the work of God (Gen. 1:1; Neh. 9:6; Ps. 102:25; Acts 14:15; and Heb. 11:3). God is the creator of all living things (Gen. 1:20–2:7; Ps. 8:3–8; Isa. 51:13; and Acts 17:28). God rules over all of God's handiwork (Job 12:17–25 and Prov. 21:1). God also rules over the nations of the world, not simply Israel (1 Chron. 29:11; Pss. 47:2; 83:18; 93:1; and Acts 17:24–31). God is the *only* God (Ps. 96:5). No one can interfere with God, "stay God's hand," or resist God's ultimate will (Deut. 4:39; Job 9:12; Dan. 4:35; Rom. 9:19). Finally, God's reign is eternal (Exod. 15:18; Ps. 10:16; Dan. 4:3).

In the New Testament, God's kingdom, not the church, is unquestionably the principal theme of Jesus' teaching and preaching (Matt. 3:2; 4:17; 5:3, 10; 6:33; 10:7; 11:11; 13:24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47; 25:34–35; Mark 1:14; 9:1; 10:14, 23, Luke 4:43; 8:1; 9:2; 10:9; John 3:5; *see* KINGDOM OF GOD). But Jesus, according to the Gospels, also spoke of *his* kingdom (Matt. 16:28 and Luke 22:30), and he declared, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36), an indication that it was a radically different kind of order.

All this language is, however, symbolic. These are figures of speech, and we miss their authentic meaning and import when we literalize or attempt to historicize them. Furthermore, God as sovereign is a metaphor based on a regal model, namely, God as king, and all that God has created is subject to God: it is God's property. This kind of language was readily understandable in an age when earthly kingdoms were commonplace and when kings ruled absolutely. But that time has passed, and few kingdoms have survived the steady march toward democracy or more participatory forms of government. In this sense, the regal model for understanding God's authority is anachronistic. Furthermore, other paradigms of God's authority and relation with creation and with humanity are found in the Scriptures. More important, they are more easily comprehended—*God as parent,* for example (Ps. 68:5; Isa. 64:8; Matt. 6:9; 7:11; Luke 15:11–32; Rom. 8:15; 1 John 3:1); *God as friend* (James 2:23); *God as helper* (Heb. 13:16); *God as shepherd* (Ps. 23; Isa. 40:11; and Luke 12:32); *God as teacher* (Exod. 4:15; Ps. 25:12; Isa. 2:3; Jer. 32:33; and Micah 4:2); *God as redeemer* (Ps. 130:8; Jer. 50:34); *God as potter* (Isa. 64:8); *God as judge* (Gen. 18:25; Ps. 96:13; Matt. 25:31–46; and Heb. 12:23); and *God as fortress, refuge, and rock* (2 Sam. 22:2; Pss. 18:2; 91:2; 144:2). These last references from the Psalms also portray God as *stronghold, deliverance, shield, and savior.*

Even though the metaphor of God as sovereign is dated, it represents a valuable theological insight if it is not forced or literalized. Recognition of God's authority as the guiding principle for individual and collective living is sorely needed in our time. Yet when God's sovereignty is used to exalt some persons and degrade others, or when kingdom imagery is employed as *the* pattern for all human relationships, unfortunate results usually follow. Authoritarianism such as that exercised in hierarchically arranged families, churches, or governments may claim to be earthly manifestations of God's sovereign kingdom, but oppression is commonplace. Furthermore, when God's sovereignty is regarded as absolute, history is usually seen as predetermined, and the possibility of free will is nullified. The papacy in Rome and Geneva under Calvin are examples of God's sovereignty historicized. Ecclesiastical authoritarianism, double-edged predestination, hyper-Calvinism, and the repudiation of all human efforts to engage in mission and evangelism are logical corollaries.

It is a mistake, however, to conclude that any emphasis on God's sovereignty inevitably undermines missionary and evangelistic passion. JONATHAN EDWARDS as well as WILLIAM CAREY were con-

vinced Calvinists. They believed in God's sovereignty. But few in Christian history have been more passionate for the proclamation of the gospel and the salvation of the lost than were they.

In our time, the idea of God's sovereignty is probably best regarded not as a manifestation of power, but as an indicator of divine purpose. God is a God of purpose, and God's purpose is the salvation of the whole of creation. Israel and the new Israel are indispensable parts of that purpose.

ALAN NEELY

Bibliography. G. H. Anderson, *Witnessing to the Kingdom;* E. C. Blackman, *Canadian Journal of Theology* 11 (1965): 124–134; T. George, *The Life and Mission of William Carey;* A. Glasser, *Kingdom and Mission;* C. A. Smith, *Mission Legacies,* pp. 245–54; C. Van Engen, D. Gilliland, and P. Pierson, eds., *The Good News of the Kingdom.*

Suffering. The universal symbol of Christianity is the cross, a symbol of suffering, specifically, the suffering of Jesus. To reflect upon the life of Jesus is to remember his suffering. As the Servant Songs of Isaiah anticipated, Jesus "was despised and rejected, . . . *a man of suffering* and acquainted with infirmity" (53:3 NRSV, see also 50:6 and 53:4–5, 7–12). Likewise, it has been the fortune of those who follow Jesus to experience suffering. "Remember the word I said to you," Jesus reminded his disciples, "'Servants are not greater than their master.' If they persecuted me, they will persecute you" (John 15:20). No sooner did the church begin to flourish then the apostles were arrested and threatened. They and others were imprisoned and murdered (Acts 4:1–22; 5:17–33; 7:54–60). But their suffering was seen not as an affliction; it was rather a means of witness. "They rejoiced that they were considered worthy to suffer dishonor for the sake of the name" (Acts 5:41). Though the words of the writer of 1 Peter were addressed to first-century Christian slaves, they have been regarded, and rightly so, as applicable to all of Jesus' disciples: "For to this you have been called, because Christ suffered for you, leaving you an example, so that you should follow in his steps" (1 Peter 2:21).

The Christian mission—if it is Christian, that is, Christ-like—is a replication of the mission of Jesus, and in due time will involve suffering. In his second letter to the church at Corinth, Paul recounts his own suffering in the spreading of the gospel (11:23–28), and he reminds his readers that though suffering is a part of being a disciple, it also is a form of witness. "We are afflicted in every way," he writes, "but not crushed; perplexed, but not driven to despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; struck down, but not destroyed; always carrying in the body the death of Jesus, *so that the life of Jesus may also be made visible in our bodies*" (4:8–10).

It is important to remember, as Douglas Webster observes, that the Greek word for WITNESS, *martus,* soon acquired a new meaning, *one who died for the faith,* and it has been transliterated as *martyr,* thus "combining the ideas of mission and suffering" (1966, 104). To be a witness will therefore result in suffering, sometimes in death. This has been particularly true for missionaries. For some, mission has meant violent death, for example, JOHN WILLIAMS, ELEANOR CHESTNUT, and Archbishop Oscar Romero. For others it has meant harassment, arrest, and months or years in prison, for example, ADONIRAM JUDSON and WILLIAM WADE HARRIS. How many have suffered the loss of spouses and/or children, for example, GEORGE SCHMIDT, E. R. Beckman, and Carie Sydenstricker? Who knows the number who have experienced terribly unhappy marriages because of abusive or mentally ill spouses, for example, WILLIAM CAREY, ROBERT MORRISON, and Martha Crawford? Abandonment by colleagues or supporters has pushed some to the brink of despair, for example, ROWLAND BINGHAM and C. T. STUDD. Oppression of the poor and the defenseless invariably weighs heavily on compassionate missionaries and missionary bishops, for example, BARTHOLOMEW DE LAS CASAS and FESTO KIVENGERE. Significant, therefore, is the apostle Paul's conclusion following his recitation of personal suffering. He says, "And besides other things, I am under daily pressure because of my anxiety for all the churches" (2 Cor. 11:28). Many of the sufferings experienced in mission stem from apprehension and pain for Christ's people.

To be involved in the mission of Jesus Christ, therefore, is to experience suffering, and one of the most vivid reminders of this fact is when we as Jesus' followers gather for the celebration of the Eucharist, a reenactment of the sufferings of our Lord. Whether we hold to the real or symbolic presence in the elements, we should always remember that "the breaking of the bread" and the "drinking of the cup" happens repeatedly outside as well as inside the walls of the church.

ALAN NEELY

Bibliography. A. J. Gittins, *Bread for the Journey;* J. S. Pobee, *Mission in Christ's Way;* R. A. Tucker, *FJIJ;* D. Webster, *Yes to Mission.*

Systematic Theology. The foundational, organized, and comprehensive reflection by Christians on the faith of the church; systematic theology seeks to answer questions like "What do we believe?" "Why do we believe that and not something else?" "On what grounds is our belief justified?" "What is the relationship between the various concepts that we believe?" and "How do we articulate that belief so that it may have appropriate meaning in today's contexts?" Wayne

Grudem gives a concise definition: "Systematic theology is any study that answers the question, "What does the whole Bible teach us today about any given topic?" (1994, 21). Stanley Grenz emphasizes the missional aspect of systematic theology: "Theology (is) a practical discipline. It is the intellectual reflection on the faith we share as the believing community within a specific cultural context. But it has as its goal the application of our faith commitment to living as the people of God in our world" (1993, 17–18).

Systematic theologians differ in their approach to the discipline. Some see God himself as the object of study, while others understand their work as reflection on the knowledge of God's revelation. They may differ in the sources they draw from for that knowledge: the Bible, Christ, the church, the history of dogma, or the preaching of the church.

Systematic theology builds on biblical theology and historical theology. Biblical theology has to do with the identification and understanding of the theology of the authors and books of the Bible in their cultural and historical contexts. Historical theology has to do with knowing the development of the church's doctrines in the way they were formed during the history of the church. Systematic theology seeks to find a way to bring together the testimony of the biblical authors with the contemporary questions of Christians in their contexts. Different traditions and various systematic theologians have built their systematic theologies upon a number of different foundations: the teachings of the church, the Bible, concepts of God's revelation, the Holy Spirit, or (especially, since Schleiermacher) humanity and its intellectual abilities. "None of these can serve as foundation and norm in abstraction from the others" (Berkhof, 1985 , 74–86).

During the first three centuries after Christ, systematic theology was inherently missional. The theologians of the church were primarily involved in APOLOGETICS, that is, the carefully reasoned presentation of the truth of the gospel to people in their contexts who were not yet Christians. By the fifth century, however, the missional character of theology began to be lost and systematic theology became increasingly an introverted activity, used to justify why the church's doctrine was right and why options offered by other Christians were wrong. The disciples and followers of the sixteenth-century Reformers essentially followed a similar dynamic, using theology as a tool to prove why their church was right and other traditions were wrong. Thus the missionary dimension of systematic theology—the presentation of the truth of the gospel to those who were not yet Christian—was lost. Lately, the missionary aspect of systematic theology is being recovered through a movement known as CONTEXTUALIZATION.

