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

Apostle, Apostles. The numerous appearances of the word *apostle* in the New Testament compared with its relative absence from all other literary sources can be traced in part to its intimate relationship to the mission of the early church. The New Testament writers, especially Luke and Paul, picked up on Jesus' rare usage of the word to give importance to the missionary dynamic of the church. Apostle is almost synonymous with mission. The word is primarily used of the twelve men chosen by Jesus to accompany him and of Paul the missionary to the Gentiles. These, along with a small number of other apostles, were vanguard missionaries as the gospel moved from Jewish particularism to multicultural universalism.

According to the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, and the Epistles, Jesus specifically designated at least these thirteen people to be his apostles. The Twelve came out of Jesus' own sociocultural context, accompanying him on his mission to the Jews (Matt. 10:1–2; 15:24; John 20:21). One of the Twelve abandoned his apostolic office and was replaced by Matthias (Acts 1:16–26). Jesus chose a thirteenth apostle a few years after his ascension (1 Cor. 15:9). Together, they were specifically chosen to continue Jesus' mission. The Twelve functioned to authenticate Jesus' mission and message of the inclusion of the Gentiles (Gal. 2:1–10; Acts 1:16–26); Paul was chosen especially to implement and clarify the mission to the Gentiles.

Biblical Study of Apostleship. Apostle *(apostolos)* is defined by its use in the New Testament and its relationship to the three words *apostellō*, *pempō*, and the Twelve. *Apostellō* ("to send") is used frequently in the Gospels, Acts, and the Epistles when referring to an authoritative commission. John never uses the word in a formal sense; rather, he uses the words *apostellō* and *pempō* as synonymous terms describing Jesus' authoritative mission and commissioning (John 20:21).

Apostolos is used eighty times in the New Testament and rarely used outside the New Testament. Josephus used it only once in any comparative sense. Eighty-six percent of these 80 occurrences are found in the writings of Paul (35x) and Luke (34x). The 11 other uses are found throughout the New Testament.

The word *apostle* is indebted to the Hebrew term *shaliach*. A *shaliach*, as used by the Jews, was someone sent by one party to another to handle negotiations concerning matters secular (such as marriage) or matters religious (such as liturgical decisions between Jerusalem and the diaspora). But the universal mission of Jesus determined the precise New Testament definition and prominence of the term.

The New Testament use of apostle arose out of the need to authenticate a mission that reversed the particularistic nature of salvation history. This definition would stress (1) the relationship to Jesus and his incarnation, and (2) the Christian's participation in extending the mission begun by Jesus.

In its broadest sense the word *apostle* can refer to a church sending members on a mission

(1 Cor. 8:23; Phil. 2:23; Acts 14:4, 14). This mission can include preaching the gospel, raising money, or ministering to another missionary. The number of those included in this broader sense are unknown.

Apostles and Mission in Paul. From a literary and theological standpoint, the first definition of apostle can be traced to Paul's writings. He uses the word throughout his writings (35x), with its usage concentrated in 23 references in Romans (3x), 1 Corinthians (10x), 2 Corinthians (7x), and Galatians (3x). Paul's polemical use of this term can be traced to his Gentile mission (Rom. 1:5; 11:13; Gal. 1–2). The radical nature of Paul's preaching elicited opposition from Jews within and outside the church. How was Paul going to legitimate his mission and message? He was compelled to clarify his own special calling and commission. Thus, Paul's use of the term *apostle* was fundamentally missiological.

Paul's nonpolemical and even general use of this term in 1 Thessalonians 2:6, when compared with its use in his other early Epistles, shows the extent to which his use of the term is tied to his need to authenticate his mission. Paul allowed for a general use of the word *apostle* while clearly defending a technical use for an exclusive few. While he calls a number of people apostles, he sees the Twelve (1 Cor. 15:3) and himself (Gal. 1:1) as apostles in a special sense.

Paul's use of apostle in his discussion of his mission to the Gentiles shows the direct relationship between apostle and mission. The Twelve and Paul were responsible for clarifying the nature of the church's mission (Gal. 2:1–10). Jesus specifically chose the Twelve to extend his mission into the Jewish world and authenticate the Gentile mission. Paul's personal mission was to implement, defend, and clarify the mission to the Gentiles. Even when Paul stresses the revelational dimensions of the word *apostle,* the missiological implications remain prominent (Eph. 3:1–13).

Apostles and Mission in Luke. Luke uniformly uses the word *apostles* (pl.) in Luke–Acts (34x). He never specifically calls any one person an apostle. In all but three occurrences (Luke 11:49; Acts 14:4, 14) it is used of the twelve apostles chosen by Jesus. He uses the word six times in his Gospel and twenty-eight times in Acts. Whereas in his Gospel Luke calls the apostles disciples, in Acts he only calls them apostles. Luke alone specifically says that Jesus called the Twelve apostles (Luke 6:13).

Luke's view of apostleship as seen in Acts is rooted primarily in his missiology and only secondarily in his ecclesiology. The decision of the 120 in choosing an apostolic replacement for Judas is the central event between the ascension and Pentecost (1:12–26). Why does this decision on an apostolic replacement occupy such a prominent place in Luke's narrative? Luke accents its importance by giving the qualification and the definition of an apostle and by recording *only* this event between the ascension and Pentecost (1:21–25). An apostle is defined as someone who has followed Jesus from the time of John the Baptist until the resurrection. Second, his function is to bear witness to the resurrection (cf. Acts 1:15–26 with 1 Cor. 9:1ff.; 15:7–11).

The following conclusions can be drawn from Acts 1:15–26. The apostles are twelve in number; they must have accompanied Jesus since the time of his baptism; and their basic function is witnessing about the resurrection. Judas' betrayal of Christ and abandonment of his office were prophesied in the Old Testament. Second, God directed the entire electoral process, even in the casting of lots (24–26). Third, Matthias is "chosen" just as the eleven were (Acts 1:2, 13). These twelve Spirit-filled apostles chosen by Jesus will extend the mission begun by Jesus.

But why is it so important that Luke establish the apostolic Twelve as a unique group and what relationship does this have to the mission to the Gentiles? Luke's definition of apostleship is found in the context of his overall purpose in writing a two-volume narrative of early Christianity. For Luke, the inclusion of the Gentiles takes place, not as an aberration involving some marginal Christians, but through an unbroken procession that begins with Jesus and continues through the Hellenists and Paul. Luke wants to establish these twelve apostles chosen by Jesus as successors of Jesus, thus legitimizing the Gentile mission.

These twelve lay the foundation of the mission in their ministry in Jerusalem. They, then, confirm the strategic ministry of the Hellenists (Acts 6:1–7; 8:14–14). Peter's paradigmatic mission to the Gentiles reflects the nature of the church (Acts 10:1–11:18; 15:1–35; 16:4). All other witnesses who come after them are part of this chain of events that results in the inclusion of the Gentiles. The apostles' strategic role in salvation history is both missiological and ecclesiological. Out of their missionary ministry arises a church whose fundamental calling is to constantly push forward into those areas where the gospel has yet to be heard.

Luke's use of the word *apostle* for Paul (14:4, 14) merits a brief comment. In both of these instances Barnabas is equally linked with Paul, and in one instance (v. 14) the order of their names is reversed. Luke, like Paul, uses apostles in a secondary sense, that is, Barnabas and Paul are apostles of the Antiochene church. Does Luke's failure to call Paul an apostle in the primary sense indicate some tension between Paul's definition and Luke's? For Luke the Twelve are unique (with this Paul agrees, 1 Cor. 15:9; Gal. 2:1–10), but Paul receives even greater promi-

nence in Acts than do they. Paul's authority, mission, and effectiveness are, if anything, superior to those of the Twelve. But for Luke each has a special role to play in world evangelization.

Summary and Conclusion. The early church found in the word *apostle* a key concept for describing the unique nature of its mission. But it was Paul and Luke in particular who unpacked this term and left us with a rich theology of apostleship. An apostle is a person who was with Jesus during his incarnation (a Lukan concept), witnessed his resurrection, and participated in authenticating and engaging in worldwide missions.

While Paul and Luke have unique developments of apostleship, both agree that the twelve apostles chosen by Jesus became missionaries to the Jews and laid the foundation for a mission to the nations. Both Luke and Paul agree that Paul had a unique role in this mission. Paul's preference would be to use the term *apostle* to describe his authority and mission. Although Luke uses this for Paul only in a secondary sense, he would readily agree with Paul that his mission and calling are unique. The word *apostle* may be used in this secondary sense today, yet not without clarifying its meaning.

There is, then, a fundamental relationship between the concept of apostleship and the mission to the world. Any definition of the term *apostle* that neglects its missiological dimensions has missed a central ingredient, without which the term loses some of its dynamic.

HAROLD E. DOLLAR

Bibliography. F. Agnew, *JBL* 105 (1986): 75–96; F. W. Barnett, *DPHL,* pp. 45–51; A. C. Clark, *ERT* 13 (1989): 344–83; K. Lake, *Beginnings,* pp. 37–58; J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians,* pp. 92–101; K. H. Rengstorf, *TDNT,* 1:407–47.

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.*

Bible. The ultimate task of all forms of Christian missions is to tell of the Judeo-Christian God (Yahweh-Jehovah) and to report the salvation made available by his grace through the life and mission of Jesus Christ. This includes the proclamation of the call to repentance, faith for the forgiveness of sin, and life in fellowship with him. Christ's representatives also provide guidance for believers who seek to live worthy of and pleasing to him. All this information comes, not through human search or invention, but from God himself. The word "revelation," from the verb "to reveal" or "make known," names the doctrine that deals with God's showing or disclosing himself, his works, expectations, and provisions.

Theologians speak of both "general" and "special" revelation. The former refers to that knowledge of God available to all people, in all places, at all times. The latter is the knowledge of God available to only some people, in some times, and in some places.

GENERAL REVELATION consists of that which can be known about God in creation, nature, and the affairs of humans as a whole. Psalm 19:1–4 speaks eloquently of the evidence of God in nature. Romans 1:20–25 asserts that the created order demonstrates the fact of God's existence, power, and goodness. Humans, however, refused to pay heed to this evidence and did not honor him as God; they worshiped that which was created rather than the Creator. Consequently, "God gave them up to degrading passions" (1:26) and almost unspeakable degrading acts. Paul, before Athenian officials, says that God made all nations from a single ancestor; gives life, breath, and all things; allots the time and boundaries of human habitation "so that they should seek God; . . . he is not far from each one of us" (Acts 17:27). Indeed, observation of humanity itself, people created in the IMAGE OF GOD, should be a persuasive argument for the existence and power of God. Hebrews 11:6 affirms that to please God one must accept his existence and knowability; this, by implication, is available through general revelation. Those who fail to acknowledge this message are, says Paul, without excuse (Rom. 1:26).

Special Revelation consists first of all in God's work through the nation Israel, her history and prophets. Micah calls to remembrance events of the nation's past "that you may know the saving acts of the LORD" (6:5). It should, however, be noted that God's special revelation to and work through Israel had a missionary purpose. It is through her that "all the nations of the world shall be blessed" (Gen. 12:3); as a "priestly kingdom" (Exod. 19:6) she is to mediate between God and others. In Exodus 34:10 God says, "I will do marvels, . . . and all the people among whom you are shall see the work of the LORD."

Isaiah affirms that God's servant will be "a light to the nations" (49:6; cf. Acts 13:46–47). The supreme act of God's special revelation came in Jesus Christ through whom the Word "became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father" (John 1:14). In Jesus we become aware of the person, nature, and character of God, see him at work, learn that God loved the world so much that he gave his Son that believers might have life (John 3:16). In Christ we hear his invitation "come to me" (Matt. 11:28). God, in Jesus, shows himself as the holy and just judge of sin, the loving God, the dying-rising Savior, the King whose kingdom will never end and who one day will reign supreme over all. God's revelation in Israel and in Jesus also involves the work of God's close human associates, specially called, Spirit-filled persons, designated as "prophets" in the Old Testament and as "apostles" in the New. These were sent, commissioned, and authorized to speak for him. Their task was to report the facts of God's revelation and also to explain and show how to apply God's message in the affairs of daily life.

