

Anthropology, Missiological Anthropology.

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

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

Though the influence of professional anthropology on missionaries was small during this era, some impressive anthropological writing by missionaries emerged. Fison with A. W. Howitt published *The Kamileoi and the Kurnai*, still considered a basic work on Australian aboriginals. Codrington's *Melanesians* contributed to anthropology its understanding of *mana*. Junod's two-volume *Life of a South African Tribe* was years later still regarded as one of the finest anthropological monographs. And Schmidt's twelve-volume study of the origin of religion did much to dissuade the academic community from their commitment to an evolutionary explanation.

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

In America, with the exception of Hartford Seminary Foundation's Kennedy School of Mis-

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

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

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

Behavior Patterns

of language and culture. Many of the *PA* articles were collected by Smalley in *Readings in Missionary Anthropology*, which was followed by *Culture and Human Values*, a collection of perceptive articles by Loewen.

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

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

Over the years, missiological anthropology has sometimes followed the vogues of secular anthropology, sometimes resisted them. Missionary anthropologists have found congenial such secular anthropological insights as the focus on specific cultures, the strengths of research based on participant observation, certain aspects of the functionalist emphasis on the internal workings of culture, the dynamics of cultural change, and the necessity to understand WORLDVIEW. On the other hand, certain secular emphases have stirred up the opposition of Christian anthropologists. Among them are the overextension of evolutionary and relativistic thinking. Early on, one of Schmidt's motivations was to combat the simplistic evolutionary theory concerning the origin and development of religion. His *Origin of the Idea of God* was so successful that most secular anthropologists dropped the theory. Christians have not been so successful in convincing the anthropological establishment that though certain aspects of evolutionary and relativistic thinking make sense, they need to be balanced by the recognition that someone started things and established certain absolutes.

There are four general areas in which the insights of anthropology are enabling greater effectiveness in Christian ministry. First, the two-way flow of influence between missiological anthropology and BIBLE TRANSLATION continues to be significant, especially in the United States. Nida has had a lot to do with this. A second significant application of anthropology relates to the influences of culture on the communication process. Nida's pioneering *Message and Mission*

brought this topic forcefully to our attention. MARVIN MAYERS, a Wycliffe translator who taught at Wheaton and later at Biola, both highlighted and broadened this theme in his important book *Christianity Confronts Culture*. A third important area of application is the contextualization or inculturation of Christianity. Kraft in *Christianity in Culture* creatively used linguistic and Bible translation theory as well as basic anthropology and COMMUNICATION theory to produce a cross-cultural perspective on theology. This book did much to show both that an anthropological approach can positively influence theologizing and that CONTEXTUALIZATION should be an evangelical issue, not merely an ecumenical theory. A fourth important area presently in focus is that of WORLDVIEW.

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

CHARLES H. KRAFT

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

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

Most prominent in this matter have been the contributions of the behavioral sciences—sociology, psychology, and cultural anthropology (including linguistics and cross-cultural communi-

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

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

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

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

As a result of studies such as the foregoing, contemporary missionaries can be far better prepared to deal with behavioral issues encountered when working in another culture. CULTURE SHOCK can be ameliorated when the missionary

is prepared for the encounter with behavioral patterns that have meanings entirely foreign to her or him. Culture change is most readily initiated by discovering what is happening at the informal "imitation of models" level of learning, bringing it to the level of awareness, and introducing change at that point. CONVERSION is best understood, not first of all as change at the behavioral outer layer of culture, but at its basic belief system or worldview inner core.

DAVID J. HESSELGRAVE

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

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

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

Those who grow up in a single cultural environment but who sojourn in another culture for an extended period often reach the stage of functional biculturalism. However, they can be said to be bicultural only to the extent that the new culture becomes a second "home" to them and they are able to identify with both cultures as "natural." For those who do not leave their culture until adulthood, moving beyond the functional to the deepest level of root biculturalism is unattainable simply because, as recent brain research indicates, the windows of opportunity to identify at the deepest levels linguistically, psychologically, socially, and emotionally with the new culture have passed. Their level of adaptation, which may be truly remarkable and take

Bonding

decades to accomplish, simply cannot match those of indigenes in the second culture.

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

A. SCOTT MOREAU

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

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

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

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

By developing relationships and gaining an empathetic understanding of the people’s feelings, desires, and fears, the new missionary can adopt habits of lifestyle and ministry that can enable him or her to be good news from the peo-

ple’s perspective in order to draw them into a belonging relationship with God.

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

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

ELIZABETH S. BREWSTER

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

Caste. A hereditary division of any society into classes on the basis of occupation, color, wealth, or religion. More specifically, in **HINDUISM**, caste (*jati*) is the permanent social group into which a person is born, with social and religious obligations determined for a lifetime by one’s caste.

The beginnings of the caste system in India are thought to date back to the invasion of Indo-European Aryans (or Vedic peoples) who migrated into the Indus Valley about 1000 B.C. *Varna* refers to the social divisions believed to have been characteristic of these people. One theory is that the organization of castes was based on *varna* (color). Aryans were light, while the invaded peoples were dark. Others believe stratification resulted in castes developing from social classes or other types of differences. During this early period, groups and strata of Hindu society began to form. No historical records exist for this period, but from the hymns, legends, and other accounts, it seems that the social system of the newcomers was composed of four major divisions: the *brahmana*, a sacerdotal or priestly category; the *rajanya*, a chiefly, noble, or warrior category; the *vaisya*, who were variously perceived as commoners, farmers, or merchants; and the *sudra*, a category of servants or commoners of a lower status.