Since the 1960s there has been a growing realization that all theology is influenced by the context in which the theologians find themselves. Thus all theologies are seen as contextual. Harvie Conn says, "The contextual character of all theology . . . has been misplaced, buried under the weight of the Western respect for the expert (in this case the theologian). . . . The pastoral dimensions of theology are befogged by the church's understanding of theology as a schooling science, abstract, done by experts, yielding universal principles applicable to all times and cultures. The concrete relation of theology to the life of the people of God remains obscured. Inevitably, the focus of such theology remains fixed around the traditional (themes) of anthropology, Christology, soteriology, etc., (themes) reflecting thematic arrangements for the study of theology as it has, in its past, addressed Western contexts and Western worldviews. . . . To what part of the historical tradition . . . will (Christians in the Two-Thirds World) go to find answers for such problems as ancestor worship, the power structures of animism, (matters of spiritual power encounter), and the Muslim misconstructions of Jesus as the Son of God" (Conn, 1984, 299–300)?

During the past hundred years or so theologians and missiologists have struggled over where to place mission in the curriculum of traditional theological reflection. Jongeneel asks, "Does mission, *dogmatically*-speaking, belong to the doctrine of God the Father, of God the Son, and/or of God the Holy Spirit (in relation to the three major parts of the Apostles' Creed)? Or is mission merely an appendix to the doctrine of vocation? Or is it an important issue in ecclesiology? Does mission *ethically*-speaking, belong to the so-called general part of the discipline (principles of ethics): is it good, a virtue, and/or a duty? . . . Or does it belong to a particular part (for instance, social ethics)" (Jongeneel, 1997, 11)? One thing is clear: systematic theology that is not missional is not true to the biblical portrayal of a loving, self-revealing, covenanting God who "so loved the world that he gave his only Son" (John 3:16). And missiology that does not reflect carefully, deeply, and systematically on the nature, mission, and purpose of God may be church extension or expansion of empire—but it is not participation by the church of Jesus Christ in God's mission through the empowerment of the Holy Spirit.

Orlando Costas suggested a way to preserve the missionary dimension of theology: build it into one's definition. "Theology is the reflective activity of the Christian Church that tries to understand the mystery of faith, describe its implications for life, and make visible its mission in the world" (cited in Kirk, 1996, 7).

CHARLES VAN ENGEN

Bibliography. K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics;* H. Berkhof, *Christian Faith* (1979); idem, *Introduction to the Study of Dogmatics* (1985); D. Bloesch, *A Theology of Word and Spirit;* G. C. Berkouwer, *Studies in Dogmatics;* H. Conn, *Eternal Word and Changing Worlds;* G. Lewis and B. Demarest, *Integrative Theology;* T. Finger, *Christian Theology;* S. Grenz, *Revisioning Evangelical Theology* (1993); idem, *Theology for the Community of God* (1994); W. Grudem, *Systematic Theology: An Introduction to Biblical Doctrine;* P. Jewett, *God, Creation and Revelation;* J. A. B. Jongeneel, *Philosophy, Science, and Theology of Mission in the 19th and 20th Centuries: A Missiological Encyclopedia,* Part II: *Missionary Theology;* J. A. Kirk, *The Mission of Theology and Theology as Mission;* H. Küng and D. Tracy, eds., *Paradigm Change in Theology;* A. McGrath, *Christian Theology;* O. Weber, *Foundations of Dogmatics.*

Theological Method. Theology has traditionally been the exclusive domain of the cultures of Europe and to a lesser degree in North America. But as a result of successful missionary work theologizing is no longer limited to one cultural context. Churches have been established in almost every region of the world and many potentially different types of theology do, or certainly will, co-exist in the world church. This, however, should not be viewed with indifference since the interdependence of all theological activity makes each ethnotheology equally responsible for the truth and unity of the faith of the whole worldwide church. Each theology should be pursued and practiced within the framework of this universal continuity as well as the local context of its own culture. What does this mean for theological method?

Theology does not derive its unity, that is, internal structure, from any particular method or from practical concerns, but rather from the object of theological investigation, namely, God. Accordingly theology is best understood as the study of God in which the unique nature of its various subdisciplines is determined by the foundational principle *sub ratione Dei* (attempt to relate all data to God). This is what distinguishes theological activity from all other disciplines (e.g., anthropology) which concern themselves with the same or similar issues. The universality of theological activity grows out of several assumptions about the nature of the human and the divine as well as the nature and task of theology.

Since there is one God, and since the plight of humanity is the same in all societies, and since our yearning for release is answered in the sacrificial death of Christ, these essential elements of God's self-revelation will correspond to universally known elements of the human dilemma. On the basis of this fundamental continuity it seems reasonable to assume that all people and languages possess the thought categories to understand and accept those elements of the Christian message which have salvific import.

Assuming that God is the all-determining sustainer of reality (Heb. 1:1–4) and that his self-revelation is mediated through that reality, it follows that divine reality must be viewed as a universally present concept. Thus, theological activity, which seeks to ascertain and systematize knowledge about that reality (God) can, by definition, never be limited to any one of the many cultural contexts which comprise the whole of human reality. In other words, theological activity is universal, in terms of both its appropriateness and its potential fruitfulness.

The nature and the task of theology remain the same across all cultural and linguistic barriers. This can be summarized in terms of a threefold definition of theology adapted from interaction with John Feinberg.

First, theology is the inductive discovery of truth from any and all sources concerning the being, acts, and relationship to God. The data needed by the theologian are available from a variety of sources and can be grouped into two general classes: (1) Divine Revelation, that is, the self-revelation of God as evident in creation, in the life and work of Christ, and in Scripture; (2) the human situation, that which is observable (experiential) including both the negative and the positive, and the contemporary and historical aspects of human existence. As used here, the positive aspects are seen to issue from God's creative involvement with humans and are reflected in individually expressed rational, emotional, and social traits as well as their cumulative expressions, that is, philosophy, science, art, community, and tradition. The negative aspects give evidence of sin and its effects and confront us with questions of evil, injustice, death, and the like. This categorization is not intended to imply parity between the two sources of data, but some degree of correlation. The cultural context of the theologian influences preunderstandings as well as the fundamental questions. Not in the sense that the questions in any way dictate the content of revelation, but rather in the sense that revelation is sufficient.

Second, theology is the analytic penetration of the meaning of each portion of inductively discovered truth. Each of these must in turn be keyed to pertinent biblical data. Exegetical tools (*see* EXEGESIS) and hermeneutical principles (*see* HERMENEUTICS) are used to determine the meaning of a given passage. This provides a basis for evaluating inductive conclusions and enables further refinement or, where necessary, reformulation.

Finally, the theologian must synthesize each portion of truth into an internally consistent and logically ordered system which speaks to the issues of one's day. This provides a framework for

a deductive process that allows valid derivation of additional conclusions.

All Christian theologies, regardless of where or by whom they are constructed, are related to one another by virtue of: (1) both positive (knowledge about God) and negative (sin) elements of the human situation; (2) a common context, the church; (3) common theological task; and (4) an essentially similar methodology. Since theological method is determined by the nature of the theological task and its raw material, the methods needed for determining the meaning of a given biblical text, formulating its principles, systematizing the concepts, and interpreting collective Christian experience (tradition) are going to demonstrate a degree of similarity from culture to culture.

The question arises as to whether we can or should have some kind of standardized methodology, "a fixed base, an invariant pattern, opening upon all further developments of understanding" (Crowe). If our definition of the theological task is correct and if the basic methodological framework is going to remain relatively unchanged from culture to culture, then we are still left with the problem of how to formally incorporate cultural differences in both our definition of doing theology, as well as our theological treatment of locally informed topics, like ANCESTRAL PRACTICES. Perhaps it would be useful to distinguish between method and model (Schökel).

A method is a defined and controllable way of proceeding. A model is a system of elements constructed to give a unified explanation of a set of observed data, or it is a system already known and tested in one field which is transferred to a new field of investigation. In both cases the model contains a surplus meaning which it puts at the service of the research. Once it is accepted it guides subsequent observation and explanation of data. It becomes an a priori form of the research and its methods. We commit ourselves to models, but we make use of methods. For example, historians make use of the same sources, use similar methods, but the different results reveal the ideological bias (model) of the historian. The model then is an a priori form of the method, which is chosen and assimilated, but the method is determined by the nature and data of the theological task.

EDWARD ROMMEN

Bibliography. J. F. Crowe, *Method in Theology: An Organon for our Time;* L. A. Schökel, "Of Methods and Models." *Congress Volume: Salamanca, 1983.*

Theological Systems. What is the connection between theology and missions? Where is the intersection between organized, integrated reflection on the Bible, the world, and the church and the global, border-crossing mandate that both flows from and into that reflection? Why do missions and theology sound sometimes like partners, sometimes like strangers, and sometimes like enemies?

Mission Marginalized. In the pre-Constantinian centuries of the church, the dialogue between mission and theological formulation was invigorating. Theology's agenda was shaped by the church's mission in the world. And a mission motivation to reach the Greco-Roman world drove the church's theologians to in-depth study. Was Justin Martyr's apologetic with the Jews a missionary theology or a theological mission? Which label would fit the interplay of Origen and Clement of Alexandria with Greek philosophy? The church had not yet become a world-conquering, empire-approved majority. In this situation mission was "the mother of theology" (Bosch, 1991, 489).

In the years that followed, the two began to drift apart. As Europe become "Christianized," the "regions beyond" horizon of mission began to recede and theology isolated itself in the church world of Christendom. Missions increasingly looked like the religious arm of politics, the bearer of power and culture. And theology lost more and more of its "on-the-road" quality.

With the division of the western and eastern churches in 1054, the Eastern Orthodox Church shifted its understanding of mission and theology to the church as the community in worship. The eucharistic liturgy became a "missionary event." And the theology of the church became a search, not for the outsider, but for Christian unity limited by the boundary of the pre-Schism seven ecumenical creeds (Stamoolis, 1986, 110).

Theology Abstracted. Reinforcing the diminishing role of mission in the Western church was a new shift of emphasis in understanding theology. In its earliest form, theology was seen as *habitus,* the cultivation of a spiritual, reflective habit or disposition in the believer (Farley, 1983, 31).

But with the coming of the universities in the twelfth century, a new emphasis began to grow—theology as a theoretical discipline *(scientia).* Thomas Aquinas (1225–74) used the newly discovered works of Aristotle to build a climactic synthesis of philosophy and theology as the crown of human knowledge that was to dominate future centuries. His split-level view of grace as a supplement to natural law left philosophy to roam widely as the rational basis for faith. The practitioners of theology began to narrow—from believer to scholar, from lay people to clergy. And with this emerging paradigm the gap between the rational systematizing of theology and mission widened.