The doctrine of revelation must also include discussion of the Bible. The word "Bible" means "books"; it is a book composed of a collection of books. Together these comprise a religious book. Although it contains information on a number of topics and issues, its primary purpose, like that of many religious books, is to relate facts about God, the universe, and especially human beings in it, and their relationships. Christians believe that this is the only true religious book. All others speak of nonexistent deities and provide incorrect and even dangerous information.

The Bible is, above all, the record of the various forms of special revelation just described. Old Testament prophets and New Testament apostles wrote down virtually all we know of God's revealing work. This was not by human instigation. From Exodus 17:14 on we are told of God's command to "write." Because it is the usual source of information about God, this record is also revelation itself; it is the word of God. As the word and Spirit work together, God's revelation of himself in the past is his contemporary self-disclosure and message. It is just because of its inclusion within God's revelation that missionaries have given much time and effort to make the Bible available in the languages of the peoples with whom they work.

There are a number of terms used to describe some important facts about the origin, nature, and character of the Bible. "Inspiration" or the phrase "inspired by God" occurs in 2 Timothy 3:16. Literally it means "God-breathed," hence, it came out of God. Second Peter 1:21 describes the communication and process of recording Scripture even more explicitly by stating that "holy men" were "moved," literally "borne" or "carried" along by the Holy Spirit. "Inspiration," then, affirms that Scripture originated with God, it was given to specially chosen individuals, and God, through his Spirit, remained active in the writing process.

"Canon," meaning literally "measuring rod," refers to an authoritative standard against which other things are measured. When referring to the Bible, canon designates those individual documents or books that are rightfully a part of Scripture, written authority. Protestant Christians traditionally acknowledge a total of sixty-six books—thirty-nine in the Old Testament, twenty-seven in the New. Roman Catholics, Orthodox, and Anglican Christians also include additional books, the Apocrypha or Deutero-canonical books. These writings seem to have come largely from the Intertestamental period (c. 400 B.C.–A.D. 70) and were included in the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament, but apparently were not in the Hebrew Bible used in Palestine and Hebrew-speaking synagogues. The exact number of apocryphal books acknowledged varies among Christian groups who include them in their canon.

It is much easier to relate what the church did with regard to the canon than the basis upon which it acted. The Old Testament was taken over from Judaism. The three divisions of the Hebrew canon (Law, Prophets, and the Writings [in which division Psalms always stood first]) is implied in the words of Jesus in Luke 24:44. Early Hebrew-speaking Christians seemed to have used the shorter canon while those who read their Old Testament in Greek used the longer. Early Christian writers refer to three divisions of books which were put forward for inclusion in the New Testament: those acknowledged by all, those rejected by all, and those which were disputed. There seems to have been no question about twenty-two New Testament books. Hebrews, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, James, Jude, and possibly Revelation were among the books of the present New Testament canon about which questions seem to have been asked by one or another group; the noncanonical books of Barnabas, Hermas, Didache, Gospel of the Hebrews, and the Revelation of Peter were regarded highly, if not actually regarded as canonical, by some.

Evidence for the basis of canonicity is inconclusive. Traditionally much emphasis has been put upon the assumed author of a book. The word of an authentic spokesman for God, prophet or apostle, or someone closely associated with such a person (Baruch in the Old Testament, Mark and Luke in the New) is assumed to have been regarded as inspired whether it was issued orally or in writing. Additional criteria have been set forth on the basis of later examina-

tions of what the early church did rather than its own statement of them. Evangelical Christians assume, primarily by faith, that the same God who inspired Scripture remained as superintendent to assure the reliability of the recognition of the canon.

An important controversy centers upon the role of the church in the canonical process. It asks whether the church *authorized,* gave authority to the New Testament canon, or *recognized* the authority that is inherent within these writings because of their divine inspiration. The answer to this question must come from historical research. The practical implication is whether the church sits in judgment upon the Scriptures or the Scriptures upon the church.

The issue of canon is particularly important for missions, not only because of the claim that Scripture is the word of God, but because several groups advocate that additional material must be added to it. Islam, for example, makes this claim for the QUR'AN and Mormonism for the Book of Mormon. Christians insist that in showing himself personally in human form and by actually providing for the greatest need of humans in the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus, special revelation reached its climax and conclusion; nothing more can be added.

Two additional words often used in discussions of the Bible are "infallible" and "inerrant." The former designates the teachings of the Bible as absolutely authoritative and true. Inerrant means "without error," but those who use the term often disagree on whether they mean without error of any kind or in accomplishing God's purpose (*see* INERRANCY).

One final comment must be made regarding the Bible. Of almost equal importance with what one affirms about its nature is the question of how it is to be interpreted. Christendom, including its missionary endeavors, has all too often denied in practice the authority claims for Scripture by interpreting it in ways which fail to seek to grasp what the original writers (divine and human) intended and what the original readers understood. This must be a guide as one seeks to apply Scripture to the different geographical, cultural, and temporal settings of the contemporary world. Those concerned with HERMENEUTICS seek those principles involved in the art and science of making meaningful and relevant in one time and place that which was originally communicated in another time and place. This definition of hermeneutics is also a brief description of another term much used by missiologists, CONTEXTUALIZATION.

Modern missionaries, following the apostle Paul, may properly begin with general revelation and then move to special revelation. It is through these that God has made available the message, the only legitimate message, about himself, the universe, and their relationship which is at the heart of the missionary endeavor.

J. JULIUS SCOTT JR.

Bibliography. G. C. Berkhouwer, *General Revelation;* C. F. H. Henry, *God, Revelation and Authority;* L. Morris, *I Believe in Revelation;* J. I. Packer, *Fundamentalism and the Word of God;* B. B. Warfield, *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible.*

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 rais-

ing 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 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.*

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 pur-

poses 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 in-

volved 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 Af-

rica, 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.*

Church Discipline. The practice of church discipline is mandated in the New Testament teaching of Christ and modeled in Acts and the Epistles. Inherent in the implications of the commission to "make disciples of all nations," church discipline is the responsibility and ministry of the local church body to its members. Whether the gentle admonition of an erring Christian brother (Gal. 6:1) or the dramatic action of excommunication of a persistently unrepentant member from the fellowship of a local church, the need for the church to monitor and care for its own is clearly taught. While formal disciplinary procedures become the responsibility of the church gathered, church discipline begins with a direct and personal appeal of a Christian brother by another who has been sinned against. Christ's teaching recorded in Matthew 18:15–17 outlines the procedures to be followed in the process of confronting a fellow believer. It should be noted that this passage allows the use of a mediator for the private confrontation in cultures where mediators are a necessity in conflict resolution. If a personal and private appeal goes unheeded, it is to be followed by the direct confrontation by the personal testimony of one or two other witnesses. In the case of continued refusal to acknowledge wrongdoing, a public exposure before the gathered church is to culminate in exclusion from the worship and fellowship of the body.

Biblical examples of discipline are found in churches planted by Paul and in the exercise of his apostolic authority. The specific offenses mentioned include blatant moral sin (1 Cor. 5:1–13), idleness and disregard of apostolic instruction (2 Thess. 3:6), and doctrinal deviation (1 Tim. 1:19; 2 Tim. 2:17–18). The purpose and goal is always the full restoration of the sinning member and the purity of the church (1 Cor. 5:6–8; 2 Cor. 2:6–8).

Church discipline is a doctrine difficult to teach and practice, especially in cross-cultural or multi-cultural mission contexts. Theological, cultural, and practical issues and problems must be considered when seeking to teach and implement the biblical principles and practice of discipline.

The problems of nominalism, SYNCRETISM, and CHRISTO-PAGANISM which have plagued the Christian church wherever it has been planted, are directly addressed by the practice of church discipline. New converts who have been properly taught and held accountable by other mature and consistent Christians and church leaders are generally more likely to make a break from past non-Christian practices. But the practical matter of who should be considered a "member" of a local flock and thus subject to the privileges and responsibilities of church fellowship, including submission to church discipline, has proven to be problematic in many instances. An observed trend in contexts where different denominational

churches have been planted is for converts under discipline in one church to escape to another rival fellowship which may have a very different view of church discipline.

Teaching church discipline in a cultural context in which well defined TABOOS exist can prove to be both a help and a hindrance in teaching biblical church discipline. While the idea of being responsible to the community for one's actions is understood, problems may arise in understanding the biblical concepts of SIN and the related purposes of church discipline.

The punishment and payment demanded for breaking a taboo must be distinguished from the restorative purpose of church discipline based on the biblical doctrines of sin, atonement, justification, and sanctification. Any prevailing notion of payment of a penalty to restore harmony or work of penance for an offense must be countered in teaching the biblical purpose and practice of church discipline.

In cultures where face saving is a high value, confrontation about sin becomes a serious breach of cultural values and is often avoided at all costs, especially in the case of another tribesman or a leader. In such cases cultural values dictate that GUILT before God is not as important as the potential of SHAME before people, even for leaders of the church who may have misused their authority and committed sins demanding the imposition of church discipline. In many of these cultures, a hierarchical leadership style is customary and the leader, including the pastor or church authority is to be highly honored and implicitly obeyed. Cases of the misuse of church discipline for the purpose of manipulation, control, imposing authority, and forcing submission on the flock are not uncommon in such situations. Abuses of ecclesiastical power, especially in the use of church discipline, are not new, as a study of church history reveals. The truth of the corporate nature of official church discipline usually is lost in such cases.

For many churches in Africa, the problems of adultery and polygamy are prevalent and yet are extremely difficult to adjudicate in reference to church discipline. Cultural marriage customs (e.g., levirate marriage, *see* MARRIAGE; MARRIAGE PRACTICES) may create situations which demand wisdom and skill to determine a resolution which will maintain the integrity and purpose of the practice of church discipline (as do divorce cases in other settings). The practice of some churches is to exclude from the rite of communion disciplined members discovered to have sinned and then restore them after one month of probationary observation and abstinence from the forbidden activity. The propensity of this procedure to lead to legalism has prompted one veteran missionary in Africa to call the practice of church discipline "the first really significant her-esy which the African churches are in a position to produce" (Trobisch).

Some of the problems experienced in the implementation of church discipline in mission contexts may be a result of the culturally conditioned practices of sending churches, missionaries, and sending agencies. A failure by sending churches to model church discipline at home or with erring missionaries has caused confusion for the younger churches. Reluctance of some early church planting missionaries to entrust the function of church discipline to national leaders of the churches they planted has been misunderstood and resented. Yet experience in places like New Guinea has shown that biblically trained and spiritually mature leaders of the indigenous church are often more discerning than the expatriate missionaries of the cultural, theological, and practical issues in cases needing discipline and wisdom in the application of the biblical injunctions. Teaching biblical truths concerning church discipline is the function of the church, not an individual. Understanding that church discipline is a means of preserving and protecting the purity of the body can help ensure appropriate application of this crucial doctrine, in every cultural context in which the Christian church is planted.

RICHARD D. CALENBERG

Bibliography. J. R. Davis, *PA* 13:5 (September–October, 1966): 193–98; D. Elmer, *Cross-Cultural Conflict;* W. Trobisch, *The Complete Works of Walter Trobisch.*

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 objective 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.*

Dreams and Visions. Dreams and visions are common universal phenomena, neither restricted to particular peoples nor historical eras. Technically, dreams are related to the state of sleep, while visions occur in trance-like states when people are awake. However, because of their often ecstatic nature and revelatory character, dreams and visions function in much the same manner. They are both important mediums of divine revelation in Scripture. In fact, they are explicitly mentioned or alluded to almost two hundred times in the Bible. Thus, dreams and visions play an important role in the drama of redemption.