Social anthropologists suggest that the persistent feature of Indian society has been the ex-

istence of endogamous descent groups (a system in which people must marry within their own group). Over time such groups were integrated into local hierarchical systems of cooperation and interdependence. The caste system typically includes the following components: (1) a local population composed of the series of mutually exclusive castes; (2) segments structured by caste in endogamous descent groups, ideally related unilineally; (3) a dominant caste with political and economic power over the others; (4) an occupational specialty related to each caste; (5) a ritual system of exchange of food, goods, and services concerned with purity and pollution as well as economics; (6) a ranking of each caste according to their respective degrees of pollution.

Various movements to reform the caste system have made some impact on the traditional structure. Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity have all made inroads into caste norms. It is significant, however, that most of the reform movements have resulted in castes of their own, evolving into exclusive, endogamous sects. Mahatma Gandhi's programs were aimed at the removal of the caste system, but the divisions persist even under modern pressures of Westernization. Since caste in India has always functioned as a powerful religious system of belief, movements to lessen the influence or abolish the caste system have so far failed.

Christian missions have for the most part ignored caste distinctions. Those who join a Christian church are compelled to join a church community outside the caste system, automatically forcing them downward from all their social and family relationships. Indications are that people would become Christians more readily if they were able to remain in their own social grouping. And yet many Christians maintain that the freedom found in new life in Christ (Gal. 3:26–29; Eph. 2) transcends the divisions of caste, and that the gospel challenges injustices associated with caste.

NORMAN E. ALLISON

Bibliography. P. Kolenda, *Caste in Contemporary India: Beyond Organic Solidarity*; W. Matthews, *World Religions*; M. N. Srinivas, *Caste in Modern India and Other Essays*; R. D. Winter and D. A. Fraser, *PWCM*, pp. B:193–212.

Communication. Communication is the missionary problem par excellence. The word comes from the Latin word *communis* (common). In order to fulfill the GREAT COMMISSION a “commonality” must be established with the various peoples of the world—a commonality that makes it possible for them to understand and embrace the gospel of Christ. Accordingly, when HENDRICK KRAEMER sought to place questions having to do with the missionary task in a “wider and deeper

setting” than that afforded by alternative words, he chose the word “communication.”

From very early days the progress of the gospel has been aided by the communication skills of its proponents. One thinks immediately of John the Baptist's preaching in Judea, Peter's sermon on Pentecost, and Paul's ministry to the Gentiles. Jesus was a master communicator. However, a tension is introduced at this point because the New Testament makes it clear that human wisdom and communication skills are not sufficient to draw people to Christ and advance his kingdom (cf. 2 Cor. 2:1–6). Though the Lord Jesus commissioned the apostles to disciple the nations by preaching and teaching, he commanded them to stay in Jerusalem until empowered by the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8). ELENCTICS, the “science of the conviction of sin” (Herman Bavinck), deals with this tension between human and divine components in Christian communication and is a pivotal, though often neglected, concern in missiology.

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

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

It must be admitted, however, that “Egyptian gold” came with a price. Ethnocentric rhetoricians of ancient times believed that if foreign

Cross-Cultural Evangelism

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

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

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

For many years theorists and practitioners alike have discussed issues such as the best starting point for gospel communication (the nature and attributes of God or the person and work of Christ) and the establishment of common ground with the hearers. Current issues

also have to do with the interanimation among language, cognition, and WORLDVIEW; the relationship among form, meaning, and function; the role of culture in special revelation and BIBLE TRANSLATION, interpretation, and application; and the relative importance of respondent understandings and preferences in CONTEXTUALIZING the Christian message. The significance accorded to the findings of the various sciences in these discussions, as well as in missionary communication theory and practice in general, serves to indicate that Augustine's “profane knowledge” problem is a perennial one. That being the case, contemporary theorists stand to benefit not just from his insight that Egyptian gold is still gold, but also from his reminders that biblical knowledge is to be considered superior both qualitatively and quantitatively, and that secular approaches are to be used with moderation.

DAVID J. HESSELGRAVE

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

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

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

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

The late twentieth century has seen, along with widespread acceptance of anthropological insights, a flowering of respect for culture in missions and evangelism. James Engel devised a scale to measure people's understanding of the gospel and their movement toward Christ. It can

be used to gauge the spiritual knowledge and involvement of both individuals and groups. At one end of the ENGEL SCALE are those with no awareness of Christianity (-7), followed by those aware of the existence of Christianity (-6), followed by those with some knowledge of the gospel (-5). Conversion is numerically neutral on the Engel Scale. At its far end are incorporation of the believer into a Christian fellowship (+2) and active gospel propagation by the believer (+3). Bridging the knowledge gap often, but not always, involves cross-cultural evangelism.

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

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

As evangelical understanding of culture has progressed, a number of innovative evangelism methods have been advanced. Noting that the theology of the Bible is often encased in stories, Tom Steffen of Biola University and others argue that STORYTELLING can be more effective in oral cultures than the Western-style cognitive teaching approach. Baptists working among the Muslim Kotokoli people of Togo have found that storytelling can lower cultural barriers to the gospel.