The ENLIGHTENMENT skepticism over supernatural revelation in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries structured and modified the two defi-

nitions of theology again. It reinforced further the isolation of theology from mission. Theology as cognitive *habitus,* as the individual quest for the wisdom of redemption, became the practical know-how necessary for ministerial work. Theology as disciplined *scientia* became a technical and specialized scholarly undertaking; it was to be undertaken like any other pure science—systematically, rationally, and without the necessity of any accompanying faith in the supernatural character of its objects of study. Theological systems were thought to be freed to become a Neo-Platonic search for abstract, rational essences, unhindered by historical, geographical, or social qualifiers.

Interruptions. The springtime of missions in the thirteenth century saw the formation of the Franciscan and Dominican orders and their missionary thrusts into places like China and Mongolia. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, the sea routes to Africa, Asia, and the Americas had been discovered. "God and gold" drove explorers and evangelists into a larger new world. The fledgling Jesuit order was born.

But, with notable exceptions, the significance of that larger world for systematic, theological reformulation was lost. In contextual response to the Reformation movement the Council of Trent (1543–63) standardized a rigid liturgical and theological uniformity on the Catholic Church. The Catholic world of theology and mission was Latinized (Shorter, 1992, 146–47).

Protestantism's response to an expanding world was also mixed. Calvin and Luther restricted their understanding of mission largely to the reform of the existing church. Their affirmation of the global witness of the church to the Triune God remained a rich but untested potential (Scherer, 1987, 54–66). It was the Anabaptist movement that broke through the links between the territorial church and society and sought to liberate once more the outsider orientation of missions and theology. Pietists and Moravians followed that same direction in the seventeenth century.

At the same time, the missionary dimensions of REFORMATION—and then Puritan—theologizing was fashioning a delayed entrance. The creeds of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries rejected the path of scholastic abstractionism and saw themselves as *habitus,* a revived church's reflections on God's mission in the world. The Reformation focus on *sola scriptura* and *sola gratia* turned theology from a metaphysical science of ontological speculation to a systematic search for God's wisdom that would speak pastorally to a Catholic context.

The polemical roles of those creeds as a teaching instrument for the instruction of church members and teachers expanded as the crisis demands of the time faded. Theological systems, properly committed to discerning the full teaching of Scripture, found themselves dividing into Calvinist versus Remonstrant (Arminian), everybody versus Anabaptist.

Compartmentalization Confronted. During the first two centuries after the Reformation, that missionary dimension of theology seldom became intentional. In abandoning monasticism, the Reformers had abandoned the prime missionary agency of the past. Without international contact with non-Christian peoples, they were torn by endless disputes, battling for sheer survival, and impacted by their own forms of scholasticism. Protestants, like Catholics, affirmed their theology as universals, bottom-line systems whose centuries-old cultural, social, or historical influences had become invisible in the context of mutual confrontation and self-definition.

The explosion of the territorial boundaries of Christianity that came with the missionary movement of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was to change that isolation of missions from theology for both Catholic and Protestant. Christian theological systems, long embedded in the Anglo-Saxon world, began their gospel dialogue with very different cultures. As they did so, their own cultural conditioning slowly became visible.

The long confusion of "Christianizing" with Western "civilizing" came more and more to the surface in the missionary confrontation. The universal message of the gospel had not been carried in a vacuum across the globe. In the providence of God, the reflective task of the Western church also had been shaped, both for good and ill, by a cultural, social, historical, and linguistic context (Muller, 1991, 201–14). Once again, missions had become the instrument calling for a new look at theological systems.

A New Partnership of Missions and Theology. In the closing decades of the twentieth century the hermeneutical task behind theology's systematic constructions is becoming consciously global. There is a new sensitivity to how understanding takes place when the gospel's meaning is carried across social, ethno-cultural boundaries and speaks to different needs. More are recognizing now the impact of the human context "as part of the interpretive task of the church throughout the ages" (Muller, 1991, 202).

From the maturing world church are emerging theological reflections that bear the title of their geographical origins—ASIAN THEOLOGIES, AFRICAN THEOLOGIES. Others have originated in Anglo-Saxon contexts and speak to ethnic and gender-based issues of power and powerlessness—HISPANIC EVANGELICAL THEOLOGIES, BLACK THEOLOGIES, FEMINIST THEOLOGIES. Still others respond to issues of wealth and poverty, of political oppression—LIBERATION THEOLOGIES and Korean MINJUNG THEOLOGY.

Many of these new explorations remain deeply touched by a Neo-Enlightenment skepticism regarding the full integrity of the Scriptures. Such formulations too frequently place context above biblical text and minimize the hermeneutical priority of exegesis in their search.

These limitations create nervous concerns in the Anglo-Saxon evangelical community. Old expectations of a theology without context return: if the REVELATION of God is transcultural, shouldn't we expect the human exercise of theological reflection to sound the same across time and space, a *theologis perennis?* Legitimate fears of SYNCRETISM arise: are these new paths falling into a theological pluralism that cannot draw boundaries between TRUTH and error?

Expectations appear more positive in "Third World" settings where mission and theology have closer ties. Christian humility acknowledges its partnership debt to Western theological systems borrowed from the missionary. Christian hopes for the global progress of doctrine asks, "How can we do justice both to the absoluteness of Scripture's united testimony and to the uniqueness of our context in which it must speak again?" And Christian zeal for the gospel makes sure the question asked has a missionary intention and a missionary dimension.

HARVIE M. CONN

Bibliography. D. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission;* E. Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education;* W. Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia;* R. Muller, *The Study of Theology: From Biblical Interpretation to Contemporary Formulation;* J. Scherer, *Gospel, Church, and Kingdom: Comparative Studies in World Mission Theology;* A. Shorter, *Toward a Theology of Inculturation;* J. Stamoolis, *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology Today.*

Theology of Mission. A discipline that reflects on the presuppositions, assumptions, and concepts undergirding mission theory. Prior to the 1960s, a number of important people like GISBERTUS VOETIUS, JOSEF SCHMIDLIN, GUSTAF WARNECK, Karl Barth, Karl Hartenstein, Martin Kähler, WALTER FREYTAG, ROLAND ALLEN, HENDRIK KRAEMER, J. H. BAVINCK, W. A. Visser t'Hooft, MAX WARREN, Olav Myklebust, BENGT SUNDKLER, Carl F. H. Henry, and Harold Lindsell reflected theologically on mission. As a separate discipline with its own parameters, methodology, scholars, and focuses, theology of mission really began in the early 1960s with the work of GERALD ANDERSON. In 1961, Anderson edited what many consider to be the first text of the discipline, a collection of essays entitled *The Theology of Christian Mission.*

Ten years later, in *The Concise Dictionary of the Christian World Mission,* theology of mission was defined as "concerned with the basic presuppositions and underlying principles which determine, from the standpoint of Christian faith, the motives, message, methods, strategy and goals of the Christian world mission."

Theology of mission is multidisciplinary. Missiology is a multidisciplinary discipline that draws from many cognate disciplines. Within missiology, theology of mission examines the various cognate disciplines and clarifies their proximity to or distance from the center, Jesus Christ, asking whether there is a point beyond which the cognate disciplines may no longer be helpful or biblical. Theology of mission integrates who we are, what we know, and how we act in mission. It brings together our faith relationship with Jesus Christ, our spirituality, God's presence, the church's theological reflection throughout the centuries, a constantly new rereading of Scripture, our hermeneutic of God's world, our sense of participation in God's mission, and the ultimate purpose and meaning of the church and relates all these to the cognate disciplines of missiology. Theology of mission serves to question, clarify, integrate, and expand the presuppositions of the various cognate disciplines of missiology. As such, mission theology is a discipline in its own right, yet is not one of the related disciplines alongside the others, for it fulfills its function only as it interacts with all of them.

Theology of mission is integrative. When mission happens, all the various cognate disciplines occur simultaneously. So missiology must study mission not from the point of view of abstracted and separated parts, but from an integrative perspective that attempts to see the whole together. Theology of mission has to do with three arenas: (1) biblical and theological presuppositions and values are applied to (2) the ministries and mission activities of the church, set in (3) specific contexts in particular times and places.

First, theology of mission is *theology* because fundamentally it involves reflection about God. It seeks to understand God's mission, his intentions and purposes, his use of human instruments in his mission, and his working through his people in his world. Thus theology of mission deals with all the traditional theological themes of SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, but it does so in a way that differs from how systematic theologians have worked. The differences arise from the multidisciplinary missiological orientation of its theologizing.

In addition, because of its commitment to remain faithful to God's intentions, perspectives, and purposes, theology of mission shows a profound concern about the relation of the Bible to

mission, attempting to allow Scripture not only to provide the foundational motivations for mission, but also to question, shape, guide, and evaluate the missionary enterprise itself (*see also* BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF MISSION).

Second, theology of mission is *theology of*. In contrast to much systematic theology, here we are dealing with an applied science. At times it looks like what some would call pastoral or practical theology, due to this applicational nature. This type of theological reflection focuses specifically on a set of particular issues—those having to do with the mission of the church in its context. Theology of mission draws its incarnational nature from the ministry of Jesus, and always happens in a specific time and place.

Such contextual analysis facilitates a better understanding of the concrete situation, an understanding that helps the church hear the cries, see the faces, understand the stories, and respond to the living needs and hopes of the persons who are an integral part of that context. Part of this theological analysis today includes the history of the way the church's missions interfaced with that context down through history. The attitudes, actions, and events of the church's missional actions in a context will influence subsequent mission endeavors there.

Thus some scholars who deal with the history of theology of mission may not be especially interested in the theological issues as such, but may be concerned about the effects of that mission theology on mission activity in a context. They will often examine the various pronouncements made by church and mission gatherings (Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Ecumenical, Evangelical, Pentecostal, and charismatic) and question the impact of these on missional action. The documents resulting from these discussions become part of the discipline of theology of mission.

Third, theology of mission is specially oriented toward and for *mission*. Reflection in this arena is found in books, journals, and other publications dealing with the theory of missiology itself. However, neither missiology nor the theology of mission can be allowed to restrict itself to reflection only. As JOHANNES VERKUYL stated,

> Missiology may never become a substitute for action and participation. God calls for participants and volunteers in his mission. In part, missiology's goal is to become a "service station" along the way. If study does not lead to participation, whether at home or abroad, missiology has lost her humble calling. . . . Any good missiology is also a *missiologia viatorum*—"'pilgrim missiology'" (1978, 6, 18).

Theology of mission is praxeological. Theology of mission, then, must eventually emanate in biblically informed and contextually appropriate missional action. The intimate connection of reflection with action is through a process known as PRAXIS. Although there have been a number of different meanings given to this idea, ORLANDO COSTAS's formulation is one of the most constructive.