Dreams and visions were prevalent throughout antiquity. For example, the royal courts of both Mesopotamia and Egypt had wise men who were professional interpreters of dreams. In the Greek world, sophisticated systems of interpretation were developed as well. Overall, there was an excessive preoccupation with dreams and visions in the Ancient Near East and the Greco-Roman world.

This is the not the case in Scripture, however. The elements that dominated the dream world of antiquity—the riotous superstition, perversion, curiosity, and obsession with one's fate—are lacking in the Bible. When viewed in this light, the biblical description of dreams and visions, while pervasive, is restrained and sober.

The Bible emphasizes that dreams and visions are typical mediums of divine revelation: "When a prophet of the LORD is among you, I reveal myself to him in visions, I speak to him in dreams" (Num. 12:6; cf. 1 Sam. 3:1; 28:6, 15; Hos. 12:10). The prophets usually received their messages through dreams or visions (Isa. 1:1; Ezek. 1:1; Daniel).

In the New Testament, dreams and visions are described as characteristic of the age of the Spirit. The apostle Peter, quoting the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit, notes that the church is to be a prophetic community, a community where "young men will see visions . . . old men will dream dreams" (Acts 2:17).

This emphasis on dreams and visions is outlined in Acts. Luke gives numerous illustrations of visions in the early church. Ananias receives a vision regarding Paul (9:10). Paul is converted through a vision (26:19). Through visions, God prepares the Gentile Cornelius to receive the gospel and prepares the Jew, Peter, to preach the gospel (chaps. 10–11). The famous Macedonian call comes through a vision (16:9). And at Corinth, Paul is encouraged by God to keep preaching the gospel through a vision (18:9–10).

What do these data suggest? What are the missiological implications of the Bible's teaching on dreams and visions? While not a normal part of the Western evangelical experience, dreams and visions are biblical and play an important part of life for people in the Two-Thirds World. Only someone with an extreme anti-supernatural bias would deny their relevance to missions.

Second, dreams and visions are mediums of revelation. God speaks through dreams and visions to convert sinners (Paul and Cornelius) as well as to encourage and guide his people (Ananias, Peter, Paul). He does the same today. Even the most conservative branches of Christianity are reporting the use of dreams and visions in the conversion of the unreached. Just as God used a vision to convert Paul, in like manner he is revealing himself to Muslims, Hindus, and Buddhists. Just as God prepared Cornelius to hear the gospel through dreams, so too is God preparing a multitude of unreached peoples to respond to his Good News.

As a missionary God, God's method of communication is incarnational. He enters into our world to communicate his message. His revelation is contextual (*see* CONTEXTUALIZATION) and thus he meets people where they are. Because many of the unreached are beyond the reach of the gospel and because much of the world is illiterate, dreams and visions are particularly relevant. Moreover, similar to the case of Cornelius, dreams or visions about Jesus often prepare the way for the message of the evangelist.

God is sovereign and never limited to human agency. He uses and will continue to use dreams and visions to fulfill his GREAT COMMISSION. Nevertheless, his use of dreams and visions in mission in no way minimizes the role of missionaries. Visions and missionaries were involved in the conversion of both Paul and Cornelius (Ananias and Peter). Whether God communicates supernaturally through dreams and visions or not, missionaries are always needed.

To affirm the reality and even need of dreams and visions to help fulfill the Great Commission in no way deprecates the priority and centrality of the Word of God. The Bible is the exclusive medium of special revelation, whereas dreams and visions are at best only supplementary and secondary.

Moreover, dreams or visions are not always divinely inspired. They can also be psychologically or satanically inspired. Because of this, new converts must be taught discernment. They must learn to examine their dreams and visions in light of Scripture. They also need to submit their dreams and visions to the leaders of their churches who will help them determine if God is speaking.

The Bible is God's full and final revelation in written form, our highest objective authority. We must examine all things by the Word of God. Moreover, Jesus primarily speaks to us through the Bible. However, he is not bound to the Bible alone. He also speaks to and guides his church through dreams and visions. To deny this supplementary and secondary form of revelation (dreams and visions), is to deny teaching of our primary medium of revelation, the Bible!

RICHARD D. LOVE

Bibliography. D. E. Aune, *ISBE* Revised, IV:993–94; R. J. Budd, *NIDNTT*, I:511–12; M. Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation;* A. Oepke, *TDNT*, V:220–38; J. H. Stek, *ISBE* Revised, I:991–92; J. G. S. S. Thompson, *NBD*, p. 1239; J. G. S. S. Thompson and J. S. Wright, *NBD*, pp. 289–90.

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.*

Financing Missions. *Biblical Models*. Three biblical models of financing missionary efforts are found in the life of Paul. He wrote to the Philippians that he had learned to trust God in all circumstances to provide his needs (Phil. 4:12–14). A tentmaker by trade (Acts 18:3), he mentioned to the Ephesians and the Thessalonians that he provided his own needs through his labor (Acts 20:34 and 1 Thess. 2:9). TENT-MAKING MISSION, as it is known today, is named after this practice. In writing to the Corinthians, however, Paul directly urged them to give generously (2 Cor. 8–9). His flexibility for financing missionary work illustrates a general principle that any method which is ethically sound and God-honoring may be considered acceptable.

Types of Missionary Support. The most common method of mission funding has long been the voluntary contribution of members of local churches, though there are multiple means used to channel what is given to where it is needed. Some denominational missions assess member churches on a per capita basis to fund the denominational mission efforts, while others allow each church to develop its own mission budget and give money as it sees fit. Non-denominational mission agencies also serve as administrative conduits through which money is collected and distributed (*see also* FAITH MISSIONS). Many agencies require each missionary to raise his or her own individual support, while others form a central pool for which every missionary raises money and out of which all salaries and project funding comes.

Following Paul's example (Acts 18:3), many continue to engage in tent-making mission. This is perhaps the most common method of financing Third-World missionaries, whose churches and agencies often do not have the financial capability to underwrite international travel or urban mission work among the economic elite in the major cities of the world.

Since the dawn of political states looking favorably on Christianity, missions have also been financed out of state treasuries, including financial grants, land grants, and imperial patronages. During the colonial era, many Protestant efforts were financed by colonial grant-in-aid deals which mutually benefited missionary and colonial enterprise. The resulting entanglements of church and state, however, often left a mixed perception on the part of both missionaries and the national churches, with the latter seeing the former as agents of the supporting state rather than ambassadors of Christ.

Finally, contemporary economic trends in the West have enabled the development of numerous private foundations and trust funds, many of which underwrite projects and otherwise finance Christian charitable work as well as direct evangelistic endeavors.

Issues in Financing Mission. Recently, however, several issues of significance for future mission financing have been raised. First, at least in North America, mission giving has largely come out of discretionary income, which has been drying up over the last few decades. While a wealthy generation that is now in process of dying has been leaving large gifts to missionary work in wills and trust funds, such giving is generally not projected to extend beyond this generation.

Second, many Western churches and agencies have begun to build giving policies around the financing of Third World missionaries, who are significantly cheaper than Western missionaries. In general this emphasis, based on new thinking of global partnership and cost-effectiveness, is a welcome change. Unfortunately, however, for some it has become an inappropriate vehicle to call for a cessation of supporting Western missionaries altogether (*see also* FOREIGN FINANCING OF INDIGENOUS WORKERS).

Third, some rightly question the amount that Western missionaries feel they must raise, which often adds up to many thousands of dollars per month to finance family travel and lifestyles which are often well above the level of indigenous populations along with benefits such as health insurance and retirement income. The implications of this for giving patterns and priorities is now being felt in churches, mission agencies, and on the various fields of service (Bonk; *see also* MISSIONARY AFFLUENCE).

Fourth, control of money and exercise of power cannot be separated as easily as we might like. This is especially significant when foreign funds have been used to initiate and preserve large missionary institutions (e.g., schools, and hospitals) which the local economy could not support unaided. Such institutions have tended to foster dependence rather than PARTNERSHIP in missionary efforts.

Finally, alarms over future Western missionary funding has begun to sound in many quarters. Models that have become traditional in the West, such as the mission agency relying on local churches to passively and unquestioningly give whenever approached, no longer hold. Discretionary finances in the consumer-driven Western cultures appear to be dwindling, as in commitment to traditional mission fund-raising techniques.

In light of these factors, it will be increasingly important in the future to find new and appropriate ways to creatively trust God to supply the necessary means for engaging in the missionary task. However, since it is God's intention to see the whole world reached, it does not seem unreasonable to assume that he will continue to provide the means to do so, though not necessarily in the ways we expect and not without our taking seriously our responsibility to the GREAT COMMISSION.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. J. Bonk, *Missions and Money: Affluence as a Western Missionary Problem;* L. Bush, *Funding Third World Missions; CDCWM,* pp. 208–9; J. F. Engel, *A Clouded Future: Advancing North American World Missions;* J. Ronsvale and S. Ronsvale, *Behind the Stained Glass Windows.*

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.

<div align="right">ARTHUR F. GLASSER</div>

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

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 co-equality 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 history. 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, empower-

ing 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.

Itinerant Mission. Itinerant mission work is usually done for short periods and rapidly changes its mode of operation. Because of various handicaps, an itinerant missionary likely has a short-term presence in the targeted context and works until interrupted by government intervention or the realization of the mission's objectives. The roving nature of the work mitigates against establishing institutions and requires focused evangelistic and mission goals.

The apostle Paul engaged in itinerant mission work. He went to specific locations to accomplish the clear objectives of proclaiming the gospel and establishing new churches. He was usually "on the move" and his tasks required him to appoint leaders and then set out for new territories and regions beyond those where he had already worked (Rom. 15:20; 2 Cor. 10:16).

Historically, itinerant types of mission and evangelism result from various sociopolitical restrictions. As migrant Christians rove throughout the world and engage in witnessing, they perform unintentional itinerant mission work. Intentional itinerant mission efforts may result when people migrate into new geographic areas. In the pioneer sections of the United States during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, circuit-riding preachers did itinerant ministries to service areas where there were not enough gospel laborers for the rising population. At the same time, itinerant work was necessary for those opening up frontier missions in the interior sections of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. Pioneering situations normally require self-imposed itinerant mission work because of limited personnel and resources.

Since World War II, new pioneer situations have emerged that are based on political circumstances rather than geographical ones. Independent nations born in the aftermath of the European colonial era established laws regulating foreign nationals in their countries. Often significantly sized population segments or people groups within these countries were historically resistant to Christian influence, especially if it seemed to be controlled by foreign agencies. These governments tended to repeal or restrict visas and residence permits that had been issued to those suspected to be foreign Christian missionaries.

Doing mission in these new types of frontier territories requires utilization of short-term visa options or seeking long-term visas under the auspices of secular humanitarian, disaster relief, or international commercial enterprises (*see* CREATIVE ACCESS COUNTRIES). "TENTMAKING" describes the way the apostle Paul supplemented his income while doing itinerant mission work (Acts 20:33–34). Modern tentmakers employ their skills and talents to achieve as permanent a status as possible in politically restricted countries by working for these secular enterprises. Often they draw their livelihood from their secular work, though this is not inherent to the tentmaking concept. Because their visa status is still short-term, the duration of the work is equally short. Itinerant missionaries must achieve their evangelistic, discipling, and church-planting objectives with optimum results in as expeditious a manner as possible.

KEITH E. EITEL

Bibliography. R. Allen, *Missionary Methods St. Paul's or Ours;* D. Barrett and T. M. Johnston, *Our Globe and How to Reach It;* V. D. Garrison, *The Nonresidential Missionary.*

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.

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, vital 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 revolutionary 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.*

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.*

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 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 Dei*, 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.