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

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

STANLEY M. GUTHRIE

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

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

The missionary expansion of the church from its earliest days is evidence of the seriousness

Culture

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

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

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

The relativization of the cultural expressions of the Christian faith has resulted in the popular acceptance within missions of the concept of CONTEXTUALIZATION, which aims to be faithful to Scripture and relevant to culture. Such an approach intends to apply the absolutes to which Scripture refers within a plurality of culturally appropriate forms. However, disquiet at the prominence currently given to contextualization in missiology was expressed by Christians with a Reformed perspective at a Caucus on Mission to Muslims held at Four Brooks Conference Centre in 1985.

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

PATRICK SOOKHDEO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Culture

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

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

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

Besides reflecting and reshaping God's demands, cultures are also the means of God's common grace. Through his providential control God uses the shaping of human cultures to check the rampant violence of evil and preserve human continuity. They provide guidelines to restrain our worst impulses, sanctions of SHAME or GUILT to keep us in line. Cultures and worldviews, then, are not simply neutral road maps. Created by those who bear the IMAGE OF GOD (Gen. 1:27–28),

they display, to greater or lesser degree, both the wisdom of God and the flaws of sin.

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

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

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

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

HARVIE M. CONN

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

nity; J. Stott and R. Coote, eds., *Down to Earth: Studies in Christianity and Culture*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Culture Shock

Spradley (1979) provides very helpful insights on structuring interviews, and collecting and analyzing interview data.

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

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

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

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

SHERWOOD LINGENFELTER

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

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

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

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

many return home before this period is over and write and speak very positively about an experience that was quite superficial.

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHARLES H. KRAFT

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

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

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

Improving Quality of Decisions. A Decisional Balance Sheet lists all known alternatives with

Dependency

the anticipated positive and negative consequences of each. The Decisional Balance Sheet will lead to improved decisions when seven criteria for information processing are met:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DONALD E. SMITH

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

Dependency. Dependence is a necessary part of life, an inborn tendency which cultural, social, and psychological conditions shape. The real

problem of dependence is not its existence or nonexistence, but the manner of being dependent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Disciple, Discipleship

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

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

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

DONALD F. SMITH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the world as the Father had sent Jesus (John 20:21).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mission and Discipleship. We have seen above that a primary goal of discipleship is becoming like Jesus (Luke 6:40). This is also understood by Paul to be the final goal of eternal election (Rom. 8:29). The process of becoming like Jesus brings the disciple into intimate relationship with the Lord Jesus Christ, and, as such, is the goal of individual discipleship. But discipleship is not simply self-centered. In a classic interaction with two of his disciples who were seeking positions of prominence, Jesus declares that servanthood is to be the goal of disciples in relationship to one another (Mark 10:35–45). The reason that this kind of servanthood is possible is because of Jesus’ work of servanthood in ransoming disciples. He paid the price of release from the penalty for sin (cf. Rom. 6:23), and from the power of sin over pride and self-centered motivation. The motivation of self-serving greatness is broken through redemption, and disciples are thus enabled to focus upon others

Enculturation

in servanthood both in the church and, with other Christians, servanthood in the world. This is very similar to Paul's emphasis when he points to Jesus' emptying himself to become a servant: Jesus provides the example of the way the Philipian believers are to act toward one another (Phil. 2:1–8).

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

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

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

MICHAEL J. WILKINS

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

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

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

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

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

A. SCOTT MOREAU

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

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

Prejudice or discrimination in a scientific sense can be both positive and negative. However, in the social sciences, including missiology, the terms are generally used with a negative connotation. It is necessary to distinguish between the two: prejudice is an attitude; discrimination is action or social interaction unfavorable to oth-

ers on the basis of their religious, ethnic, or racial membership.

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

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

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

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

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

Ethnocentrism is Counterproductive in Missions. "Missions" are the ways and means whereby the Christian church fulfills its mission of world evangelization. INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION, CROSS-CULTURAL MINISTRY, and CHURCH PLANTING are parts of the process of world evan-

gelization. At any of these points ethnocentrism can curtail or cripple efforts in missions.

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

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

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

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

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

ENOCH WAN

Bibliography. W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice*; J. D. Dovidio and S. L. Gaertner, *Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism*; P. Jackson, ed., *Race and Racism: Essays in Social Geography*; D. Kitagawa, *Race Relations and Christian Mission*; R. A. LeVine and D. T. Campbell, *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Atti-*

Evangelism

tudes, and Group Behavior; V. Reynolds, et al., eds., *The Sociobiology of Ethnocentrism*.

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 pre-

tend 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

Extent of Missionary Identification

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*.

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

Historically rooted in anthropological research techniques where the researcher studied his or her “subjects” in their own context, identification was recognized as a means of increasing insights, sympathy, and influence among the people under study. The sensitive missionary, however, goes further and benefits more deeply by becoming subjectively involved with the people among whom he or she ministers. Recogniz-

ing that the final decision for Christ lies with the hearer, not the advocate, early concepts for missionary identification called for the missionary to work in light of human social institutions and the associated means to make decisions in the local setting when presenting the gospel.