"Missiology," Costas says, "is fundamentally a praxeological phenomenon. It is a critical reflection that takes place in the praxis of mission. . . . (it occurs) in the concrete missionary situation, as part of the church's missionary obedience to and participation in God's mission, and is itself actualized in that situation. . . . In reference to this witnessing action saturated and led by the sovereign, redemptive action of the Holy Spirit, . . . the concept of missionary praxis is used. Missiology arises as part of a witnessing engagement to the gospel in the multiple situations of life" (1976, 8).

The concept of praxis helps us understand that not only the reflection, but profoundly the *action* as well is part of a "theology-on-the-way" that seeks to discover how the church may participate in God's mission in the world. The action is itself theological, and serves to inform the reflection, which in turn interprets, evaluates, critiques, and projects new understanding in transformed action in a constantly spiraling pilgrimage of missiological engagement in a context.

Because of the complexity of the inter- and multidisciplinary task that is theology of mission, mission theologians have found it helpful to focus on a specific integrating idea that serves as a hub through which to approach a rereading of Scripture. This "integrating theme" is selected on the basis of being contextually appropriate and significant, biblically relevant and fruitful, and missionally active and transformational.

Clearly we are trying to avoid bringing our own agendas to the Scripture and superimposing them on it. Rather, what is being sought is a way to bring a new set of questions to the text, questions that might help us see in the Scriptures what we had missed before. This new approach to Scripture is what DAVID BOSCH called "critical hermeneutics."

In 1987, the ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSORS OF MISSION said,

> The mission theologian does biblical and systematic theology differently from the biblical scholar or dogmatician in that the mission theologian is in search of the "habitus," the way of perceiving, the intellectual understanding coupled with spiritual insight and wisdom, which leads to seeing the signs of the presence and movement of God in history, and through his church in such a way as to be affected spiritually and motivationally and thus be committed to personal participation in that movement. . . . The center, therefore, serves as

> both theological content and theological process as a disciplined reflection of God's mission in human contexts. The role of the theologian of mission is therefore to articulate and "guard" the center, while at the same time to spell out integratively the implications of the center for all the other cognate disciplines (Van Engen, 1987, 524–25).

Thus we find that theology of mission is a process of reflection and action involving a movement from the biblical text to the faith community in mission in its context.

Theology of mission is definitional. One of the most interesting, significant, yet frustrating tasks of mission theology is to assist missiology in defining the terms it uses, including a definition of "mission" itself. By the way of illustration, the following may be offered as a preliminary definition of mission

> Mission is the People of God
> intentionally crossing barriers
> from Church to non-church, faith to non-faith
> to proclaim by word and deed
> the coming of the Kingdom of God
> in Jesus Christ,
> through the Church's participation
> in God's mission of reconciling people
> to God, to themselves, to each other, and to the world,
> and gathering them into the Church
> through repentance and faith in Jesus Christ
> by the work of the Holy Spirit
> with a view to the transformation of the world
> as a sign of the coming of the Kingdom
> in Jesus Christ.

Theology of mission is analytical. Theology of mission examines the theological and theoretical assumptions, meanings, and relations that permeate mission. To do this, mission theologians have found it helpful to partition the task into smaller segments. We noticed earlier that Gerald Anderson used the terms "faith, motives, message, methods, strategy, and goals." Jim Stamoolis studied *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology Today* by analyzing "the historical background, the aim, the method, the motives, and the liturgy" of mission as that took place among and through the Eastern Orthodox.

Following this method, some mission theologians organize their questions around the fact that mission is *Missio Dei,* it is God's mission. So one finds a number of mission theologians asking about "God's mission" *(missio Dei),* mission as it occurs among humans and utilizes human instrumentality *(missio hominum),* missions as they take many forms through the endeavors of the churches *(missiones ecclesiae),* and mission as it draws from and impacts global human civilization *(missio politica oecumenica).*

So theology of mission is prescriptive as well as descriptive. It is synthetic (bringing about synthesis) and integrational. It searches for trustworthy and true perceptions concerning the church's mission based on biblical and theological reflection, seeks to interface with the appropriate missional action, and creates a new set of values and priorities that reflect as clearly as possible the ways in which the church may participate in God's mission in a specific context at a particular time.

When theology of mission is abstracted from mission practice it seems strange and can be too far removed from the concrete places and specific people that are at the heart of God's mission. Theology of mission is at its best when it is intimately involved in the heart, head, and hand (being, knowing, and doing) of the church's mission. Theology of mission is a personal, corporate, committed, profoundly transformational search for a trinitarian understanding of the ways in which the people of God may participate in the power of the Holy Spirit in God's mission in God's world for whom Jesus Christ died.

Charles Van Engen

Bibliography. G. H. Anderson, *The Theology of Christian Mission;* idem, *CDCWM,* pp. 594–95; J. H. Bavinck, *An Introduction to the Science of Missions;* H. Berkhof and P. Potter, *Keywords of the Gospel;* D. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission;* A. Glasser and D. McGavran, *Contemporary Theologies of Mission;* H. Lindsell, *A Christian Philosophy of Missions;* R. Padilla, *Mission Between the Times: Essays on the Kingdom;* J. Scherer, *Gospel, Church and Kingdom: Comparative Studies in World Mission Theology;* W. Shenk, ed., *The Transfiguration of Mission: Biblical Theological & Historical Foundations;* W. Scott, *Bring Forth Justice: a Contemporary Perspective on Mission;* C. Van Engen, *Mission on The Way: Issues in Mission Theology,* idem, *God's Missionary People, Rethinking the Purpose of the Local Church;* C. Van Engen, P. Pierson and D. Gilliland, eds., *The Good News of the Kingdom: Mission Theology for the Third Millennium;* J. Verkuyl, *Contemporary Missiology: An Introduction;* G. Vicedom, *The Mission of God: An Introduction to a Theology of Mission.*

Trinity. Whereas in recent decades much scholarly thought about God has been drawn toward process theology or to some form of universalism, a small but healthy list of books has probed classic Trinitarianism, and some of this work has sketched the missiological implications.

Rejecting the speculative and frequently postmodern argumentation of the former, the latter approach anchors itself in what the Bible says about God's dealings with his covenantal people, and with the world, across the centuries, culminating in his gracious self-disclosure in Christ. While the biblical witness strenuously insists on the oneness of God, this one God is not *simplex*: the biblical material cries out for the kind of

elaboration that issued in the doctrine of the Trinity. If the later elaborations (e.g., technical distinctions between "person" and "substance") should not be read back into the pages of Scripture, it does no harm to apply the term "Trinity" to what the Bible discloses of God, provided anachronism is avoided.

Even the Old Testament includes hints of the non-*simplex* nature of the one God (see, e.g., Erickson). But the biblical furnishing of the elements that called forth the doctrine of the Trinity comes to clearest focus in its treatment of Jesus the Messiah. Already in the Old Testament, one stream of prophetic expectation pictures Yahweh coming to rescue his people, while another stream pictures him sending his servant David. When these streams occasionally merge (e.g., Isa. 9; Ezek. 34), they do so in the matrix of anticipated mission.

Selected features of New Testament witness to God as triune become clear when their missiological bearing is articulated.

First, the kind of monotheism disclosed in the Bible is far more successful at portraying God as a loving God than any *simplex*-monotheism can ever be. A unitarian God may be thought to love his image-bearers in the space-time continuum. But it is very difficult to imagine how such a God could be said to be characteristically a God of love before the universe was created, unless the word "love" is stretched to the breaking point. Although little is said in the Bible regarding the intra-Triune relationships before creation, there are important hints. The Son enjoyed equality with God before the incarnation, but, far from wishing to exploit his status, in obedience to his Father's commission emptied himself, became a servant, and died the odious death of the cross (Phil. 2:6–11). In John's Gospel, the Son's love for the Father is expressed in unqualified obedience (e.g., John 8:29; 14:31). The Father's love for the Son is displayed both in withholding nothing from him and in "showing" him all that he does, including commissioning him with a mission that ensures all will honor the Son as they honor the Father (John 3:35; 5:16–30). Embedded deeply in Paul's thought is the conviction that the Father's giving over of the Son to death on the cross is the ultimate measure of God's love for us (Rom. 8:32; cf. 1 John 4:9). The love of God that ultimately stands behind all Christian mission is grounded in, and logically flows from, the love of the Father for the Son and of the Son for the Father. As much as the Son loved the world, it was his love for the Father which drove him to the cross (hence the cry in the Garden, Mark 14:36). The Father loved the world so much that he sent his Son (John 3:16). Thus it was the Father's love for the Son that determined to exalt the Son and call out and give to him a great host of redeemed sinners.

Second, the doctrine of the Trinity stands behind the incarnation. If God were one in some unitarian sense, then for God to become a human being the incarnation would either so exhaust God that the incarnated being would have no one to pray to or the notion of God would have to shift from his transcendent personhood and oneness to some ill-defined pantheism. Incarnation in the confessional sense is possible only if the one God is some kind of plurality within unity. The Word who was with God (God's own companion) and who was God (God's own self) became flesh, and lived for a while among us (John 1:1, 14). The Lion of the tribe of Judah comes from God's own throne (Rev. 5).

For God to become human, something other than a *simplex* monotheistic God was necessary. This is more than a technical point. The high point of revelation is the coming and mission of Jesus Christ (cf. Heb. 4:1–4). His disclosure of God (cf. John 14:7) not only through instructive words and deeds of justice and mercy, but supremely in the cross, depends on the incarnation, which itself is dependent on biblical Trinitarianism. Conversely, if it were not for the incarnation of Jesus Christ, if it were not for what the incarnate Lord accomplished, it would be difficult to assign any sense at all to the conviction that believers come to "participate in the divine nature" (2 Peter 1:4).

Moreover, the sending of the Son becomes the anchor for the sending of the disciples (John 20:21). As he has had a mission from his Father, so we receive our mission from him. Indeed, in this sense the Christian mission is nothing more than a continuation of the mission of the Son, the next stage as it were. None of this would be particularly coherent if unitarianism replaced Trinitarianism.

Third, although orthodox Trinitarianism insists that all three persons of the Godhead are equally God, it insists no less strongly that each does not perform or accomplish exactly what the others do. The Father sends the Son, the Son goes: the relationship is not reciprocal. After his death and exaltation, the Son bequeaths the Spirit: the reverse is not true. The Spirit is given as the "down payment" of the ultimate inheritance: that cannot be said of the Father or the Son. When the exalted Christ has finally vanquished the last enemy, he turns everything over to his Father: once again, the two persons of the Godhead mentioned in this sentence could not have their roles reversed without making nonsense of the biblical narrative.

The bearing of these observations on missiological thought is twofold. First, God discloses himself to the ideal community, the archetypical community, "a sort of continuous and indivisible community," as the Cappadocians taught (the words are attributed to Basil of Caesarea). This

stands radically against the isolated individualism espoused by many forms of liberal democracy. It is an especially important component of our vision of God in all attempts to evangelize and disciple societies less enamored with individualism than are many Western nations (*see also* INDIVIDUALISM and COLLECTIVISM).