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 MC-GAVRAN 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.*

New Testament Theology of Mission. The New Testament is first and foremost a missionary document in the sense that it details the carrying out of God's plan of salvation for the world. Perhaps the best single portrayal of this is the "chain of revelation" in the Gospel of John, in which God reaches the world first through Jesus as the Sent One. Then the Father and Son "send" the Holy Spirit and finally the Godhead "sends" the disciples to encounter the world with the demands of God and thereby to force decision. The means by which this is accomplished is called "mission," which technically, in John, means the process of sending chosen heralds with the gospel message of salvation.

Theology of Mission in the Gospels and Acts. One positive result of redaction criticism is the realization that each Gospel contains its own portrayal of Jesus and its own theological emphasis (*see also* JESUS AND MISSION). We will begin with Mark because of the likelihood that

Mark was the first Gospel. The centrality of mission in Mark can be seen in the framing of Mark's prologue with "gospel" (1:1, 15). Jesus comes as one proclaiming the "good news" about the "KINGDOM OF GOD," calling for "repentance" and "faith-decision" (1:14, 15). The kingdom refers to the inbreaking of God's rule into history. Jesus taught it as both present (Mark 3:27; cf. Matt. 12:28; Luke 17:20–21) and future (Mark 1:15; cf. Luke 21:31). The disciples are thus heralds of the kingdom message, calling the lost to God. In this sense there is a progression of agents, from the prophets (12:2–5) to John the Baptist (1:2–3; 11:32) to the disciples, who from the start are "apostles" or "sent ones" (3:13–15), to the Son himself (1:38; 9:37). The disciples are called from the start to be "fishers of men" and to leave everything to do so (1:16–20; 10:28). Jesus warns them to expect terrible opposition (13:9–13) in their mission to the nations (13:10) but tells them that their task is worldwide proclamation (3:14; 14:9). Jesus' way is one of suffering (8:31; 9:30-31; 10:33–34), and the disciples are called to imitate Christ by "bearing their cross" with Jesus (8:34). One of Mark's major themes is discipleship failure (6:52; 8:14–21; 9:14–32; 14:27, 32–41, 50–52; 16:8) but Jesus provides the answer when he promises to meet them as Risen Lord and overcome their weaknesses (14:28; 16:7). In the midst of failure to understand and remain faithful, the disciple in mission is promised the presence of the Risen Lord.

Matthew's mission theme is built upon Mark's but expands several emphases. At the outset, there is an antinomy. Matthew has the greatest emphasis on particularism, that the mission is only for the Jews (10:5, 6; 15:24). At the same time, the Gentile mission is given an important place from the start, as the Gentile Magi are the first to come (drawn by a divinely sent star) to worship the newborn Messiah (2:1f.). In short, Matthew is a salvation-historical chronicle of the movement of God's plan of salvation in three stages: from the mission of the prophets (23:37; cf. 21:34–36; 22:3–6) and John the Baptist (3:1–12; 11:7–14) to the mission of Jesus that is the core of the first Gospel to the mission of the disciples to the nations that concludes the Gospel (28:18–20) . Each stage prepares for the following step. The Jewish mission is the core of the first two stages, and the universal mission is the goal of the third. In this sense "the gospel of the kingdom" called both Jews (4:23; 9:35) and "all nations" (24:14) to repentance. In fact, the mission to the Jews was in reality the first stage of the universal mission, which in Matthew is linked to the eschaton (13:24–30; 24:14). A major theme in mission is rejection, as the disciples must expect the same hatred and persecution as Jesus suffered (10:17–36; see vv. 24–26 on sharing Jesus' suffering). But the goal of it all is to bring the Jewish people and the nations to faith (a key element in the miracle stories) and obedience. (The ethical requirements of the kingdom are central to the Sermon on the Mount.)

Mission in Luke–Acts is at the heart of the New Testament emphasis. The two should be considered together, for they form two volumes of a single story, detailing the divine plan of salvation as it moves from Jesus to the early church. In fact, one of the major themes of Acts is that the church relives and carries on the life and ministry of Jesus, seen in parallels between Luke and Acts in miracle stories, the road to Jerusalem/Rome, and the trials of Jesus and Paul. The two points of continuity between the life of Jesus and the church's mission are the temple (inaugurating both volumes) and the Holy Spirit (central to both). Soteriology is the primary theme, with the three major aspects coming together in Luke 24:47—REPENTANCE (25 times in Luke–Acts vs. 10 total in the other Gospels), FORGIVENESS OF SINS (9 in Luke–Acts vs. 3 total in the rest of the New Testament), and proclamation of the gospel (the heart of Acts; *see* PROCLAMATION EVANGELISM). In Luke we have salvation procured for the world, and in Acts we have salvation proclaimed to the world. In preparation for Acts, the universal mission is even more emphasized in Luke than in the other Synoptic Gospels, as in: (1) Simeon calling Jesus "a light of revelation for the Gentiles" (2:32); (2) 3:4–6, Luke adds to the Isaianic "voice in the wilderness" (Isa. 40:3–4) the statement in 40:5, "And all mankind will see God's salvation"; (3) Jesus' inaugural address of 4:18–27, which concludes with a turn from the Jews to the Gentiles (vv. 25–27); (3) Jesus' deliberate ministry to Gentiles (7:1f.; 8:26f.; 17:11f.); (4) Jesus stressing Gentile openness (7:9; 11:30–32; 13:29).

All this comes to fruition in Acts, as the mission is launched in two stages, Jesus' resurrection command (1:8) and the coming of the Spirit to launch the mission (2:1–12). Yet it takes time for the church to understand God's will. They apparently understood Jesus in terms of the Old Testament centripetal approach (*see* OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY OF MISSION), for they remained in Jerusalem, seemingly waiting for the Gentiles to come to them. The Spirit had to force them out in a series of steps to the Gentile mission, first in the PERSECUTION following STEPHEN's manifesto (8:1–3), then Samaria (8:4–25) and the Ethiopian eunuch (8:26–40), followed by the conversion of Paul, the missionary to the Gentiles (ch. 9), and finally the conversion of Gentile Cornelius (ch. 10). At each stage, supernatural leading was evident. The missionary journeys demonstrated several themes: evangelism and follow-up; flexible methods demonstrating sensitivity to culture; home-based church planting methods; the CONTEXTUALIZATION of the gospel for both urban and rural settings; and primarily the

centrality of the empowering presence of the HOLY SPIRIT. Acts might better be entitled "The Acts of the Holy Spirit through the Apostles." It is the work of the Spirit that is carried out by the church, and the Spirit sends, guides, and empowers the human agents in carrying out God's mission.

An important subsidiary element in Luke–Acts is the ministry of Jesus and the church to the outcasts. Luke wants to show that the kingdom completely reverses all earthly mores, and so shows that Jesus and the disciples are especially oriented to the poor and the oppressed, as in the quotation from Isaiah 61:1–2 in the inaugural address of Luke 4:18–19, "The Spirit of the Lord . . . has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. . . ." This continues throughout Luke's Gospel (1:51–53; 3:11–14; 6:20–26; 12:13–33; 16:8b–13, etc.) and Acts (2:44–45; 4:32–35, etc.). The debate between EVANGELISM and SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY in modern missions would be a false one for Luke. For him, to have one without the other produces a truncated gospel.

Mission in John has often been overlooked. Several recent studies have shown that mission is at the heart of John's purpose, which was two-fold—to bring unconverted Jews to Christ, and to involve the church in God's mission. Let us begin with the "chain of revelation" introduced above. (1) In the prologue Jesus is called the "Word" (1:1, 2, 14), which means he is the "living revealer" of the Father; to meet Jesus is to encounter the presence of God. As such he is also the "sent one" (stressed over thirty times in the Gospel), which means he is the *shaliach* or "envoy" of God to the "world" (105 of the New Testament's 185 occurrences are in John). His task is to call the world to faith-decision, stressed in three word groups—"believe" (98 times), "know" (two words used 141 times), and "see" (five verbs used 114 times). God's universal salvific love (1:4, 7, 9; 3:16) has brought salvation to the world and called it to respond to the new "life" (66 times in John) in Jesus. (2) In the farewell discourse, the Holy Spirit as the *paraclete* (the best translation is probably "Advocate") is also a "sent one," being given or sent twice by the Father (14:16, 25) and twice by the Son (15:26; 16:7). He will carry the "witness" of the Father and the Son (15:26) into the new age begun by Christ. (3) The followers of Jesus become "sent ones" (17:18; 20:21) and continue the mission to the world. In the resurrection commission of 20:21–23, they are sent by the entire Godhead and filled with the divine presence. Furthermore, they continue Jesus' function as judge (5:22, 30; 8:15–16; 9:39) in verse 23, for as the world responds to their mission, "whatsoever sins you forgive are forgiven, and whatsoever sins you retain are retained."

Mission Theology in Paul (*see also* PAUL AND MISSION). It is difficult to capture the message of so voluminous and deep a thinker as Paul. Virtually everything in his ministry and writings touches on the concept of mission, so all we can do is highlight key aspects. Before the Damascus road experience, Paul was a committed Jewish particularist, and so his conversion completely reversed his direction in life and all that he stood for. Paul's commission to mission came in three stages—the voice of Christ (Acts 26:16–18; cf. Gal. 1:15–16), the confirmation of Ananias (9:15), and a later vision in the temple (22:21). From that time Paul viewed himself as a pioneer missionary with a global rather than local vision (2 Cor. 10:15–16) who sought to bring the gospel to "those who have not heard" (Rom. 10:14). Those brought to Christ were his "joy and crown" (1 Thess. 2:19) and "the seal of my apostleship in the Lord" (1 Cor. 9:2). Yet evangelism was not his sole purpose; he strongly felt the responsibility to disciple those converted (following the GREAT COMMISSION), so he followed up on his churches by visit and letter (in this sense all his epistles are "follow-up"!) and continually dealt with problems in his churches.

Paul's mission strategy begins with his concept of revelation. God has revealed his plan of salvation and enacted it in the sacrificial death of his Son. This message must now be proclaimed (Rom. 10:14–15). The gospel is not just a message to be preached; it is the light of God shining in a world of darkness (2 Cor. 4:3–6), an eschatological revelation of that "mystery" hidden from the foundation of the world (Rom. 11:25; 16:25–26; Eph. 3:2–6). Mission is thereby an eschatological unfolding, a culmination of the divine intent from eternity past. In its united mission the church manifests the "manifold wisdom of God" to the cosmic powers, telling them in effect that they have lost. This victory is based upon the sovereignty of God and upon the cosmic reconciliation of "all things in heaven and earth" achieved by Christ (Col. 1:19–20). According to Colossians 2:15 Christ achieved this victory after the cross when he "disarmed," "triumphed over," and "made public display" (imagery of the Roman triumph) of the evil POWERS. The church participates in this reconciling and triumphant work by "proclaiming" the "hope of the Gospel" to "every creature under heaven" (Col. 1:23). The universal mission is the great mystery of God, and it needs the focus and priority of the people of God.

For Paul eschatology, Christology, and soteriology intertwine. The redemptive-historical act of God in Jesus is the basis of mission. All of history points to the life and sacrificial death of Christ on the cross as its mid-point. The sin and guilt brought about by Adam have now been expiated by the gracious gift of Christ (Rom. 5:12–

21), leading to the justification of the sinner (Rom. 3:21–26). The creeds and hymns of the early church reflect upon the humiliation/exaltation of Christ (Rom. 1:3–4; Eph. 1:3–14; Phil. 2:6–11; Col. 1:15–20; 1 Tim. 3:16), and the unbeliever participates in this via faith-decision and confession (Rom. 10:9–10). This gracious and merciful act of God provides the content of mission. Paul believed strongly in a contextualized message and strategy in which the missionary became "all things to all people" in any area not contrary to the gospel "in order to win some" (1 Cor. 9:19–23). He adapted his message to reach the people where they were, centering on fulfillment of Scripture for Jews (Acts 13:16–43) and upon natural revelation for Gentiles (see Acts 14:14–18; 17:22–31).