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

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

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

The practice of incarnational missionary identification functions on three levels: (1) lifestyle—external identification in terms of language, dress, food, patterns of courtesy, use of local transportation, and housing; (2) willingness to serve alongside and eventually under a local leader; (3) inner identification, the deepest of all levels. Attitudes of dignity, respect, and trust

speak of our genuine love for the people with whom we minister. Genuinely deep love forms both the foundation and capstone for all levels of identification.

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

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

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

ROBERTA R. KING

Bibliography. K. Bediako, *Christianity in Africa: The Renewal of a Non-Western Religion*; P. Hiebert, *Anthropological Insights for Missionaries*; C. H. Kraft, *Christianity in Culture*; E. Nida, *Message and Mission: The Communi-*

cation of the Faith; P. Parshall, *New Paths in Muslim Evangelism*; A. Tippett, *Introduction to Missiology*.

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

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

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

The Fallen Nature of Humankind. It is not necessary to consider every aspect of the human person in order to discuss the nature of forgiveness; one alone is necessary, the fact of human sinfulness (*see SIN*). It is this negative quality, oddly enough, that lifts us most clearly above the rest of our earthly, created order and shows us most decisively what we are not to be, even though that is what we are. This is true because sin is a moral category and only moral, responsible beings may sin. And because guilt attends our sin, we are painfully aware that sin ought not to be there even though it is and it is unques-

Forgiveness of Sins

tionably ours; we cannot honestly blame anyone else. All the major religions of the world have concepts of morality, sin, guilt, and responsibility (see also HUMAN CONDITION IN WORLD RELIGIONS). The Bible, in particular, speaks with great force and clarity here, emphasizing the *inherent* nature of our sinfulness, its gravity, and its consequences. Sin is not simply something that we have done wrong or some hurt we have inflicted upon someone else; sin is an offense against God and God's moral requirements, requirements that derive from his very nature. Were the moral nature of the universe simply the result of God's decisions, they would not have ultimate ontic reality and could be changed at will. Rather, the moral categories—the violation of which makes sin sinful—are expressions of the very nature of reality as God has created it, with ourselves as God intended us to be, and with God himself as he eternally is (see DIVINE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD). Hence, David cries out, "I know my transgressions and my sin is always before me. Against you, you only have I sinned and done what is evil in your sight" (Ps. 51:3, 4). As the contemporary psychologist Karl Menninger puts it, sin is "An implicitly aggressive quality—a ruthlessness, a hurting, a breaking away from God and from the rest of humanity, a partial alienation, or act of rebellion. . . . Sin has a willful, defiant or disloyal quality. *Someone* is defied or offended or hurt" (*Whatever Became of Sin?* p. 19)—and that someone is God. The Bible presents an unremitting picture of universal human sinfulness, surrounded by the apostle Paul in Romans 3:10–18, concluding with "All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23).

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

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

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

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

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

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

per he says, “This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins” (Matt. 26:28).

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

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

WALTER A. ELWELL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Christian has no right to limit obedience to the GREAT COMMISSION to a select circle. Never-

Gender Roles

theless, believers should be cognizant of their responsibility to share the gospel with their friends and intimates. Even more, Christians of all cultures should be intentional in cultivating genuine friendships with unbelievers.

JEFFERY B. GINN

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

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

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

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

and nurturers, both being necessary for the well-being of society.

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

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

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

ship training in the church for males and females should be related to the roles they play in society. Brusco (1995) has done an excellent anthropological study on the effect of conversion to evangelical Protestantism on gender roles in Colombia. Her work shows how allegiance to Christ brings gender role changes.

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

MARGUERITE G. KRAFT

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

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

In today's missions, when the amount of financial support available for a particular ministry or project is often tied proportionately to the level of productivity, what is communicated to donors or potential donors about the ministry's level of success or failure may prove to be the deciding factor in whether the support, and possibly the ministry, is continued or not. Under such circumstances, honesty in communication becomes a very important factor between the missionary and his or her mission and donors and also between the mission and its donors. Honesty becomes an issue of Christian conscience in being straightforward in these relationships, and it becomes an issue of faith in

our sovereign Lord who is in complete control and who is building his church. Missionaries must always remember that they cannot serve God and mammon, regardless of the noble reasons for trying.

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

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

THOMAS L. AUSTIN

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

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

Indigenization provided the freedom for the Greek translators of the Hebrew Old Testament (the Septuagint) to take a word like *theos* from

Indigenization

the idolatrous world of polytheism and use it to describe the only Creator of heaven and earth, the God (*theos*) and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Out of the reservoir of ancient Near Eastern metaphors God paints himself as the divine warrior (Exod. 15:1–3) come to deliver his people from Egypt. He reshapes the treaty language of the ancient Hittite codes from their polytheistic

connections to draw a picture of the covenant made between Creator and creature, Redeemer and redeemed (Exod. 20:1–17). He encloses his eternal Word in the limiting wrappings of the Hebrew language, his own coming in the God-man Jesus Christ, the Word of God incarnate as a first-century Palestinian Jew.

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

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

Later Jesuit experiments particularly in China moved in a similar direction. MATTEO RICCI saw the Chinese homage to Confucius and to the ancestors as ritual expressions of gratitude not inimical to the Christian faith. He “found in Confucius the natural theology, the *preparatio evangelica*, of China as his theological training had given him this for the West in Aristotle” (Allen, 1960, 39).