Yet the Persons of the Godhead are not three indistinguishable godlets, like three indistinguishable peas in a pod. They interact in love, and, in the case of the Son to the Father and of the Spirit to the Son and to the Father, in obedience, they each press on with distinctive tasks in their unified vision. In confessional trinitarianism, the three Persons of the Godhead are equally omniscient, but they do not think the same thing, that is, the point of self-identity with each is not the same as with the other. The Father cannot think, "I went to the cross, died, and rose again." Each is self-defined over against the others, while preserving perfect unity of purpose and love. This observation, lightly sketched in Calvin, has been probed more thoroughly in recent times. It preserves the individual person without succumbing to individualism. This stands radically against a collectivity in which individuals are squeezed into conformity or submerged in the community, no longer a community of free persons.

It is within such a framework, then, that the church should pursue the unity for which Jesus prayed (John 17). This unity is in fact precisely what has been lived out among countless Christians over the centuries, in fulfillment of Jesus' prayer: a oneness in love, in shared vision, despite all the diversity—mirroring, however imperfectly, the oneness of God. The oneness of the collective, or of a unified ecumenical structure, is a poor reflection of this glorious reality. Indeed, this oneness in love becomes a potent voice of witness to the world (John 13:34–35). We love, not only because he first loved us, but because God is love (1 John 4:7–12).

Fourth and finally, full-orbed reflection on the significance of the doctrine of the Trinity for mission demands extended meditation on how the Triune God pursues a lost and rebellious race of those who bear his image, on the distinctive roles of the Father and the Son, on the part played by the Holy Spirit in this mission. The Holy Spirit convicts the world of sin, righteousness and judgment (John 16:7–11), enabling the person without the Spirit to see and understand what would otherwise remain closed off (1 Cor. 2:14). The Holy Spirit also strengthens believers for every good work, conforming them to Christ in anticipation of the consummation of the last day. His is the initiative in explosive evangelism in the Book of Acts; his is still the regenerating power that transforms men and women when the word of the gospel is heralded today.

DONALD A. CARSON

Bibliography. L. Boff, *Trinity and Society;* C. E. Braaten, *Missiology* 18 (1990): 415–27; G. H. Clark, *The Trinity*; J. S. Connor, *Missiology* 9 (1981): 155–69; T. Dunne, *TS* 45 (1984): 139–52; M. J. Erickson, *God in Three Persons;* C. E. Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology;* R. W. Jenson, *The Triune Identity;* E. Jüngel, *The Doctrine of the Trinity;* D. H. Larson, *Times of the Trinity;* J. Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom;* L. Newbigin, *Open Secret;* idem, *Trinitarian Faith and Today's Mission;* J. Piper, *The Pleasures of God;* K. Rahner, *The Trinity;* J. Thurmer, *A Detection of the Trinity.*

Truth. In common use truth refers to that which is correct, actually exists, or has occurred. Philosophers investigate the nature of truth itself in the areas of knowledge, beauty, and morals. From the ENLIGHTENMENT (early eighteenth century) onward they have sought a truth which can be verified by science with accuracy. Immanuel Kant (1724–1802) raised the question of whether truth in itself is knowable or only as the knower perceives it. He opened the way to extensive questioning of even the existence of truth. Relativists may deny its existence in any objective, absolute sense in favor of a "truth" which is dependent upon knower and circumstances. Existentialists and their successors argue that truth emerges from experience. Postmodernists hold to a PLURALISM of many different "truths," whatever is true for a particular person or group is correct for them, even if it contradicts the truths held by others.

Throughout the Bible one can detect different nuances concerning truth. The common connotations of correctness and accuracy are assumed. The Old Testament frequently stresses faithfulness, reliability, and morality whereas in the New the emphasis is more upon true statements and teachings and attitudes and actions consistent with God's nature and will.

In both Testaments truth is a quality of God, at times almost becoming a personification of him. Speaking of God both the psalmist (119:160) and Jesus (John 17:17) affirm, "Your word is truth." The Holy Spirit is "the Spirit of truth" (John 14:17; 15:26; 16:13; cf. 1 John 5: 7). Hence, God's communication of truth is in complete harmony with his nature (he does not lie, Num. 23:19; 1 Sam. 15:29); God's revelation of his person, works, and will are accurate and trustworthy. Ultimately, Jesus Christ himself is truth. "I," he said, "am the way, the truth and the life, no one comes to the Father but by me" (John 14: 6). He himself is the embodiment of truth—truth that is both personal and absolute, eternal and relational, objective and experiential. What philosophers, kings, sages, scientists, common people, priests, prophets, shamans, and diviners seek is

found in him. In Jesus all things find their form, function, relation, and meaning. As the truth itself, Jesus reveals the truth about God, the universe, and their relationship. He is also the only way to the reestablishment of a right, accepting relationship with God.

God's servants and representatives are to be people of truth. They are to reflect and point to the truth which is Jesus Christ. They are to report, to bear testimony to the Truth. The facts and implications they report must be accurate, even when they might be threatening or irritating, or bring hostility. In their own lives and activities they are to tell the truth and be characterized by faithfulness and dependability as they live the truth.

This is the background and presupposition for "truth and missions." Missions and missionaries must be committed to truth and be characterized by it. They must proclaim the pure truth of the gospel. God's truth, which is sure (Titus 1:9), absolute, changeless, and "committed once and for all to the saints" (Jude 3) may come in cultural dress and cannot be separated from the persons who proclaim it. Nevertheless, it transcends culture, time, and messenger. One must be careful neither to add to nor subtract from God's truth, nor to diminish his requirements or expectations. It is often difficult to distinguish between preference stemming from the missionary's culture and background and that which is a genuine part of God's saving message—its implications, and manners of life that comport with it. It usually requires conscious effort. It was in a cross-cultural situation that Paul employed the phrase "truth of the gospel" in a way which seems to equate the gospel and truth (Gal. 2:4, 14; 4:16; 5:7). For him to add, subtract, or act contrary to "the truth of the gospel" was to deny that the death of Christ and justification by faith produced their intended results (Gal. 2: 16–21).

Missions and missionaries struggle with truth in other ways. How information and attitudes are communicated differ from culture to culture. What seems to be correct, proper, or honest may be related or interpreted differently by different groups and raise questions about truthfulness. The missionary must never regard as inferior the persons or traditions of another group which do not impinge upon the content or the demands of God's message or of his will. Furthermore, God's cross-border, cross-cultural servants must neither glamorize nor exaggerate the successes, difficulties, or hardships of their tasks.

Truth is not only the believers' lives but our mission. It is our proclamation, life-style, operating principle, objective, and love. For God is truth, his word and revelation is truth, his standard is truth, his intent is truth, and he relates to and calls people to and in truth.

J. Julius Scott Jr.

Uniqueness of Christ. Many discussions about the significance of Jesus Christ within the context of world religions virtually cut Jesus off from his historical and scriptural roots and speak of him as the founder of a new religion, whereas certainly Jesus had no intention of launching another "religion" as such. The coming of Jesus was prepared for through God's dealings with Israel and their Scriptures. It was from the Hebrew Bible that Jesus drew his identity and his motivating mission. Two major unique aspects of Old Testament revelation combined in the uniqueness of Christ: the uniqueness of Israel and the uniqueness of Yahweh. Both lie at the heart of a biblical understanding of mission (*see also* Old Testament Theology of Mission).

The Uniqueness of Israel. The Bible presents God's redemptive answer to the human problem (comprehensively portrayed in Gen. 1–11) through the call of Abraham and the creation of Israel as God's people. God's covenant with Abraham concludes with God's commitment to the mission of blessing all nations (Gen. 12:3). God chose to achieve that universal goal through a particular historical means—the nation of Israel. Israel's unique election thus stands in integral connection to its place in the mission of God for the nations. The New Testament, from Matthew's opening genealogy, affirms that Jesus completed what God had already begun to work out through Israel. The mission of Jesus has to be understood against the background of a historical, particular people (*see also* Jesus and Mission). His uniqueness is linked to theirs. The Hebrew Bible is clear that God's action in and through Israel was unique. This does *not* mean that God was in no way involved in the histories of other nations. On the contrary, Israel boldly claimed that Yahweh was sovereign over all nations (e.g., Amos 9:7; Deut. 2:20–23; Exod. 9:13–16; Isa. 10:5–19; Jer. 27:5–7; Isa. 44:28–45:13). It does mean that only in Israel did God work within the terms of a covenant of redemption, initiated and sustained by his grace (e.g., Amos 3:2; Deut. 4:32–34; Ps. 147:19f.; Isa. 43:8–13; Exod. 19:5–6; 20:26; Num. 23:9; Deut. 7:6). Israel only existed because of God's desire to redeem people from every nation. While God has every nation in view in his redemptive purpose, in no other nation did he act as he did in Israel, for the sake of the nations. No other nation experienced what Israel did of God's revelation and redemption.

The New Testament presents Jesus as the *Messiah,* Jesus the Christ. And the Messiah "was" Israel. That is, he represented and personified Israel. The Messiah was the completion of all that for which Israel had been placed in the world—God's self-revelation and his work of human redemption. For this reason, Jesus shares in the uniqueness of Israel; indeed he was the point

and goal of it. What God had been doing through no other nation he now completed through no other person than the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth. The paradox is that precisely through the narrowing down of his redemptive work to the unique particularity of the single man, Jesus, God opened the way to the universalizing of his redemptive grace to all nations, which was his purpose from the beginning. It was this connection between the "mystery" of Israel's existence for the nations in the Old Testament and the significance of the gospel of Jesus' messiahship that formed the basis of Paul's mission theology in relation to the Gentiles (Gal. 3:14, 26–29; Eph. 2:11–13; 3:4–6). The fulfillment of Israel's *historical particularity* in Jesus was at the same time the fulfillment of Israel's *eschatological universality*. In this way the uniqueness of Christ is inseparable from the mission of God's people.

The Uniqueness of Yahweh. There can be no more powerful affirmation in the Old Testament than the claim that Yahweh alone is truly and uniquely God (e.g., Deut. 4:32–40). This monotheistic thrust was not simply the singularity of deity, but rather sought to define the one God in terms of the nature, character, and actions of Yahweh (e.g., Isa. 40:12–31; 43:10–12; 45:5, 22–24). Yahweh is unique in character, and deity.

An important ingredient in Old Testament Israel's eschatology was the conviction that Yahweh would come bringing both redemption and judgment. Several of these texts were applied by Jesus to himself, or to the circumstances surrounding his ministry (e.g., Isa. 35:4ff.; Matt. 11:4–6; Ezek. 34; John 10:11, 14; Matt. 22:41–46; Mal. 2:1; 4:5; Matt. 11:14). The implication was that, in the person of Jesus, Yahweh had indeed come, as the birth title "Emmanuel" also signified, to inaugurate the new age of his salvation and reign.