Mission Theology in the General Epistles. The General Epistles do not all center upon mission. Some are primarily pastoral, like James, 2 Peter–Jude, or the Johannine epistles. The two that contain mission principles are Hebrews and 1 Peter. Hebrews defines itself as a "word of exhortation" (13:22), a pastoral homily addressing a church tempted to return to Judaism due to persecution. There are two primary themes, christology (the superiority of Christ) and soteriology (the pilgrimage theme). God is the one who completes his revelatory acts by speaking through his Son, the culmination of his plan (1:1–3). Indeed, all of Scripture points to fulfillment in him. Thereby he is superior to the angels (1:4–2:18), to Moses and Joshua (chs. 3–4), to the priesthood (chs. 5–7), and to the covenant, sanctuary, and sacrifices (ch. 8–10). Christ is not only the Son exalted to the right hand of God (1:2–3; 8:1; 10:12) but also has authority over this creation (1:2, 8, 10) and the angelic orders (1:9). Christ alone has made salvation possible by his once for all sacrifice (9:12, 26–28; 10:10–14). Hebrews does not discuss a mission to the Gentiles, but there is a witness theme. Like the heroes of the faith in chapter 11, who witness with their sacrificial lives (12:1), and like Jesus, who is the final model of those who are willing to "resist to the point of shedding blood" (12:2–4), believers are called to a life of pilgrimage. They must run the "race" (12:1–2) and consider themselves "strangers" in this world (11:9, 13), oriented not to the present but to a future reality, "a better country—a heavenly one" (11:10, 16). This means a willingness to "bear the disgrace (Christ) bore" (13:13). The contribution of Hebrews to a mission theology deals with the negative side, rejection and persecution, as the people of God witness through suffering.

First Peter is also written to a suffering church, and like Hebrews it calls for believers to consider themselves called by God to be temporary visitors and resident aliens on this earth (1:1, 17; 2:11). The message of this book is that the mission, when conducted in the midst of terrible hostility, calls upon the believers to witness via exemplary lives of goodness. The theme is given in 2:12: when the pagans slander you as being evildoers, let your conduct so shine that they observe your goodness, are convicted by it, and "glorify God in the day of visitation" (*see also* 2:15). "Glorify God" means they are converted and then glorify God at the last judgment. Peter then shows how this works out in the three primary relationships Christians have—to government (2:13–17), to master-slave (2:18–25) and then wife-husband (3:1–7) relationships. Christ is the model for a proper reaction to hostility, for he refused to retaliate and instead entrusted himself to God (2:21–24). So his followers must also become models of faith and goodness when the world turns against them (4:19). That is their mission. For Peter mission is an eschatological journey, done in light of the blessings of salvation (1:3–12; 2:4–10) and at all times looking forward to the culmination of mission in eternity (1:4; 3:22; 4:7). With this in mind, in spite of persecution the people of God are always ready to respond to queries with gentleness and a life that proves the validity of the gospel (3:15–16).

Mission Theology in Revelation. Many have said that there is no mission in this book, since it deals with cosmic war and the end of human history. However, a close study shows a distinct and profound message. The major theme of the book is the SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD, and in the cosmic war the sub-theme is the futility of SATAN. Divine control is subsumed in the verb "was given" which occurs often in two key passages, the four horsemen of the Apocalypse (6:2, 4, 8) and the coming of the Beast (13:5, 7). This verb tells us that God (the giver) is in control of the forces of evil. They can do nothing without his permission. Moreover, everything Satan does is merely a parody or great imitation of what God has already done perfectly, such as the mortal wound healed (= resurrection), the mark of the beast (= God sealing the saints), the false trinity of 16:13. Armageddon is not the great defeat of Satan. It is actually his final act of defiance, for the war was won by the "slain Lamb" on the cross (the predominant title of Christ in the book).

Mission is the outgrowth of the activity of the slain Lamb, and it is far more predominant than has often been thought. In fact, Richard Bauckham (1993; 238–337) has noted that "the conversion of the nations" is a major theme of the book. The "nations" are not just predestined to judgment but are called to repentance. In fact, 14:6–7 shows that one of the purposes of the seals, trumpets, and bowls is not just to pour out JUDGMENT but to prove God's sovereignty over the earthly gods (the trumpets and bowls are built upon the Egyptian plagues of Exodus) and thus to proclaim "the eternal gospel" and call the na-

tions to "fear God and give him glory." The earth-dwellers reject that offer and refuse to repent (9:20, 21; 16:9, 11, though the refusal shows the call to repentance was real), but apparently some do repent and give "glory to the God of heaven" in 11:13. Moreover, the nations produce those "purchased" by the blood of Christ (5:9), worshipers before God (15:4), the "multitude" standing before the throne in 7:9, and the saints who bring their glory and honor into the New Jerusalem (21:24–26).

The saints are militant during the Great Tribulation not by fighting back (13:10) but by witnessing through their perseverance and their proclamation of the one true God. The use of lamp-stands for the church (1:12, 20) may well symbolize its witnessing activity, and the WITNESS theme is central to the book. Jesus as the "faithful witness" (1:5; 3:14) is the model, and the saints are called to the interdependent perseverance and witness. As seen often above, witness leads to PERSECUTION, and the mission of the church via *martyria* ("witness") ends in MARTYRDOM, as in 12:11 where the believers "conquer" the dragon by "the word of their testimony" in that "they did not love their lives so as to shrink from death" (see also 6:9). It is clear that the people of God are pictured as engaged in missionary activity even as they are hunted down by the forces of the Beast, and that some respond to their witness and have their place in the eternal city.

GRANT. R. OSBORNE

Bibliography. R. Bauckham, *The Climax of Prophecy: Studies on the Book of Revelation;* D. J. Bosch, *Transformation Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission;* A. Glasser, *Kingdom and Mission;* F. Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament;* R. E. Hedlund, *The Mission of the Church in the World: A Biblical Theology;* A. Köstenberger, *The Mission of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel;* W. J. Larkin and J. F. Williams, eds., *Mission in the New Testament: An Evangelical Approach;* P. T. O'Brien, *Gospel and Mission in the Writings of Paul;* D. Senior and C. Stuhlmuller, *The Biblical Foundations for Mission.*

Paul and Mission. The mission of the apostle Paul in the first century has functioned as a principal inspiration and paradigm for Christian witness during the millennia since. The modern missionary movement in particular has routinely attempted to take bearings from the apostle's missionary thinking and endeavors. Where this has been pursued at a scholarly level, such inquiries have not infrequently also proved suggestive for those engaged in the modern academic study of Paul. Among more familiar examples of such studies in the past century would certainly be those by Allen, Blauw, Senior and Stuhlmueller, and Bosch.

The modern academic study of Paul has had good reason, in any case, to devote considerable professional attention to Paul's mission, since that mission has functioned as a principal feature in the scholarly reconstructions of early Christian history and theology. In the process, contemporary Pauline research has sometimes proposed findings that challenge popular assumptions about the Pauline mission, serving thereby as a useful corrective for a too easy correlation between the Paul of history and the interests and requirements of the modern missionary movement. At the same time these modern academic inquiries have not always escaped their own accommodations to contemporary intellectual fashions.

Beginning with F. C. Baur of Tübingen in the mid-nineteenth century, and throughout the entire period of modern Pauline studies since, the history and literature of the Pauline mission have been continuously queried. For example, Baur counted only four of Paul's principal letters as authentic, and nonevangelical scholarship today tends conventionally to accept only seven as assuredly Pauline (excluding Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, and the Pastorals). Likewise the historical reliability of Acts, and of its account of the Pauline mission, has been repeatedly called into question. While fashionable opinion on the matter has oscillated over the years, the recent pattern has increasingly been to assume a sharp contrast between the Paul presented in the narrative of Acts and the historical Paul represented by his principal letters, and in consequence to discount the usefulness of Acts in assessing the history of the Pauline mission.

Such findings can often seem to have more to do with the predilections of the modern-day academic than with an even-handed scholarly assessment of the historical data. The problematic nature of many of the assumptions that undergird such findings has often been demonstrated. Nevertheless, a large segment of contemporary Pauline scholarship would doubt the traditional chronological reconstruction of Paul's mission, and in particular the "three tours" approach so characteristic of more popular presentations.

Yet it is noteworthy that in the alternative reconstructions being proffered, while the chronology of the Pauline mission is shifted, the pattern of Paul's geographical movement as presented in Acts is left largely intact. This anomaly within the modern inquiry arises from the fact that, whatever the chronology of events, the relevant data derivable from Paul's principal letters on the geographical pattern of his mission correlate remarkably well with the more detailed data available from Acts.

That is to say, in both the letters and in Acts Paul carries out his missionary endeavors in the same sector of the Mediterranean world, in the same provinces, and in the same general sequence. In both sources Paul works in the lands

surrounding the northeastern Mediterranean, between Judea and the Adriatic; both sources show him progressing through this area generally from east to west; and both sources see him attending to Syria/Cilicia, Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, in that order—and also Galatia at some point along the way.

Indeed, the Paul of the letters is explicitly conscious of such a geographical pattern in his mission. In a context in which he anticipates travel westward to Rome and beyond to Spain, he states that already "from Jerusalem all the way around to Illyricum I have fully proclaimed the gospel of Christ" (Rom. 15:19). The distinctiveness of this geographical dimension in the apostle's understanding of his mission can be obscured by its very familiarity. Paul clearly took his mission to be in part a geographically definable accomplishment.

A second distinguishing characteristic of the Pauline mission, evidenced both in the letters and in Acts, is the intentional focus on community formation. Paul saw his mission as more than gospel proclamation and conversion of individuals; through and beyond these endeavors he understood his missionary role to concern the establishment of settled, believing communities. This churchward orientation of his mission is evident not least in his surviving missionary letters, all of which are directed to the stabilization and maturation of newly planted churches. Paul pursued his geographical mission in terms of ecclesial achievement.

In the first decades of the twentieth century Pauline studies came increasingly under the influence of a history-of-religions approach, which emphasized the importance of the Greco-Roman religious context for understanding Paul. This approach affected the understanding of Paul's mission in at least two respects. First, it helped ignite a debate that continues to the present on the relationship of Paul's Damascus experience to his subsequent theology and to his Gentile mission preoccupation. For example, numerous studies attempted a religio-psychological interpretation of the Damascus experience, in which the sudden reorientation to Gentile mission of this erstwhile Pharisee was explained as the compensatory outworking of an uneasy conscience over the harsh exclusivism of Judaism. Such an approach is no longer in vogue, owing to the excessive degree to which modern assumptions must be interpolated into the historical data in order to render such psychological interpretations feasible.

It is now widely recognized that whatever led up to the Damascus event, the interpretive baseline for the event must begin with the fact that Paul experienced it as an encounter with the risen Jesus. And, in light of his own explicit testimony, it is also increasingly accepted that Paul experienced this encounter not as a conversion so much as a call, as a divine summons to a task on the model of OLD TESTAMENT PROPHETS (Gal. 1:15–16). No interpretation of the Damascus Road event and its consequences is likely to prove sustainable which does not recognize that the event was in the first place an encounter/call. That is to say, Paul understood his sense of commission not as derivative of his Damascus Road experience but as constituent to that experience. The complex ramifications of the event for Paul's subsequent life and thought are best accounted for as unfolding from this duality at the heart of the original experience. It was the christological encounter that set in motion Paul's theological reorientation, while it was the call to Gentile mission that determined the direction of the resulting theological development.