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

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

Protestant models in the nineteenth century promised more freedom but often practiced a

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

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

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

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

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

HARVIE M. CONN

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

Individualism and Collectivism. A minority of the world’s peoples live in cultures where individual interest (individualism) prevails over group interest (collectivism). Individualism is

strong in the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Italy, and Western European societies. Collectivism dominates elsewhere. However, even in predominantly collectivist nations exposure to Western individualist-oriented media may shift urban groups toward individualism.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Individualism and Collectivism

act in harmony with group opinion is considered to have a bad character.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Inter-group Relationships. Relationships with outsider groups are primarily competitive in collectivist cultures, even confrontational and often marked by distrust and hostility. Support of the in-group is considered necessary in dealing with outsiders, an "us against them" approach. The

factionalism that fragments some nations originates in the collectivist cultures of their many constituent groups and tribes.

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

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

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

Business Dealings. Among collectivists, personal relationships are essential. Business is conducted by first establishing a social relationship, then proceeding to details of the task, and the exchange of goods, services, and money. Legal contracts are secondary to knowing the groups involved and establishing rapport and trust. Management focuses on groups as the basic unit. It is almost compulsory that persons in the in-group be given advantages in hiring, assignment of jobs, and other realms of business. Failing to do this is considered disloyalty to the group.

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

Some Implications for Missions. Contemporary evangelical missions have predominantly originated in individualist societies, and gone to collectivist societies. Differing assumptions and

expectations have led to frequent misunderstandings and antagonism. The continuing resistance of some people groups to the Christian message may well be a serious consequence.

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

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

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

DONALD K. SMITH

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

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

Intercultural communication is distinct from cross-cultural communication, which compares a particular behavior or behaviors in differing cultures. International communication deals with comparative mass media communication in different nations and to communication between nations. Global communication is a term usually

limited to the technology and transfer of information without regard to national borders.

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

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

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

Humanistic Models. Humanistic models emphasize the human element in communication. The transactional view of communication recognizes that knowledge of the receiver or listener is part of shaping the message form. Communication is seen as sharing. Symbols are used to stimulate the formation of meaning in another person, and consequently the sharing of meaning through a context-sensitive process. The interactional approach recognizes the reciprocal nature of communication, in which a circle that includes feedback and alteration represents the communication process. Both the transactional and interactional views of communication are consistent with biblically based INCARNATIONAL MISSION. A Christian view of communication must also recognize the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the communicative process.

Most humanistic models developed in the Western world assume that sharing of information is the primary aim of communication. However, East Asian societies that are deeply influenced by Confucianism (China, Korea, Japan especially) view communication as primarily to establish and maintain harmony. Balance and harmony in human relationships are the basis of society. Interpersonal communication is guided by social rules specific for each situation, depending on age, status, and intimacy. Thus, com-

Intercultural Communication

munication is an “infinite interpretive process” (Jandt, 1995, 29) where everyone concerned seeks to develop and maintain a social relationship. Communication is a way to seek consensus, not essentially to transmit information. Difficulties in intercultural communication will arise from the fundamentally different purposes in communicating between East and West, as well as from the more obvious differences in style, context, and vocabulary.

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

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

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

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

of communication emphasizes the implicit aspect.

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

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

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

Even though the same signal systems are used in every culture, the many significant differences in their usage make clarity of understanding between members of different cultures difficult to achieve. One culture may emphasize the importance of the verbal (the spoken word), while another emphasizes the unspoken use of body language, the kinesic system. Another culture may have highly developed pictorial communication, while still another has an intricate system of communication involving numbers. The individual signals may have totally different significance in different cultures, for example, a gesture may mean approval in one culture and be considered obscene in another or a word may indicate appreciation in one setting but rejection in a different culture. Effective intercultural communication at the explicit-utilitarian level demands learning both the relative importance of the various signal systems in different cultures as well as learning the meaning intended by various signals.

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

modeled this kind of intercultural communication as he explains in 1 Corinthians 9:19–23.

DONALD K. SMITH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Effective Communication and Contextualization of Work and Ministry. The desired outcome of intercultural competency is effective communication in every area of culture. The goal of cultural competency is to contextualize work and ministry in the cultural system that is known and practiced by people in the local community. The intercultural worker must intentionally frame communication and ministry within the cultural systems available to local cultural participants. This requires that intercultural workers rethink what they do and how they do it, and reframe it into the language, economic, social, and value systems of the local culture.

Many missiologists define cultural competency with reference to incarnational ministry (see INCARNATIONAL MISSION). The example for incarnational ministry is the Lord Jesus Christ. In Philippians 2:6–7, Paul speaks of Jesus as being “in very nature God,” yet not clinging to that identity, but “taking the very nature of a servant, being made in human likeness.” Lingenfelter and Mayers (1986, p. 15) characterize Jesus as a “200% person.” They then draw the analogy that the intercultural missionary must become at least a 150% person—ideally, retaining their own cultural identity at least at the level of 75%, and yet adding a new identity of 75% of the culture in which they serve. The challenge of incarnational ministry is becoming more than we are,

Interpersonal Communication

and learning and incorporating the culture of our hosts into our lives, and participating effectively in ministry within their cultural context. Yet incarnational ministry is not enough. As Christians we are engaged in lives of pilgrimage; as Peter says, “as aliens and strangers in the world, . . . live such good lives among the pagans that, though they may accuse you of doing wrong, they may see your good deeds and glorify God on the day that He visits us” (1 Peter 2:11–12).