Similarly, soon after the death and resurrection of Jesus we find the early church referring to him and addressing him in terms which had previously been applied only to Yahweh in their Scriptures. They called him Lord, the Greek word *Kyrios* being the one regularly used in the Greek version of the Old Testament for the divine name Yahweh. They "called on his name" in worship and prayer (cf., Ps. 116:12f., 17). Stephen saw Jesus standing at the right hand of God sharing in his divine glory (Acts 7:55). Paul transferred the saving name of Yahweh to Jesus in his evangelism (Acts 16:31; cf. Joel 2:32; Rom. 10:13). In possibly his earliest letter, 1 Thessalonians, Paul speaks of Jesus in remarkable ways, given that it was written within about a decade of the crucifixion and that the Thessalonians obviously accepted the claims as basic elements in their new faith. He speaks of "the Lord Jesus Christ" in the same breath as "God the Father" (1:1, 3). He addresses prayer to both together (3:11–13). Jesus is "God's Son," who will come to bring in the final act of judgment and salvation (1:10). "The Day of the Lord (Yahweh)" (e.g., Joel 1:15; 2:11, 28–32; 3:14 etc.) has been transformed, in the light of the expected coming of Jesus, into "the Day of the Lord Jesus" (4:16–5:2).

The heartbeat of Old Testament monotheism can also be felt in the way Paul expanded the credal *shema* of Deuteronomy 6:4–5 into a declaration of the uniqueness of Jesus in relation to the world of Greco-Roman polytheism in 1 Corinthians 8, and in the way Peter converted the Deuteronomic affirmation that Yahweh is God "and there is no other" (Deut. 4:35–39), into the exclusive claim that salvation was to be found in the name of Jesus, and in "no other name" (Acts 4:12).

Possibly the most remarkable identification of Jesus with Yahweh comes in Philippians 2:5–11, probably part of an early Christian hymn which Paul incorporates here to make his point. Jesus has been given "the name above every name" (v. 9)—which in the light of the Hebrew Scriptures could only mean the name of Yahweh. Verse 10 then clinches this affirmation by applying to Jesus words taken from Isaiah 45:22f. which were originally spoken by Yahweh about himself, declaring his uniqueness as God and his unique ability to save. The uniqueness of Jesus is thus founded unmistakably on the uniqueness of Yahweh, and specifically to his action in salvation. It thus has a direct connection with the central dynamic of Christian mission.

In Jesus, then, the uniqueness of Israel and the uniqueness of Yahweh flow together, for he embodied the one and incarnated the other, climactically fulfilling the mission of both.

CHRISTOPHER J. H. WRIGHT

Bibliography. L. Hurtado, *One Lord, One God: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism;* C. J. H. Wright, *Knowing Jesus through the Old Testament;* idem, *Thinking Clearly about the Uniqueness of Jesus;* N. T. Wright, *Who was Jesus?*

Unity. The subject of Christian unity immediately evokes several basic questions: "With whom?" "By whom?" and "For whom?" In response, the meaning of Christian unity can be stated in objective terms as a foundational New Testament truth. It is first and foremost an understanding about Christ and salvation. Second, it is an attitude of belonging, respect, and fellowship. Third, it is an action that expresses union with Christ and with others of his body. Succinctly, biblical Christian unity is a supernatural reality based on the ontological truth of the union of believers with Christ. Since all true believers have been united to Christ through the

new birth, they have likewise been united to one another as members of his body, the church.

The outworking or implications of Christian unity are expressed in a variety of New Testament references. In John's Gospel, Christ speaks of believers being one, as the Father and the Son are one. In 1 Corinthians, Paul likens the unity of the human body to the unity of Christians. Again, in Ephesians, he speaks of the true unity of Christians as a reflection of the unity of the Holy Trinity. Each of these descriptions is linked with a causal clause, which shows a consistent call for visible evidence of the spiritual reality of union with Christ for the purpose of witness and outreach. The reality of Christian unity is a fundamental spiritual truth, tied together with the foundational purpose of the church's mission in the world.

What does the absence of reference to organizational or ecclesiastical forms in the New Testament texts indicate about unity? Surely, it eliminates any basis for dogmatic imposition of structures. At the same time, all Christians are called to make the practical expression of Christian unity a high priority, or suffer the consequences of ineffective witness and outreach.

DARYL PLATT

Universality of Mission. The universality of mission is the mandate of mission that the gospel be proclaimed to all the peoples of the world. It includes providing all peoples with the opportunity to hear with understanding the message of salvation found only in Jesus Christ, the opportunity to accept or reject him as Lord and Savior, and the opportunity to serve him in the fellowship of a church.

The impetus of the universality of mission arises from the nature of the GOSPEL itself. The universality of the gospel, in turn, is inextricably linked to its uniqueness, a uniqueness found in its CHRISTOLOGY (*see also* UNIQUENESS OF CHRIST). The incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus is the message of the presence of the eternal God providing in Christ the only way of salvation for all those living in spiritual darkness and death. The biblical witness is that "God was pleased to have all his fullness dwell in him [Jesus], and through him to reconcile to himself all things whether things on earth or things in heaven, by making peace through his blood, shed on the cross" (Col. 1:19–20). It is only in this unique gospel of Jesus Christ that the world is confronted with the reality of the redemption of God. Thus, the gospel is for all the world because it is about all the world. It alone reveals the alienation of all humans from God and the hope of their reconciliation to God.

The religious pluralist objects that such a particular and exclusive claim of salvation in Christ is a barrier to genuine relationship with those of other faiths (*see* PLURALISM and UNIVERSALISM). But if the uniqueness of the gospel is denied, how is one to affirm God's intention to provide the means of salvation for the world and the historical event that actualized salvation? It is the uniqueness of the gospel that requires that all the peoples of the world hear the content and condition of God's provision of salvation in Christ and be given the opportunity to believe in Jesus. Thus it is out of the unique message of the gospel that the necessity, urgency, obligation, and self-sacrifice of global mission emerge in their fullest implications (*see also* MISSIONARY TASK, THE).

Further, in the GREAT COMMISSION, the Lord Jesus commands the universal dissemination of the gospel. Matthew 28:18–20, Mark 15:16, Luke 24:46–47, and Acts 1:8 restate the intent of the commission in different words with the same effect—the gospel is to go to "all nations," "all the world," "all the nations," and to "the uttermost parts of the earth." In the Matthew passage Jesus prefaces his commission with the assertion of his absolute authority in heaven and on earth. To fail to take the gospel to all the world is tantamount to disobedience to the lordship of Christ.

The Matthew passage also provides added dimension to the scope of the commission. DONALD MCGAVRAN proposed that "all nations" *(panta ta ethnē)* refers to all the peoples of the world; that is, all humanity, all who live on earth, all the ethnolinguistic groups of the world (*see also* PEOPLES, PEOPLE GROUPS). The mandate of the Great Commission is to make disciples in all the world through evangelism, church planting, and instruction.

The importance of every individual, moreover, is related to the universality of mission. John 3:16 clearly declares God's intent that the message of his loving provision of salvation be universally communicated. "For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, that whoever believes in him shall not perish but have eternal life." Each person, as a special creation of God, deserves the occasion to have his or her spiritual need and hunger met by God's redemptive love.

The universality of mission also has eschatological implications. Our Lord appears to link global evangelization with his return (*see also* MILLENNIAL THOUGHT AND MISSION). In Matthew 24:14 he declares, "And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached in the whole world as a testimony to all nations, and then the end will come." In Revelation 5:9 praise is ascribed to the enthroned Lord Jesus because with his blood he bought people "for God from every tribe and language and people and nation."

The ultimate impetus of the universality of mission is the glory of God. That is, global mission is driven by God's intention to redeem to

himself a people to love and praise him out of all the nations and people groups of the world (*see also* WORSHIP).

DONALD R. DUNAVANT

Wealth and Poverty. One of the great social problems that faces those who would bear witness to the Christian faith in a global manner is that of distributive justice. There is an extreme divergence between the rich and poor of today's world, a contrast often described in terms of the North–South divide. Experts in demographics estimate that early in the third millennium, the world's population will be 6.3 billion, and by 2025 it may reach 8.5 billion. Moreover, 95 percent of the global population growth over this period will be in the developing countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. By 2025, Mexico will have replaced Japan as one of the ten most populous countries on the earth, and Nigeria's population will exceed that of the United States.

Despite progress made in economic growth, public health, and literacy in the third world, at least 800 million live in "absolute poverty." This is defined as a condition of life where malnutrition, illiteracy, disease, squalid housing, high infant mortality, and low life expectancy are beyond any reasonable definition of human decency. The stark reality is that the North (including Eastern Europe) has a quarter of the world's population and 80 percent of its income, while in the South (including China) three-quarters of the world's people live on one-fifth of its income. Also, approximately 90 percent of the global manufacturing industry is in the North. While the quality of life in the North rises steadily, in the South every two seconds a child dies of hunger and disease.

Still the contrast between wealth and poverty does not correspond exactly with the North–South division. Many OPEC countries are rich, while poverty is found in North America and Europe. In the United States 14 percent of people and 30 percent of children are beneath the poverty line. In Britain over 10 percent live below the legal definition of poverty, and another 10 percent to 15 percent are close to this point. A great disparity between wealth and poverty is found not only between nations but also within them.

On the other hand, one-fifth of the world's population lives in relative affluence and consumes approximately four-fifths of the world's income. Moreover, according to a recent World Bank report, the "total disbursements" from the wealthy nations to the THIRD WORLD amounted to $92 billion, a figure less than 10% of the worldwide expenditures on armaments; but this was more than offset by the "total debt service" of $142 billion. The result was a negative transfer of some $50 billion from the third world to the developed countries. This disparity between wealth and poverty is a social injustice so grievous that Christians dare not ignore it.

God has provided enough resources in the earth to meet the needs of all. Usually it is not the fault of the poor themselves, since for the most part they were born into poverty. Christians use the complexities of economics as an excuse to do nothing. However, God's people need to dedicate themselves not only to verbal evangelism but also to relieving human need as part of sharing the good news (Luke 4:18–21), both at home and to the ends of the earth.

This explains why Christians in the two-thirds world place issues of poverty and economic development at the top of their theological agendas. Some Christians in the North have difficulty understanding why "liberation" is so central to the thinking of their counterparts in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, but they have never faced the stark, dehumanizing reality of grinding poverty (*see also* LIBERATION THEOLOGIES).