The history-of-religions phase within Pauline studies also stimulated considerable interest in the numerous examples of religious propaganda in the Greco-Roman world, and sought to reinterpret Paul's missionary efforts in light of this larger social phenomenon. Such studies highlighted not only the vigorous Jewish proselyte movement of the period, but also the wandering preachers then common in the Hellenistic world, and the rapid spread of the Eastern mystery religions throughout the empire at this time. Such studies have thrown much useful light on the patterns of religious propagation within Paul's world. At the same time, in attempting to trace a generalized phenomenon of the period, such investigations have tended to accent those characteristics common to all these efforts while obscuring the individual distinctives. In consequence, even today scholarly texts will speak with assurance of multiple first-century movements of religious propaganda, all functioning more or less on the familiar pattern of the Pauline mission.

Recent research has been severely undermining this projection. It is now being noted, for example, that the wandering preachers of Hellenism were not pursuing community formation. Neither was the spread of the mystery religions nor the Jewish proselyte movement furthered by individuals under a sense of divine calling to missionize. And none of these movements interpreted itself in terms of geographical progress. Even for Christianity itself in the initial postapostolic centuries, closer inquiry finds the evidence almost entirely lacking for the figure of the missionary evangelist seeking to plant churches in new geographical areas on the Pauline model. A significant result of this reassessment now in progress has been to clarify more adequately the distinctiveness of Paul's particular mission, and especially to clarify the extent to which the geographical framing of his mandate, and its ecclesial focus, represent exceptional characteristics

for missionary perception and outreach in his day.

In the latter part of the twentieth century an increasingly influential sociological approach in New Testament studies produced illuminating contributions on the social dimensions of the early Christian mission. For example, a helpful distinction has been traced between the "itinerant charismatic" preachers of the early Palestinian Christian communities and the more orderly efforts of those like Paul who may be characterized as "goal-oriented community organizers." But more adventurous attempts to reinterpret Paul's missionary outreach itself in terms of modern sociological models for religious expansion, such as millennial, conversionist, or sectarian models, have thus far proved less than persuasive, owing to a general perception that these models are being inappropriately imposed upon the historical data. This field of inquiry is nevertheless promising, and more methodologically sensitive and disciplined studies along these lines should prove fruitful for a better understanding of the varied patterns of religious propagation in the Greco-Roman world.

The Bultmannian school of thought, which dominated Pauline studies in the middle decades of the twentieth century, transmuted the larger inquiry into existentialist categories in ways that rendered the essential issues of Paul's mission largely peripheral or irrelevant. By the last quarter of the century, this whole construct had been duly challenged and displaced, especially owing to the far-reaching reassessments in Pauline studies precipitated by E. P. Sanders in 1977, now mediated most prominently through work by J. D. G. Dunn in what is conventionally termed the "New Perspective" in Pauline studies. The result has been to move the dominant issues of Pauline inquiry at the commencement of the twenty-first century back into territory more congenial to acknowledging and addressing questions relating to Paul's mission and mission thinking.

In particular this shift of perspective has allowed renewed consideration of a significant but less dominant strand of inquiry in twentieth-century Pauline studies emphasizing and exploring the eschatological structuring of Pauline theology. The eschatological nature of Paul's thinking was first effectively accented in 1911 through an influential survey of Pauline studies by the New Testament scholar A. Schweitzer, who subsequently gained wide notice as a medical missionary in Africa. Beginning in 1936 O. Cullmann then directed attention to the eschatological nature of Paul's own self-understanding. Building on this, the Danish scholar J. Munck from 1947 on systematically worked out the proposition that all Paul's missionary thinking and endeavors are best interpreted in terms of his eschatological convictions.

Munck demonstrated that the salvation-historical framework in which all of Paul's theological reflection takes place also functions as the determinative framework for Paul's understanding and implementation of his mission. Paul took himself to be a participant in the end-time redemptive events of Old Testament prophetic expectation. More particularly, he understood himself to be a participant in the fulfillment of that part of Old Testament eschatology which expected the inclusion of the nations, the Gentiles, in the messianic blessing. Paul therefore took his own vigorous outreach to be part of the eschatological ingathering of the nations, and his Damascus experience to be a divine summons to participate in this outreach to the ends of the earth.

The historical characteristics of Paul's missionary outreach are then best understood as those practicalities implicit in seeking to implement such an eschatological assignment, given the realities of Paul's first-century world and his assumptions about that world. Paul sought to actualize the promised "blessing to the nations" by concrete efforts to help form believing communities province by province across his Roman world. This required deliberate travel to the population centers of these provinces. The little gatherings he formed center by center symbolize for him the incorporation of the Gentiles into the messianic community in fulfillment of Old Testament expectation. He recognizes that he is working between the "already" of Christ's redemptive act and the "not yet" of Christ's final triumph, bringing the life of the age to come into the present fallen world. And as a messenger of the Crucified One in this interim time, he knows that he must work amidst all the vicissitudes of the human condition, accepting toil and suffering and being vulnerable to conflict and disappointment. Yet he is sustained by the joyous assurance that God's eternal purpose, to unite Jew and Gentile together in the worship of Christ as Lord, will be fulfilled.

Of course the mission of the apostle Paul must not be used as an exclusive norm for appropriate Christian outreach. The biblical understanding of mission encompasses more than is represented by the particularities of the Pauline model. Yet within the larger scope of the biblical witness Paul does constitute a principal representative of evangelical outreach. And for those prepared to find in his mission a guiding point of reference for appropriate Christian witness in our own day, Paul can serve as an effective reminder of basic components of the biblical perspective on mission. This would include convictions such as:

(1) That Christian mission should be understood and implemented within a theological frame of reference; and that theological reflection may in turn discover a needed relevance, balance, orientation, and dynamic if pursued (as for Paul) within a missiological frame of reference.

(2) That within the eschatological structuring of God's redemptive purpose, the primal mandate for the time between Christ's first and second advents is gospel proclamation to the nations, that within the larger divine economy the core intention for the present interim period is the effecting of this mandate.

(3) That from among the recipients of redemption God may commission selected individuals to a singularly disciplined, proactive, and sustained collaboration in the proclamation to the nations.

(4) That the proclamation of the gospel is meant to be implemented, and its achievement measured, in part by geographical attainment, that a deliberately cross-cultural mission to the unreached peoples and nations of one's world functions under first biblical warrant.

(5) That through and beyond missionary proclamation and evangelism, the planting of believing communities and their nurture to settled maturity in Christ must remain a primary focus of any biblically validated missionary outreach.

(6) That God's redemptive purposes will assuredly be achieved, that he remains sovereign in the course of the missionary proclamation to the nations, and that he will triumphantly accomplish his intention to sum up all things in Christ.

W. PAUL BOWERS

Bibliography. R. Allen, *Missionary Methods: St. Paul's or Ours?;* J. Blauw, *The Missionary Nature of the Church;* D. Bosch, *Transforming Mission;* W. P. Bowers, *Novum Testamentum* 22 (1980): 316–23; idem, *JETS* 30 (1987): 185–98; idem, *DPHL,* pp. 608–19; D. Gilliland, *Pauline Theology and Mission Practice;* M. Green, *Evangelism in the Early Church;* F. Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament;* J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind;* D. Senior and C. Stuhlmueller, *The Biblical Foundations for Mission.*

Persecution. Suffering experienced by those whose opinion or belief is being attacked by another group. For the first Christians who came from a Jewish heritage, SUFFERING and persecution were both part of their lot. Jews living under Roman rule could expect to be persecuted if they chose to follow Jesus (e.g., Matt. 5:10–12; 10:23; Luke 21:12; John 15:20).

The Jews as a people had been persecuted for centuries prior to Christ's birth. Christians who came out of Judaism still faced hostility from Rome. In addition, at least until A.D. 70, they faced persecution from the Jewish leaders. Such persecutions often had the opposite of the intended effect. The persecution of the church after Stephen's MARTYRDOM did not stop Christianity but spread the gospel beyond the confines of Jerusalem (Acts 8:1). Paul's conversion resulted from the Damascus road encounter with Jesus while he was traveling under Jewish authority to persecute the church in Damascus (Acts 9:1–31). In testimony and correspondence Paul frequently referred to his persecuting work (Acts 22:4; 26:11; 1 Cor. 15:9; Gal. 1:13; Phil. 3:6; 1 Tim. 1:13). James was martyred by Herod, and when the populace approved he had Peter arrested for the same purpose (Acts 12:1–11). Through God's intervention, the tables were turned and Herod lost his life, while Peter escaped and was able to continue sharing his faith. Jewish persecution of Paul for his evangelistic work led to his arrest and eventual transport to Rome under guard. In this, however, the Jews living in Rome as well as Paul's escorts and his guard detail all had the chance to hear the gospel (Acts 28:17–30; Phil. 1:12–14). Persecution, though violent and intended to shut down the church, often had the opposite effect.

The Roman rulers initially tolerated Christians as a subsect within Judaism, but Nero's scapegoating of them after the A.D. 64 fire in Rome started a pattern of persecution which continued for almost 250 years. With varying intensity, Christians were perceived as a threat to the state. Though not consistently applied throughout the Roman Empire, and with periods of hostility followed by temporary reprieves, the reality of Christianity's illegality as a religion remained part of the Christian experience until the Edict of Milan (A.D. 313) officially legalized Christianity in the empire. Though two relatively brief periods of persecution followed (under Licinius in 322–23 and Julian in 361–63), official toleration of Christianity across the Roman Empire was assured.

Contemporary Situation. While it is true that Christians have over the course of history persecuted others (e.g., Muslims during the CRUSADES; Jews during the Middle Ages and the modern era), including other Christians (e.g., the Donatists, Anabaptists, Puritans, and Huguenots), by and large it is accurate to say that Christians have been the recipients of hostility. Far from being only a thing of the past, persecution today continues to be a reality faced by many Christians, particularly those in militant religious states. It is estimated that more Christians have lost their lives through persecution in this century than all other centuries combined, though generally there has been little publicity of this in the secular press of free countries. David Barrett estimates that some 160,000 Christians were martyred in 1996 simply because they were Christians. Contemporary researchers have begun to speak out on behalf of the persecuted (e.g., Shea and Marshall), noting that the Western church and Western governments have been

largely silent in the face of an increasingly well-documented reality.

A number of mission organizations have also been founded to investigate, publicize, and advocate on behalf of those at risk, including Brother's Keeper, Christian Solidarity International, International Christian Concern, and Voice of the Martyrs. Additionally, existing agencies are incorporating departments which emphasize the persecuted church, including Christian Life Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, Open Doors, and World Evangelical Fellowship Religious Liberty Commission. The National Association of Evangelicals (U.S.) published a statement of conscience in 1996 reflecting "deep concern for the religious freedom of fellow believers, as well as people of every faith" and many agencies and churches have joined the WEF-sponsored International Day of Prayer for the Persecuted Church.

Missionary Implications. With the recent increase in interest in reaching the unreached, persecution of missionaries will likely grow rather than shrink in the coming decades, simply because so many of the unreached live under religious or political ideologies that suppress the spread of the Christian message. Additionally, Christians are often perceived as part of the West in general, and the official anti-Western tenor in these countries will exacerbate the potential problems.

Almost no missiological training in the West offered today will help future missionaries training face persecution, though it appears that house seminaries in China prepare their future pastors for interrogation. Missionaries, especially those going into at-risk situations, would benefit from realistic preparation for the possibilities they may face. In addition, having been trained, they may also be more able to offer both preparation and aid to indigenous Christians who suffer because of a choice to follow Christ in a hostile environment.

A. Scott Moreau

Bibliography. G. W. Bromiley, *ISBE Revised*, 3:771–74; W. H. C. Frend, *ER* 11:247–56; P. Marshall, *IBMR* 22:1 (January 1998): 1–8; idem, *Their Blood Cries Out;* E. M. B. Green, *NBD*, pp. 913–14; H. Schlossberg, *A Fragrance of Oppression;* N. Shea, *In the Lion's Den*.