SHERWOOD G. LINGENFELTER

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

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

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

All interpersonal communication involves gaps between people and the techniques used to bridge those gaps. Traditional approaches to communication have tended to focus attention either on the source of messages or on the vehicles used to convey them. The primary vehicle, of course, is LANGUAGE, and much attention has been devoted to the place of language in the communication process, as if words contained the meanings people attempt to communicate. But, as Berlo and others have demonstrated, meanings reside neither in the external world nor in language or other vehicles we use in the communication process. Though we can pass messages

from person to person, meanings reside only in persons, never in the vehicles used to convey the messages. Meanings are created by receptors on the basis of their perceptions of what the communicator intends by the messages he or she is sending.

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

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

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

On the other hand, exciting PEOPLE MOVEMENTS have often resulted when messages of God’s love and power have been presented in

ways that were accurately interpreted by the receptors from within their frame of reference.

CHARLES H. KRAFT.

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

Kinship. Kinship relations have long been a major part of anthropological study. For kinship (interpersonal) relations and social (intergroup) relations combine with the economic, political, and religious aspects of culture to structure human behavior. The relative importance people from different cultures (kinship, peasant, industrial, and postindustrial) place on these relations will vary widely and impact their behavior.

Despite this diversity, all human relationships can be understood within a framework of identity, STATUS, and role. *Identity* is specified by the use of a kinship term to designate particular individuals—the term serves as their identity. *Status* relates to the cultural expectations associated with particular identities—how people expect those so identified to behave. *Role* is the actual behavior of people with a particular identity; this behavior reflects the basic nature of the relationship. Thus kinship terms define cultural sets of rights and duties that are acted out in real life through specific behavior patterns.

By fitting into relationships with people on the basis of cultural expectations, missionaries serving in a particular society may be able to remove much of the mystery associated with their presence. By adapting to local cultural expectations, outsiders can learn much about appropriate behavior and use that knowledge to build relationships that may serve as a launching pad for communicating the gospel. In kinship societies, with their focus on close egalitarian relationships, outsiders must build intragenerational relationships with members of the society and use that bonding to communicate. In peasant societies relationships are more hierarchical and intergenerational, often resembling a family structure. In industrial societies, which focus on individuals, communication often springs from the interaction between individuals—friends, business associates, people with common interests. Postindustrial societies, with an emphasis on team building, demand complementary skills; each person contributes to the whole, which may be a neighborhood, club, association, or group bound by occupation.

Similarly, an appreciation for the nature of groups within a society can be utilized in presenting the gospel and assisting church growth within a cultural context. Each group has its own criteria

for membership. These are often based on kinship (nuclear family, extended family, clan), territory (neighborhood, city, state), economic position (caste, occupation), or language (dialect, tribe). As with kinship relations, each group has an identity (terminologically defined), a status (set of expected behavior patterns), and roles (the actual patterns of the group's behavior). A group's understanding of themselves and others—how far the boundaries extend before others are recognized as being outside the group—can be of great assistance to missionaries attempting to discover how many translations of Scripture should be made within a particular region or which groups will interact with a newly founded church.

To build an effective missiological strategy, it is important to determine whether a given society places greater value on individual or group identity. One should also analyze whether the society is tightly or loosely structured. Societies fall into four general categories: (1) authoritarian—individual-oriented and tightly structured; (2) individualist—individual-oriented and loosely structured; (3) hierarchist—group-oriented and tightly structured; and (4) collectivist—group-oriented and loosely structured. Determining the nature of a particular society is vital for sound development and implementation of an evangelistic strategy. Should the approach focus on individuals or whole groups (see INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM)? And if groups, which ones would make the most appropriate targets, and why? Should Christianity be presented as a means for people to relate more effectively with other groups or as a means of building interpersonal relationships?

An understanding of relationships will also give insight into the nature of LEADERSHIP patterns within a society. What determines who is to be a leader—a general election, appointment (and by whom?), or a birthright? How is leadership expressed? What are the responsibilities of leaders within the group and beyond? How do leaders actually perform their duties? The framework of identity, status, and role is once again helpful for understanding rights and duties as people exercise leadership. Is leadership the prerogative of an individual, such as a judge, or is it delegated to a group, such as the panchayat under an Indian banyan tree or a palaver in Africa? Understanding the leadership patterns within a society is crucial as a church selects a pastor or gives responsibilities to a group of elders. What gives them the right to serve, and what are the implications of following cultural patterns in contrast to ignoring them?

Throughout Scripture there are many patterns of kinship and social interaction as well as expressions of leadership. Therefore we should not argue that there is a biblical pattern since there are many. Rather, Scripture can be brought to

Lifestyle Evangelism

bear (both positively and negatively) on the status and roles of individuals and groups within each cultural context. Clearly research in the area of kinship and social structure is important for the introduction of the gospel and its ongoing impact as the church develops and grows.

R. DANIEL SHAW

Bibliography. T. Brewster and B. S. Brewster, *Bonding*; M. Douglas, *In the Active Voice*, pp. 183–254; W. H. Goodenough, *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*; S. Lingenfelter, *Transforming Culture: A Challenge for Christian Mission*; R. D. Shaw, *Missiology* 18 (1991): 291–304.

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

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

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

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

the gospel message to those he was trying to reach.