The Western missionary movement reflects an affluence that has developed as a result of the threefold revolution that has given Europe and North America a standard of living that is the envy of the world (*see also* MISSIONARY AFFLUENCE). Since the sixteenth-century the scientific, industrial, and political revolution has unleashed an avalanche of material goods that has raised the West from poverty. Most of the world has not shared in this achievement. When missionaries from the West went to preach and minister in other lands during the nineteenth century, they often believed that God favored them materially and scientifically so that they could overawe the heathen. As recently as the 1970s a missionary could observe that "Economic power is still the most crucial power factor in the western missionary movement. It is still the most important way that the Western missionary expresses his concept of what it means to preach the gospel" (Bernard Quick). The fact that most Protestant missionaries serve in some part of Africa, Latin America, or Oceania, those parts of the world where most of the poor reside, indicates that missionaries are economically superior in the social contexts of their ministry.

There have always been a few individuals who have pointed out that Western missionaries can take for granted a level of material security, lifestyle, and future options that are beyond the wildest dreams of the people among whom they work. As the twentieth century progressed others joined in calling attention to the unforeseen and unwelcome effects of this economic disparity. At the TAMBARAM CONFERENCE (1938) a report was presented that clearly showed the dilemma between the comparatively "wealthy" missionaries and the "poor" people to whom they ministered. By the very nature of the situation missionaries were looked upon as the representatives of a

wealthy and powerful civilization who introduced a new standard of economic values. The people that they served looked upon them not as proclaimers of a new faith, but as sources of potential economic gain. The problem of the personal affluence of Western missionaries when compared to the indigenous peoples was spelled out more explicitly in books such as *Ventures in Simple Living* (1933) and *Living as Comrades* (1950) written by Daniel Johnson Fleming, professor of missions at Union Theological Seminary (N.Y.). Writers like Fleming pointed out that the wealth of the West obscured the message of Christ, and led to feelings of helplessness and inferiority on the part of those to whom the missionaries ministered.

However, the problem of global economic disparity was once again obscured in the post–World War II period, when the North American missionary rank increased from less than 19,000 in 1953 to over 39,000 in 1985. These new missionaries were mostly from evangelical missionary groups who tended to neglect the work of the denominational agencies and focused on personal conversion, often ignoring economic and material problems.

Yet the work of authors such as Viv Grigg and Jonathan Bonk as well as a number of contributors to the *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* and *Missiology* focused attention on the obstacle to Christian witness inherent in the issues of wealth and poverty. Many of these writers counsel Christians in the more developed lands to share their material means with others. This can be done by supporting public and private efforts to aid the poor, by scaling down their standard of living, and by working for the empowerment of those who do not have the ability to represent themselves.

ROBERT G. CLOUSE

Bibliography. J. Bonk, *Missions and Money, Affluence as a Western Missionary Problem;* R. G. Clouse, ed., *Wealth and Poverty: Four Christian Views of Economics;* V. Griff, *Companion to the Poor;* K. Koyama, *Waterbuffalo Theology;* J. A. Scherer, *Global Living Here and Now;* J. V. Taylor, *Enough Is Enough: A Biblical Call for Moderation in a Consumer-Oriented Society.*

Wheaton '83. Sponsored by the WORLD EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP and held as a continuation of the work done in the WHEATON CONGRESS (1966), the BERLIN CONGRESS (1966), the LAUSANNE CONGRESS (1974), the PATTAYA CONSULTATION (1980), and the GRAND RAPIDS CONSULTATION (1982), Wheaton '83 gathered 336 participants from 59 nations, with 60 percent coming from the non-Western world. The Consultation's theme was "I will build my Church," with each element in the agenda stressing the role of the local church as the central expression of God's kingdom in the world. There were three tracks within the consultation, with the following foci: (1) the biblical nature of the church and its mission; (2) the nature and mission of the church in new frontiers; (3) the nature of mission as involving both evangelism and social concerns.

Wheaton '83 continued the discussion with evangelical ranks on the nature of mission and the roles of evangelism and discipleship within mission. Within that debate, the tenor at Wheaton '83 was the recognition that alleviating poverty, bringing justice and transforming people and societies are all part of *MISSIO DEI.*

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. M. L. Branson, *Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin* 7:1 (Sept.–Oct. 1983): 11–26; R. Covell, *Missiology* 11:4 (1983): 531–33; A. F. Glasser, *IBMR* 9 (1985): 9–13; R. C. Padilla, *The Best in Theology,* 1:239–52; T. Sine, ed., *The Church in Response to Human Need;* P. Sookhdeo, *New Frontiers in Mission;* Wheaton '83, *Wheaton '83: An International Evangelical Conference on the Nature and Mission of the Church: June 20–July 1, 1983, Wheaton, Illinois.*

Witness. A witness is one who bears testimony about a person, place, or event. While the modern term frequently is associated with seeing (e.g., an eyewitness), the underlying Hebrew and Greek terms focus more on testifying than on observing. Throughout the Bible the term is used in forensic contexts to indicate one who is able to explain what has happened due to personal experience of an event or issues related to the event being investigated. The purpose of such testimony is to establish truth so that appropriate judgment may be determined. To do so, however, two or more independent witnesses were necessary to establish accusations against the accused (Deut. 19:15). Bearing false witness against someone was forbidden (Exod. 20:16), and punishable by giving the false witness the punishment due the accused (Deut. 19:16–21).

In addition to the legal concept, a witness may authenticate accounts of an event or meaning outside of legal proceedings. Paul, for example, calls God himself as a witness of Paul's commitment to pray for the Christians in Rome (Rom. 1:9). The Spirit also bears witness with our spirit that we belong to God (Rom. 8:16).

The term also develops a nonlegal but technical sense of bearing testimony about Christ. John the Baptist bore such a testimony (John 1:7, 15). The word signifies lifestyle and verbal testimony about Christ before non-Christians in the hope of persuading them to respond to the gospel. (Acts 1:8). Jesus promised the power of the Spirit for such witness and in Acts 4:33 the apostles showed the fulfillment of Jesus' promise. In Paul's vision, Jesus encouraged Paul that he would bear witness of Christ in Rome just as he already had in Jerusalem (Acts 23:11).

Contemporary Issues. In many evangelical circles, *witnessing* refers to the act of evangelism. Typically it is used of verbal proclamation of the gospel and may be divorced from lifestyle.

Lifestyle witness (*see also* LIFESTYLE EVANGELISM) refers more specifically to our testimony to the truth through the concrete way we live. If detached from some type of truth proclamation (verbal, written, etc.), however, lifestyle witness will inevitably be read through the WORLDVIEW of the observer (*see also* PRESENCE EVANGELISM). In cross-cultural settings, the observers' worldviews may have little or no Christian orientation, and the lifestyle they see will be interpreted in categories that make sense to the observers rather than to the witness. While it is true that our lives bear witness for good or ill, lifestyles without corresponding sensitive and appropriate explanation to the receptor will always be read in light of the receptor's categories.

In ecumenical circles, witness refers to "the total evangelizing presence and manifestation of the church" (Bria, 1067), and is all that the church is and does. *Common witness* was popularized in ecumenical circles from the 1970s, and refers to the joint witness of the universal church in all of its efforts. It was built on the theological reflection that no single church fully manifests Christ to the world; it takes a universal effort to achieve such global witness. Particular attention in this understanding is given to cooperative efforts which display UNITY in mission, however imperfect they may be. Such efforts stand as a witness before the world of our unity in Christ and God's love for humankind. Common witness is broader than just cooperative efforts, however. It is also reflected when we live lives which honor our Christian commitments and display an accepting, ecumenical attitude toward Christians who are from different ecclesiological backgrounds.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. I. Bria, *DEM,* pp. 1067–69; H. D. Buckwalter, *EDBT,* pp. 765–69; F. W. Danker, *ISBE Revised,* pp. 1086–87; T. Stransky, *DEM,* pp. 197–200; A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness.*

World Congress on Evangelism (Berlin, 1966). An international gathering of evangelicals to promote the cause of missions, the Berlin congress had its roots in a burden BILLY GRAHAM had over the worldwide lack of clarity and agreement on evangelism. It was the decision of the staff of *Christianity Today* to celebrate their tenth anniversary by dealing with this burden. They invited 1,200 delegates from virtually all Protestant denominations in a hundred countries, as well as Roman Catholic and Jewish observers, to participate in a ten-day congress under the rubric "One Race, One Gospel, One Task." The response was positive, and delegates came from the oldest Christian church (the first-century Mar Thoma Syrian of India) and from the beginnings of the Auca church whose members a few years before had participated in the slaying of evangelical missionaries in Ecuador. With the precedent of the 1910 WORLD MISSIONARY CONFERENCE at Edinburgh, where approximately the same number (1,206) of delegates pledged to carry to completion the evangelization of the world, the Berlin Congress called the leaders of the WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES to rekindle the dynamic zeal for world evangelization that had characterized Edinburgh fifty-six years previously.

Plenary sessions were devoted to reaffirming the divine authority and theological justification for world evangelization as well as exposing the internal hindrances and external obstacles standing in the way of its achievement. Serious attention was also given to reviewing how the biblical methods of evangelism could be adapted to the various situations facing churches throughout the world. Finally, "acting voluntarily, personally, and in wholesome unity, without committing their churches," the delegates pledged "to bring the Word of Salvation to the human race in this generation, by every means God has given to the mind and will of men." There were complaints that the congress failed to arrive at consensus on crucial issues such as the relation of EVANGELISM AND SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY. But it did define clearly the biblical nature of evangelism and was later seen as an essential step in the movement of evangelicals worldwide to the launching of the LAUSANNE CONGRESS FOR WORLD EVANGELIZATION in 1974.

ARTHUR F. GLASSER

Bibliography. C. F. H. Henry and W. S. Mooneyham, eds., *One Race, One Gospel, One Task: World Congress on Evangelism, Berlin 1966,* 2 vols.; *Christianity Today* 10 (Oct. 14, 1966): 34; (Oct. 28): 67–93, 96–97; (Nov. 11): 131–39, 142–58, 177–79; (Nov. 25): 24–25, 34–36.

Worship. Today as throughout history, worship and mission are linked inextricably together, for God propels his mission through the drawing of worshipers to himself. God's call to worship him empowers us to respond with his passion to do mission. Thus, worship ignites mission; it is God's divine call-and-response strategy.

Indeed, the Scriptures resound with his global call to worship via mission. The prophet Isaiah, for example, responding in the midst of worship, takes up the call to go (Isa. 6:1–8). Likewise, the Samaritan woman encounters Jesus Christ, the incarnate God. He discloses that the Father is seeking authentic worshipers, people in relationship with him. The woman responds by immediately calling others to come see the man who told her everything she had done (John 4:26). Fi-

nally, the greatest call-and-response pattern surfaces when the disciples meet with the resurrected Jesus just before his ascension (Matt. 28:16ff.). Finally recognizing Jesus' true identity, they fall down and worship him. In the context of worship, Jesus gives his crowning imperative, the GREAT COMMISSION (Matt. 28:17–20). The missionary mandate flows out of an intimate relationship with God generated in worship. God's propelling call to go into all the world becomes our response of commitment and allegiance to him. We join him in his passion to call worshipers to himself.