Planning. Planning, whether of an ad hoc or strategic nature, is not new to the mission enterprise. Though current strategic planning for mission purposes increasingly emphasizes the Social Sciences and electronic technology, planning as a critical factor in Christian mission can be dated to certain events in the Book of Acts (e.g., the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 or the hall of Tyrannus "campaign" in Acts 19). Mo-

nasticism, using music to teach Christian doctrine to the illiterate masses, and the development of mendicant orders are just a sampling of the resultant structures flowing from planning processes long before the modern mission era.

As we review the modern missions era, we see pioneers like William Carey who demonstrate key elements of planning in their writings. Carey's classic treatise *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians* . . . gives testimony to the strategic use of biblical information statistics, maps, organizational networking, and financial support structures in planning the mission enterprise. J. Hudson Taylor's "Call to Service" also shows the evaluative processes and resultant planning necessary in the structural changes that occurred as missions headed "inland" in the mid-nineteenth century using the incipient structures of the faith mission model.

The work of Rufus Anderson from the United States and Henry Venn from England are representative examples of evaluative processes that led planned change in mission strategy during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Their planned change resulted in the famous "three-self" formula with its goal of planting and fostering the development of churches that were self-governing, self-sufficient, and self-propagating (*see* Indigenous Churches). This period of the nineteenth century also is an era in which women became increasingly assertive in organizing their own agencies for sending single women missionaries. The evaluation and subsequent strategic planning by valiant women opened the possibility of reaching women and children with the gospel in cultures where male missionaries had little access to the female and child population.

Consultations and conferences have been the contexts from which much planning and resultant strategic change have occurred. Mt. Hermon (1886), Edinburgh (1910), Jerusalem (1928), Madras (1938), Berlin (1966), Lausanne (1974), and Lausanne II Manila (1989) are all examples of events that have not only resulted in planned change, but provided ongoing evaluation of mission endeavor. Centers like the U.S. Center for World Mission in Pasadena, California, Overseas Ministries Study Center in New Haven, Connecticut, or The Oxford Centre for Mission Studies in Oxford, England, exemplify the present commitment of the global mission enterprise to planning as an ongoing necessity.

Terms associated with the planning process are used differently. Words usually seen in planning literature include mission, purpose, vision, dream, goal, objective, and plan (action plan). These terms are used inconsistently, but with necessary definition become functional. Lyle Schaller suggests that all solid planning models must include a strong future orientation, an emphasis on action, realistic analysis of the context,

participative agreement building, and challenge for participants to join in chosen course of action.

In the process of planning, terms like mission and purpose refer to the *why* of an organization or enterprise. Vision/dream refers to an image of a preferable future condition. Goals describe what we want to achieve with objectives, focusing on that which must be accomplished to reach a goal. Action plans describe the activities that will ultimately enflesh our conceptualizings.

The *mission–vision–goals–action plan* model or the *think–plan–act–evaluate* model exemplifies some current formats for the planning processes used in the mission enterprise.

BYRON D. KLAUS

Bibliography. R. R. Broholm, *The Power and Purpose of Vision: A Study in the Role of Vision in Exemplary Organizations;* J. M. Bryson, *Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations;* E. Dayton and D. Fraser, *Strategies for World Evangelization;* F. R. Kinsler and J. Emery, eds., *Opting for Change—Evaluating and Planning for TEE;* L. Schaller, *Effective Church Planning.*

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

45

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.*

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 cessationist 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.

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 convinced 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.*

Spiritual Warfare. Spiritual warfare is the Christian encounter with evil supernatural powers led by Satan and his army of fallen angels, generally called demons or evil spirits (*see* DEMON, DEMONS). The original battle was between Satan and God, but on the level of the heavenlies, the war has been won decisively by God (Col. 2:15; 1 John 3:8). On earth the battles continue, but the issue is to determine not who will win but whether God's people will appropriate the victory won for them by the cross and the resurrection.

The conflict began in the Garden of Eden as recorded in Genesis 3 and will continue until the

fulfillment of the events predicted in Revelation 20. Scripture makes it clear that Satan leads the anti-God and anti-Christian forces as "the prince of this world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11) or "the god of this world" (2 Cor. 4:4) and as a leader of the fallen angels (Matt. 25:41). It is also clear, however, that although Satan gained some measure of control through the events in the garden, God retains ultimate sovereignty over his creation. God's people are assured of victory in the battle when they engage the enemy on the basis of faith and obedience—the conditions set by God in his covenant with Israel and the implications of submitting to God in James 4:7.

Every battle Israel fought in the conquest of Canaan was won or lost on spiritual considerations. When Israel obeyed God's commands and acted on the basis of faith, God gave them victory no matter what the military situation. The battle was ultimately between God and the gods. While idols are treated in the Old Testament with contempt as utterly devoid of spiritual power (Ps. 114:4–8; Isa. 40:18–20; 44:9–20; Jer. 10:3ff.), the god or spirit behind the idol was treated as real (cf. Deut. 32:17; Ps. 106:37; 1 Cor. 10:18–20). Yahweh was often compared to the gods (1 Kings 8:23; 1 Chron. 16:25; Pss. 86:8; 96:4; 135:5). That was not a comparison with nothing. It was the sovereign God compared to the angels who were in rebellion against him.

This battle is portrayed in the Gospels and in the rest of the New Testament. Paul states clearly that "our struggle is . . . against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms" (Eph. 6:12). These are real enemies, and resistance against them will involve spiritual warfare. While we are assured of victory in the battle, we are never assured that we will not have to fight in the battle.

The influence of the ENLIGHTENMENT and later the evolutionary hypothesis began a process which has resulted in the secularization of the Western worldview. As a result, biblical references to the role of spirit beings in the realm of the created world are often misinterpreted or ignored in dealing with the text, and many missionaries have gone to the field with a defective worldview, resulting in serious flaws in their approach to animistic belief systems.

At the other end of the spectrum, there is a tendency to overemphasize the role of spirits which produces a Christian SYNCRETISM with ANIMISM. People use the Bible as a good luck charm to protect one from evil spirits, prescribe certain words or expressions to be used in dealing with demons, or assume that knowing the name of a demon gives more power over it. People coming from animistic backgrounds also fall into syncretism, but that is usually because the Christians who introduce them to Christ do not help them

50

understand the Christian worldview as it relates to issues of spiritual power.

Much of this confusion stems from the fact that Satan's primary tactic is deception. That does not mean that everything a demon says is a lie. Deception gains its power by concealing the lie in surrounding truth. What is needed is discernment, not simply in responding to what a demon may say but in dealing with the deceiving spirits that are constantly trying to confuse our belief system (Rev. 12:9; 1 Tim. 4:1).

The primary issue in deception is always truth, and Satan deceives especially concerning the source of power and of knowledge. God has provided all the power and knowledge we need to live as "more than conquerors" in Christ; but ever since the Garden of Eden, Satan has been trying to cause us not to trust God to provide the power we need and to doubt our ability to know God and to trust the Word of God.

Satan uses his power to cause us to fear him. For Christians to fear Satan they must first doubt the power and provision of God for victory over Satan. Thus he accomplishes two goals: to cause Christians to doubt God and to gain some measure of control over them through fear.

But Satan will also seek to entice people—believers or unbelievers—to take power from him rather than from God. He comes as an angel of light and makes his power seem desirable. This brings one into contact with a long list of occult practices such as fortune telling, magic, sorcery, and witchcraft. Satan has enough power to produce some striking results—"counterfeit miracles, signs and wonders" (2 Thess. 2:10). Some people only ask, "Does it work?" rather than "Is it from God; is it true?" Many people end up with a spiritual stronghold in their lives because they have fallen for Satan's deceptive use of power.

Ultimately spiritual warfare is the battle for the mind. Satan knows that people will always live what they really believe, even if they do not live what they profess to believe. Since one's belief about God is foundational to all other beliefs, Satan will almost always begin by trying to pervert one's belief about the character of God. It happened in Eden. Satan said that God's statement about dying if people ate of the fruit was a lie and that God could therefore not be trusted. He also implied that God could not love them and withhold that beautiful, desirable fruit from them. Once they began to question the integrity of God, they came under Satan's control.

It appears that Satan's great desire is to be God (Luke 4:5–7; 2 Thess. 2:3, 4). This is also seen in the Old Testament in the conflict between God and the gods. As noted above, the real power behind the "gods" in the Old Testament is Satan and his host of evil spirits. This same principle applies to all religious systems which set forth a god other than the Yahweh of Scripture. So the

battle is still in process. Unfortunately, many missionaries have failed to help their converts make a thorough worldview change from an animistic view in which the spirit world is manipulable to a Christian view in which a sovereign God is in control. Not only can God not be manipulated by us, there is absolutely nothing we can do to commend ourselves to God. We are utterly dependent on his grace as a means of dealing with our sin and relating to him on a daily basis. The very definition of sin is dependent on one's view of the holiness and sovereignty of God. A low view of sin stems from a low view of God.

Thus winning in spiritual warfare always needs to begin with a right view of God and with a right view of what it means to be a child of God. If we say that we are children of God by faith but believe that we have to earn our daily standing with God, we become the victims of an impossible situation. By grace God makes us "co-heirs with Christ" (Rom. 8:17)—a standing which we could never earn by our own efforts. Believing that this is indeed our position "in Christ" provides the only viable position from which to resist the enemy. The battle looks very different from the vantage point of the throne of God than it does from the context of the circumstances of our lives on earth.

In missionary ministry this battle may well be more like a POWER ENCOUNTER than the battle for the mind which underlies it. Paul says that his call was "to open their eyes, to bring them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God" (Acts 26:18). Thus evangelism is a kind of power encounter, and converts need to understand clearly that they are moving from one realm of spiritual power to another.

Often associated with conversion is the destruction of objects used in non-Christian religious practices. This is a visible renunciation of the old ways and old worldview, but it is also a challenge to the "gods" behind the objects to defend themselves if they are able.

Missionaries may well see overt demonic activity (*see* POSSESSION PHENOMENA), and they need to know how to minister with confidence in such a situation. Many places have been opened to the gospel through seeing a person set free from evil spirits. Spiritual practitioners in other religions may challenge Christians to demonstrate their power in a variety of ways. The missionary needs to be prepared to respond appropriately. Ultimately prayer may be the most important weapon in the Christian's arsenal against the enemy.

TIMOTHY M. WARNER

Bibliography. N. Anderson, *How to Help Others Find Freedom in Christ;* M. Kraft, *Understanding Spiritual Power;* A. S. Moreau, *The Essentials of Spiritual War-fare;* E. Murphy, *The Handbook for Spiritual Warfare;* T. Warner, *Spiritual Warfare*.

Strategies in Mission. Many people moving out in mission do not seem to think much about strategy. At least the mainstream of missions at any given point in history has been what others are already doing. The constant element may have been a desire to share the riches of the gospel, but the actual technique at any point has usually been assumed.

One of the first major movements was the phenomenon of the highly individual initiatives of the Irish peregrini. They set out with the idea of monastic centers as a main strategy—the nature of the movement from which they derived. And it worked. The Benedictine movement gradually took over the Irish centers of biblical study, devotional life, and evangelistic outreach, adding so many Roman elements of industry and science that these centers became the nucleus of most of the major cities of Europe. Whole kingdoms came into the fold when strategically located wives influenced their husbands to adopt the faith, often from a variety of motives. Some groups were forced into the faith although contemporary writings denounced that approach. Some approaches represented CONTEXTUALIZATION so radical that they would not readily be conceived of today yet they went on with clear success. Can you imagine the orgy of a Spring goddess of fertility becoming an Easter sunrise service? But it worked. For that matter, can you imagine the entire Roman Empire deciding to become Christian? That event remarkably benefited the faith in many ways.