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

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

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

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

TIMOTHY K. BEOUGHER

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

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

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

and wholesome sentiment. It expresses joy in being with or involved with someone or something.

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

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

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

ED GLASSCOCK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ture interact meaningfully about marriage practices with members of another culture?

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

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

Monogamy, the marriage of one man and one woman, with an exclusive sexual relationship, is the most common idealized form of marriage. Cultural variations of its enactment include religious rituals, civil ceremonies, and common law acceptance. The choice of partner may be up to the individual or at the discretion of the extended family. Monogamy is generally recognized to uphold the creation model of one husband and one wife restated by Jesus (Matt. 19:4-6). Polygamy, one man with two or more wives, is attested to in the Old Testament and continues to be practiced in some cultures today. Polyandry, one woman with two or more husbands, is the least common of the traditional marriage patterns. Same-sex marriages, involving two males or two females, have recently been suggested as analogous to monogamous relationships, though there is no biblical support for this type of marital union.

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

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

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

our own relationships and practices. We must learn before we would be teachers.

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

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

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

ADRIENNE FORGETTE AND YOUNG LEE HERTIG

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

Missionary Affluence. A relatively unexamined element of recent missionary life and work has been the affluence of Western missionaries in comparison with the majority of the world's peoples among whom they work. The development of great personal wealth in the West over the past few centuries and the cultural assumptions inherent with that wealth have been paralleled by the development of like assumptions and expectations of appropriate missionary lifestyles and capabilities. Wealthy missionaries, as Bonk rightly points out, find it difficult at best to truly incarnate Christ among the destitute of the world, as the gap between them is simply too big and the wealthy have too much to lose by letting go of that to which they cling.

It does not matter that missionaries, by Western standards, are generally on the lower end of the socioeconomic scale. What does matter is that all too often those among whom they work see the missionaries as having access to personal and institutional wealth of which the indigenous population can only dream. Often, however, it is not just a question of the amount of income; even missionaries who live at low income levels can still communicate a materialistic worldview, and those who have wealth can communicate

genuine lack of materialism. Additionally, that the missionary may live a truly incarnate lifestyle does not remove the fact that such a lifestyle is by the *missionary's choice*, and such a type of choice is unavailable for the poor.

The fact of such disparity may subvert the very gospel message the mission agencies and missionaries bring, and often leads to hidden resentment and eventually open conflict. As the gap between the rich and the poor continues to grow, and as INDIGENOUS CHURCHES begin to find their own authentic voices, it will become an increasing problem that Western missionaries who work in areas of endemic poverty will of necessity have to face more realistically if they are to be true partners in the global missionary task.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. J. J. Bonk, *Missions and Money: Affluence as a Western Missionary Problem.*

Paternalism. In a generic sense, all that is positive in familial relationships, in particular that of father to child. When paternalism exists in adult or institutional (such as church-mission) relationships, however, the considerable literature shows it has negative connotations. Paternalism might be thought of as the use of coercion to achieve a good that is not perceived as such by those persons for whom it is intended.

Paternalism, the concept of intervening actively for the perceived well-being of another, has long existed in mission. People with knowledge, skills, funds, or power (the older missions) have used them to get new churches to follow their demands. An example of paternalism is a mission keeping control of a work because it feels that the locals are unqualified and would do themselves and the cause of Christ harm by taking leadership. Paternalistic attitudes assume superior knowledge, wisdom, and skills. While well intentioned in some cases, they fail to recognize the work of the Holy Spirit in young churches and their leaders.

While the connotations of paternalism are often negative, churches or missions sometimes develop rules (by-laws, covenants, mission and purpose statements) with the positive result of producing mature Christian behavior.

Paternalism is a complex issue. Mission leaders must face the tension involved in deciding how much or how little influence to exert, either actively intervening or passively withholding something, for the perceived good of emerging missions, churches, and their leadership.

MIKEL NEUMANN

Bibliography. J. Kleinig, *Paternalism*; D. VanDeVeer, *Paternalistic Intervention.*

Pre-evangelism. Many well-intentioned witnesses for Christ employ evangelistic strategies

Race Relations

that assume every unbeliever is potentially ready to respond to the gospel upon first hearing. Such strategies encourage Christian witnesses to get right to the point to attempt to bring unbelievers, without delay, to repentance and faith in Christ, regardless of their background or lack of prior exposure to Christian truth.

In contrast to this direct approach, others prefer a more indirect style of evangelism, employing strategies that assume most unbelievers are initially not ready to respond meaningfully to the gospel. Proponents of the indirect approach are convinced that, in most instances, they need first to establish a relationship of trust with those to whom they are witnessing and to demonstrate their own credibility. They also argue that it generally takes time for unbelievers to become fully convinced that the gospel is true, relevant, and worth accepting, no matter what the cost. It is felt that unbelievers need first to process the new information they have received, to seek clarification, to abandon previously held views and presuppositions, and to weigh the potential ramifications of a decision to follow Christ. Otherwise, the new converts may make only a superficial, premature decision for Christ that fails to result in authentic conversion. Advocates of the indirect approach often characterize direct evangelism as a one-size-fits-all strategy that treats everyone essentially alike and thus fails to demonstrate appropriate respect for human dignity and individuality.