Wherever we have seen meaningful, authentic worship, the church has experienced a new missions thrust. Yet, a radical separation of worship from mission has dominated mission methodologies. DONALD MACGAVRAN once claimed, "Worship . . . is good; but worship is worship. It is not evangelism" (1965, 455). The typical practice has been to call people to a saving faith in Jesus Christ with worship being a resultant by-product. While ignoring God's primary call to worship, missiologists have, however, recognized the need for relevant Christian worship to nurture a Christian movement. Thus, the model of "evangelism-before-worship" has dominated evangelical mission strategies.

Yet God's call to worship him is currently sweeping around the world in great, new revolutionary ways. Along with new openness to new forms and patterns of worship, there is greater recognition of the intimate relationship between worship and mission. Such winds of worship empowering mission have been building over the past few decades in relation to renewal movements. In 1939, for example, the Methodist Episcopal Church published a small manual, *A Book of Worship for Village Churches,* for the "great army of Christian pastors, teachers, and laymen who are leading the toiling villagers of India through worship to the feet of Christ" (Ziegler, 1939, 7). The manual resulted from a desire to see the church in India take root in its own soil in tandem with the vast treasures of two thousand years of Christian heritage. Research revealed that where dynamic worship was practiced, changed lives and growing churches resulted. On the other hand, weak, stagnant and ineffective churches existed where worship of God in Christ was neglected (ibid., 5).

More recently, as renewal movements grow in their experience with God, God calls them into mission. The common strategic link of each of these groups is their focus on worship with evangelism as the inclusive by-product: the "worship-propels-mission" model. French Benedictine monks, for example, have entered Senegal with the goal of creating a model of contextualized worship drawn from cultural musical traditions. They have adapted African drums and the twenty-one-string Kora harp to attract Muslims to Christ. Likewise, the Taizé Movement from France is growing through the development of contemplative, worship forms. Facilitated by the burgeoning impact of electronic media and new musical forms worldwide, the growth of a Worship and Praise Movement, originating from such streams as the Jesus People Movement through Marantha! Music and the Vineyard Movement, is forging an openness to new, global worship forms.

Among the most exciting developments are the new mission forces from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Their distinctive approaches commonly revolve around worship. In Kenya, one of the most dynamic examples of church growth is found at the Nairobi Chapel. The Chapel bases much of its strategy on the development of meaningful worship (especially music) for effectively communicating the gospel to a predominantly university-student based church (Long). The vision does not stop with Kenya; they are reaching out to neighboring Tanzania. In West Africa, Senufo Christians of Cote d'Ivoire are reaching out to their neighbors through their distinctive worship form—song, dance, and drama (King). Christian Inca Indians from Peru are reaching out to Native Americans of North America. Through their deeper understanding of more culturally relevant worship forms, Inca Christians are preaching through the use of Indian storytelling styles. Asians are going to other Asians; Koreans to the Philippines and American Filipinos to Japan. In one case, Taiwans' Hosanna Ministries partnered with the Korean Tyrannus Team in initiating a series of Worship and Praise activities in 1989. This partnership brought forth a movement of renewal in Taiwan where unbelievers came to Christ and believers dedicated themselves to missions (Wong). They discovered "an intimate relationship between worship and mission" (1993, 3). Worship propelled both evangelism and commitment to do more mission.

With the growing surge of worship empowering mission, we must keep five factors in mind in order to achieve a lasting impact for the kingdom. First, worship must remain worship: we must, above all, seek encounter with God. Worship services should not serve as functional substitutes for evangelism. Rather, we must seek authenticity of interaction with God and developing relationship with him. Genuine worship of the Creator will attract and confront those who long to enter into the kingdom. Likewise, evangelistic programs must pursue evangelism. The two, worship and mission, must remain distinct, yet work hand-in-hand.

Second, we must allow God to transform and make anew his original creation. Contextualization of the gospel is not an option, but an imper-

ative. Throughout the Scriptures and history, we see people worshiping God in ways that were formerly heathen but then transformed with radically new meaning. Service order, length, language, symbolism, prayer forms, songs, dance, bowing, speeches, Scripture reading, and artifacts must be captured to nurture believers and bring the peoples of the world into relationship with the living God.

Third, we are to pursue diversity within the unity of the body of Christ (Eph. 2; 1 Cor. 12): "Diversity (of worship forms) seems to coincide with the periods of effective mission efforts" (Muench, 1981, 104). Foundational mission goals must seek to make Christ understood and known within their own context. The Celtic church, for example, known as a strong mission church, encouraged each tribal group to develop its own worship service pattern. Likewise, worship patterns and forms must vary according to the cultural contexts—including multicultural settings. In order to know God intimately, peoples from differing contexts require the freedom to interact with him through relevant worship forms.

Fourth, there is a great need for research toward developing appropriate worship. We must allow dynamic worship to grow and change as relationship with God deepens. Worship forms are shaped by and reflect our relationship with God via appropriate, expressive cultural forms. There is great need for openness in pursuing, experimenting, exchanging, and documenting experiences in worship. Needed topics of research should include biblical models of worship that seek precedents for adapting cultural forms, comparative philosophical thought forms, historical models of worship from the Christian movement, uses and meaning of ritual (anthropology), verbal and non-verbal symbols (communication), and comparative cultural worship patterns.

Finally, we must train for worship and worship leading. In keeping with "spirit and truth" worship (John 4:23), missionaries must first of all be worshipers of the living God. Then they are empowered to take up God's passionate call to bring all peoples to worship him. Besides studying the nature of worship and the numerous patterns and forms that worship can embody, we must train people to lead worship and stimulate meaningful worship cross-culturally. Training for worship must become a major component in the formation of missionaries.

Authentic Christian worship brings people to encounter Jesus Christ. As one looks to God, God reveals his vision to us. We respond to his call. Thus, worship propels and empowers mission. Ultimately, God calls us to participate in achieving God's vision as entoned by the Psalmist: "All the nations you have made will come and worship before you, O Lord; they will bring glory to your name" (Ps. 86:9).

ROBERTA R. KING

Bibliography. P. B. Brown *In and For the World: Bringing the Contemporary Into Christian Worship;* J. G. Davies, *Worship and Mission;* R. R. King, *Pathways in Christian Music Communication: The Case of the Senufo of Cote d'Ivoire;* K. W. Long, *Worship and Church Growth: A Single Case Study of Nairobi Chapel;* S. Morgenthaler, *Worship Evangelism: Inviting Unbelievers into the Presence of God*; P. E. Muench, "Worship and Mission: A Review of Literature" M.A. Thesis, Fuller Theological Seminary; J. Piper, *Let the Nations Be Glad;* A. L. C. Wong, *The Dynamics of Worship and Praise in God's Mission in Taiwan;* E. K. Ziegler, *A Book of Worship for Village Churches.*

Wrath of God. The word "wrath" occurs in over two hundred places in the Bible and the concept is implied in many more. The overwhelming majority of these refer the attitude, activity, or response of God to human SIN. Wrath is the continuing reaction of the holy, pure, sovereign, personal God to anything which offends his moral nature and kingly rights. This includes rejection by the offender of his person, rule, will, and affronts to his holy being, whether it be conscious and direct or subconscious and indirect.

In Scripture God's wrath may be the threat of coming punishment and doom or of present or future judgment. In the absolute sense it is a synonym for eternal separation from God and punishment in HELL. Divine wrath may be directed toward a group or an individual. Those who do not acknowledge God, the HEATHEN, are under the wrath of God and will feel its full fury. God's people who turn away from him or refuse to live according to his will and law are also objects of his wrath. This is the primary way the term is used of Israel in the Old Testament. In the case of God's people there is the call to repent so that wrath may be averted and restitution offered, when the time of punishment is completed. The Old Testament also stresses that God is "merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness" (Ps. 86:15; 103:8; 145:8).

The precise phrase "wrath of God" appears only in the New Testament. Because the righteous visitation of wrath is a prerogative of divine sovereignty, God's people are not to avenge themselves (Rom. 12:19). Other references to the "wrath of God" fall into a number of categories. (1) It is the lot of those who reject Jesus Christ and refuse to obey God's will revealed in him. In John 3:36 the wrath of God is the opposite of having eternal life through believing in the Son and rests on those who do not obey the Son. Paul says wrath is being revealed against "all ungodliness and wickedness of men who . . . suppress the truth" (Rom. 1:18). He also insists that it

comes "upon the sons of disobedience" who live immoral, frivolous, materialistic, idolatrous, ungodly lives (Eph. 5:6; Col. 3:6). (2) It is from wrath that we are saved in Christ. As Paul affirms, we are "justified by his blood, saved by him from the wrath of God" (Rom. 5:9). (3) The outpouring of the wrath of God is a central focus of the visions of judgment in Revelation (14:9; 15:1; 16:1; 19:15) and people seek refuge from it (6:16).

The Greek word *hilastērion,* translated "propitiation" in such passages as Romans 3:25 in the KJV and NASB, has a direct relation to "wrath." It refers to the sacrifice offered to appease the wrath of an offended deity. Either because propitiation is a word unfamiliar to moderns or because of a desire to dissociate the Judeo-Christian God with the vengeful, often irrational wrath of deities in pagan religions, most twentieth-century translations use some other rendering, such as "expiation" or "sacrifice of atonement." God is certainly not a vengeful, capricious being but wrath is his proper, just response to sin. However *hilastērion* and related terms are handled, one must not lose sight of the fact that Paul asserts that through the blood of Jesus God's wrath (note the occurrence of the term in the preceding context; Rom. 1:18; 2:5, 8; 3:5) is real but turned aside by God's grace received by faith.

The fact of God's wrath has often been a motivation for evangelism and mission. The threat of and warning against it is a frequent, legitimate part of the Christian message aimed at winning converts. It is also one of the appropriate stimuli for Christian behavior. It is, however, dangerous to sensationalize, dramatize, or overly emphasize wrath for it is only a part of God's nature. The prophet Habakkuk sought a balance when he cried, "In wrath remember mercy" (3:2).

JONATHAN EDWARD's sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," is sometimes cited as an example of extreme scare tactics. Edwards' concern was to show that although sinners do stand in danger of God's wrath, they are in the hands of one who is also compassionate, merciful, and loving to the repentant.

The heart of the Christian message is that God, against whom sin has been committed, rightly responds in wrath. His justice demands proper punishment for wrongdoers. However, God in love, mercy, and grace has, in Christ, acted to both satisfy his justice (Rom. 3:26) and to make forgiveness and salvation available in Christ. This is the balanced and correct impetus and message of the missionary enterprise.

J. JULIUS SCOTT JR.

Bibliography. L. L. Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*; R. V. G. Tasker, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Wrath of God*; G. Van Groningen, *EDBT*, pp. 845–46.