Much of the expansion of the faith in Europe—the overall phenomenon of the so-called conversion of barbarian Europe—was due to the prestige of the gospel representing the extension or renewal of the highly respected Roman civilization (minus its legions), much as modern missionaries have on their side whatever respect (or disrespect) people around the world have for the achievements of the West minus its colonial domination. That is, factors that are often unconscious, or not acknowledged, have given a gust of wind to strategies which might not otherwise have worked as well.

But behind what did or did not work lies the question about what it really is to do mission. Conscious strategy would have to build on basic concepts of what the goal is understood to be. What are we trying to do to people, their families, and societies? Is it merely a case of transmitting a message of hope and pardon? Do we demand that people repent and believe? Is it a case of bringing about "the obedience of faith" (Rom. 12:5; 16:26)? Is it something else to pray that his kingdom come (Matt. 6:10), and to "preach the kingdom" (Acts 28:31)? "As my fa-

ther has sent me, so send I you." Are those marching orders? John records "the Son of God appeared for this purpose, that he might destroy the works of the devil." Have missionaries been doing this? They have fought ignorance, poverty, injustice, disease. Does that in itself clarify a strategy for mission? Somewhat. But missionaries have also carried disease with them. In North America in the early twenty-first century age stratification and family-dissolving individualism have progressed to the point that the American model for church planting consists to a great extent of the understandable concept of finding loose individuals and collecting them into fellowships which are like surrogate families. This does not work very well in a traditional society where natural families are already the basic structure. In that case the strategy sometimes becomes one of extracting people from real families in order to produce the expected fellowship.

Probably the strategy least likely to succeed is the one in which large, enthusiastic local congregations in the West send people out to reproduce the precise image of their Western fellowship, bypassing the mission agencies which over a period of many years have adjusted to some extent to the mixed realities of the field cultures and have accumulated wisdom rather than having to reinvent the wheel. Often an individual missionary family is less of a threat than a team, which often finds it more difficult to get close or much less inside a strange society.

God often has initiated a breakthrough by miracles and healings, and the very wording of Paul's summary in Acts 26:18–20 would seem to predict the early possibility of a POWER ENCOUNTER in which it is decided once and for all whether God or Satan has the upper hand within a given group. But can you plan this out? Turn it on? And, over the long haul is it proper to expect that the primary means of fighting rampant disease, for example, is to appeal to God for miracles? Do a thousand mission clinics and hospitals have a reason for existence? Are amazing new insights into microbial realities allowing and insistently requiring new strategies for destroying "the works of the devil"? Mercy ministries may be seen as bait; are they also essential to defining the very character of a loving God—and, by contrast, the character of our great enemy?

One of the most pursued strategies has been the planting of a string of "missions." Despite grumblings about "the mission station approach" the idea has prevailed of planting a complete community self-sufficient in food production, education, medicine, and even blacksmithing, masonry, and the importation of foreign building methods, materials, and patterns. Whether Roman Catholic, Moravian, or Protestant, this strategy has been, rightly or wrongly, one of the most enduring tech-

niques, especially in frontier, pioneer, literally dangerous situations, where the "station" is in a certain real sense a fortress. The very opposite, say, that of a young, unarmed man going out and handing himself over to a tribal society for better or worse and becoming a functional part of that society has also worked. Somewhat similar, but not willingly, at first, would be the case of ULFILAS, who, as a captured slave in the fourth century was forced to become bilingual and was enabled eventually to contribute to the immensely influential Gothic Bible.

Much less frequently in the twenty-first century will we find conditions in which a lone individual might be the intended *method* as the *means* of significant mission. The world has changed beyond imagining, introducing obstacles and opportunities that can hardly be predicted from one day to the next. The very nature of the expanding kingdom of God is quite unclear in detail, but unquestionably it is a global phenomenon. And this certainly affects strategy.

For example, it is dramatically new that the Christian movement is leaping and abounding in the non-Western world without a parallel in the West. It is dramatically new that the former "mission fields" are now sprouting hundreds of mission societies of their own and thousands upon thousands of their own missionaries. Some of these new missionaries are often strikingly more able to fit in, while others are often embarrassingly less willing to adapt, just as Western missionaries have been known to be. In sheer number of agencies, associations of agencies, regional gatherings, global gatherings, scholarly gatherings, and scholarly societies, the situation is unprecedented.

When it comes to strategy one of the largest and yet most puzzling challenges is the emergence of a major phenomenon of indigenous movements that are neither fish nor fowl. In Africa at the turn of the millennium, the so-called AFRICAN INITIATED CHURCH MOVEMENT involves over thirty million people. Many of the leaders of this phenomenon are illiterate but quite intelligent, their movements fed by a few who read for the benefit of the rest. Their theologies range from what Westerners might approve to what staggers the imagination—such as the concept of divine persons as members. Few missions have developed a strategy for assisting these new churches to move in the right direction.

In India the very possibility of Hindus who continue to be Hindus in many cultural dimensions but who devoutly read the Bible, worship, and seek to follow Christ has many wondering. While no one knows how large this phenomenon is, some scholars estimate that it is as large as the explicitly Christian movement, and to some extent more earnest than those who, by now, are brought up culturally as Christians. Strategies

being developed to reach out to assist and fellowship with people like this are likely to have as little initial acceptance as Paul's idea of uncircumcised Gentiles.

But parallel, if not similar, reasons for not identifying with Western Christians exist in both China and the world of Islam, and in both cases millions are profoundly impressed by the person of Jesus Christ and the strange power of the Judeo-Christian Bible. Strategies at the beginning of the Third Millennium must take into account the possibility that far more of what we call Christianity is simply reflective of a particular cultural background of one portion of the globe. And, the way things are going, Western Christianity now incorporates many detestable, even demonic, elements such as radical age segregation, the temporary family structure, and the world's highest divorce rate, delinquency rate, and prison population. Meanwhile, many other non-Christian societies exhibit stable family life. It already appears to be true that the faith of the Bible is now out of the control of the West. Just as the Roman tradition eventually lost control of European Christianity, the non-Western world is growing without adopting all of the features Westerners might expect or desire. What strategy can we develop in this situation? Missionaries have traditionally been willing to put up with deviations that might startle people back home. But probably the greatest obstacle to the development of effective new ways of working on the field may be the very fact that we have not been willing to employ mission field perspectives in our own backyards. Outgoing missionaries have no missiology to follow. Who among us has been able to know what to do with the burgeoning Mormon movement or the New Age movement?

Undoubtedly new strategies will be developed both through the inherent creativities of isolation and the methodical comparison of notes. The world is both bigger, more fluid, and more complex than ever. It is also smaller and more amenable to nearly constant interchange between workers who were once far more isolated from each other all across the world.

Some of the most pregnant possibilities, undreamed of before, are arising out of strategic PARTNERSHIPS and dozens of other ways in which workers are able to encourage and enlighten one another. Conversation and interchange have become virtually instantaneous compared to the need for endless months for travel or even for mail to get around the globe. Working closely together has always been a marvelous phenomenon in the world of overseas missionaries, and new levels of collaboration are now well established, possibly leading to new innovations in mission strategy in the future.

RALPH D. WINTER

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.*

Tent-Making Mission. The apostle Paul witnessed while he earned a living by making tents in the city of Corinth (Acts 18:3). This is how tent-making got its name. Tent-making mission has gained prominence in recent years, but tent-makers are not new. They are as old as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. While being semi-nomadic cattle-ranchers, they became witnesses to the living God, Yahweh, before the Canaanites. In the early church, persecution scattered believers from Jerusalem to Antioch and beyond. Those scattered went about bearing testimony as they worked their trades. The modern missionary movement sent out people as medical missionaries, social work missionaries, educational missionaries, and agricultural missionaries. They pursued their missionary calling while utilizing their professional skills.

Why has tent-making gathered considerable attention among the missionary strategists during the past decade? The reason is simple: missionaries as missionaries have not been permitted to go where the majority of non-Christian people are. During the past decades, missionaries have gradually been ousted from the countries of their service as communism, totalitarianism, and Islamic regimentation began to spread. Despite the collapse of Eastern European countries, the Berlin Wall, and the Soviet Union, the number of non-Christians in "closed" countries has been on the rise due to the resurgence of traditional religions and ideologies. The movement for reaching the unreached has added value to the acceptance of tent-making as a mission strategy.

Who, then, are these tent-makers? They may be defined as cross-cultural workers with a secular identity called to make disciples within "closed" countries. This understanding is more exclusive than other definitions. They are "cross-cultural workers," not mono-cultural workers. Christian witnessing to people of the same cultural background is the duty of all believers, and not to be categorized as something extraordinary. "With secular identity" refers to one's witnessing through one's occupation. "Called to make disciples" refers to one's sense of calling as a tent-maker with the *intentionality* to make disciples. Finally, tent-makers as defined here serve "within closed countries" (*see* CREATIVE ACCESS COUNTRIES).

There are two main areas of dispute among those favoring the tent-making strategy. First, the matter of tent-makers serving "within closed countries." The preference here for exclusivity is one of strategic concern. It is imperative that tent-makers receive special training with a focus on a special people group. Reaching those behind closed doors stipulates special preparation. Learning the language and culture of the people requires time and discipline. The success of their ministry depends on it. Their service as tent-makers may be prolonged rather than short-lived. Obviously tent-making is applicable in "open" countries. Second is the issue of support methods. We should not make this an issue to divide those who are advocates of the tent-making strategy.

In Acts 18:1–5, we see Paul supporting himself by teaming up with Aquila and Priscilla as tent-makers. Later when Silas and Timothy arrived in Corinth from Macedonia, Paul devoted himself exclusively to preaching. Paul vehemently defended fully-funded spiritual ministry (1 Cor. 9:1–14). There are various ways of doing ministry. On his part, he opted not to receive church support, *not on principle but for a pragmatic reason.* For he has indeed successfully argued for the legitimacy of accepting church support for his ministry.

What are the qualifications of tent-makers? The tent-makers must be (1) physically, emotionally, and spiritually self-reliant; (2) adaptable; (3) biblically literate; (4) alert to the emerging mission context; (5) trained in meeting needs vital to the people group they seek to penetrate; (6) trained in long-term and low-profile evangelistic skills; (7) equipped with broad new strategic thinking; and (8) prepared with a special strategy for responding to opportunities presented by need.

How does one go about finding a tent-making job across cultures? One must be creative and persistent in job hunting like anyone else. One may consult sources such as InterCristo, the International Placement Network, and the International Employment Gazette. One may look for international employment on the Internet. One may inquire regarding job availability through one's professional association or examine the job listing in a professional journal. Possibilities abound in high-tech fields. Foreign embassies are worth checking. Potential tent-makers may latch on to government or intergovernmental assignments. They may go to work with humanitarian relief and development organizations. TEACHING ENGLISH TO SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES (TESOL) is in high demand all over the world. One can serve as a teacher in most fields and at all levels, as a medical doctor, as a nurse, as an engineer, as a farmer, and as a "professional" student.

There are some problems associated with tent-making. For security reasons, the "success" stories are in short supply. Often we hear only of failures, tent-makers coming home due to their inability to adjust to the culture of the host country, family reasons, or inadequate preparation. It is difficult to do the required balancing act between job and ministry successfully. There is often not enough time for ministry because of the job pressures. Tent-makers are to witness through their occupations, but some employers prohibit such witnessing activities. Despite these difficulties, tent-making missions must continue to be explored. The future context of mission as a whole demands it. Tent-makers are the agents of strategic missions for tomorrow as well as today.

TETSUNAO YAMAMORI

Bibliography. D. Hamilton, *Tentmakers Speak: Practical Advice from Over 400 Missionary Tentmakers;* J. Lewis, ed., *Working Your Way to the Nations: A Guide to Effective Tentmaking;* J. C. Wilson, Jr., *Today's Tentmakers;* T. Yamamori, *Penetrating Missions' Final Frontier: A New Strategy For Unreached Peoples.*

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.*

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

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). Finally, 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 effec-

tively 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 imperative. 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, wor-

ship 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.*