Over the past generation, James Engel had greater impact than any other person on evangelical thinking about the need for what is often called pre-evangelism. Elaborating on a model first advanced by Viggo Sögaard, Engel developed what has come to be known as the ENGEL SCALE, which sees conversion as an often lengthy process, only one part of which is the actual moment of regeneration. As Engel notes, recipients of Christian witness frequently begin their spiritual journey from a point at which they lack even an awareness of the existence of a supreme being. Then, often quite gradually and tentatively, they begin to move from initial exposure to Christianity to a vague awareness of their own personal spiritual need. Eventually, they may begin to develop at least a measure of interest in the gospel, but it often takes time for them to become fully aware, first of its essential details, and then of its implications for them personally. Typically, it takes additional time for unbelievers to develop a fully positive attitude toward the gospel and to recognize that it is indeed capable of meeting their deepest felt needs. It is only after they reach this point that they are ready to make a meaningful decision to repent and place their faith in Jesus Christ.

The Engel Scale helps us to see, therefore, that we really need to adjust the content and focus of

our witness to persons as they are along the conversion continuum. Instead of immediately urging someone to make a definite decision for Christ, it is often more appropriate first to employ a variety of pre-evangelistic techniques, helping him or her gradually to move along the scale to the point where he or she is fully ready to follow Christ.

RAYMOND P. PRIGODICH

Bibliography. J. F. Engel, *Contemporary Christian Communications: Its Theory and Practice*. Nashville; J. F. Engel and W. H. Norton, *What's Gone Wrong with the Harvest? A Communication Strategy for the Church and World Evangelism*.

Race Relations. The reality of race and race relations has been central to the missions movement in the United States from at least the early nineteenth century. The combinations of increased scientific interest in race as a category (as evidenced in books as disparate as David Hume's *Of National Characters* in 1748 and Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859) and the growing American dilemma of dealing with the enslavement of Africans and their descendants in this country helped focus the attention of people interested in missions, especially with respect to Africans and their descendants in the Western Hemisphere, on how to—and even whether to—evangelize people of other races.

Race as an ethnic designation has a rather recent history. By the dawn of the nineteenth century, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach's fivefold typology of races—Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, African, and Malayan—had not only gained ascendancy, but also reified racial categorization into a static, biological system, rather than a dynamic movement within human history. If race were to be seen as a static category, then race mixing could be rightly deemed “unnatural” and for Christians “sinful.” Because of the presence of Africans and their descendants in the Western Hemisphere due to chattel slavery, these concerns took on special significance for black-white relations in the United States.

Christians engaged these issues in the early missions movement by (1) evangelizing Africans and African American slaves as equal members of the human family; (2) evangelizing Africans and African Americans slaves, but limiting their Christian freedom to the “spiritual realm” and denying their full human capacities and rights; (3) ignoring, denying, and even fighting against efforts to Christianize blacks out of a denial of their humanity and even fear of the power of the gospel to breed insurrection against the slavocracy. Of course, some slave missionary efforts reflected a basic compatibility between Christian faith and slavery, noting in a threefold defense of Christian slavery: “Abraham practiced it, Paul

preached it, and Jesus is silent on the issue.” Indeed, some missionary efforts to slaves revolved around the text “Slaves, obey your earthly master” (Eph. 6:5).

In the evangelization of Africa, race relations played a crucial role. Early efforts to send black Americans to Africa combined with efforts to repatriate freed blacks to Africa in colonization efforts was resisted by some free blacks who claimed America as their home. In the late nineteenth century, some missionary agencies declined to send blacks on African missions for fear of intermarriage with white missionaries. Others were concerned that blacks’ interpretation of the recent Civil War in the United States as God’s judgment against slavery would be dangerous baggage in evangelizing colonized Africans. As segregation became part of American denominational life, black denominations formed their own separate mission agencies and the work of missions became another reflection of American segregation.

The impact of the Civil Rights Movement and the changing patterns in American race relations affected missions work in bringing more blacks into the mainstream of home and foreign missions, and making visible to the larger society the steady stream of missionary activity sponsored by black churches at home and abroad. Contemporary efforts at racial reconciliation are building on the work of intergrationists in the 1950s and 1960s. The reconciliation accords reached between black and white Pentecostals in 1994 as well as ongoing conversations between the National Association of Evangelicals and the National Black Evangelical Association reflect the churches’ sense that racial reconciliation is a part of kingdom work. Some missions organizations, such as Youth With a Mission, have even incorporated notions of identificational repentance and reconciliation as part of their missions strategies, noting the need for contemporary Christians to confess the sins of their forbears as part of the healing process.

HAROLD DEAN TRULEAR

Bibliography. G. Myrdal, *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem in American Democracy*; T. Sowell, *Race and Culture: A World View*; W. Williams, *Black Americans and the Evangelization of Africa: 1877–1900*.

Repentance. Repentance is the central message that the church is to bring to the world (Luke 24:47). It is a characteristic of the life of the church, and is one of the primary goals of the church’s mission.

The key terms in the Old Testament are *nâham* and *shûbh*. The former word carries the root idea of “to pant, sigh, or groan.” It speaks of lamenting and grieving and when it is aimed at one’s own character it has the idea of repenting.

The latter word speaks of turning from sin to righteousness (2 Chron. 7:14). Through Israel, God calls all nations to repent.

The key New Testament terms are *metamelomai*, *metanoëō*, and *epistrephō*. *Metamelomai* stresses the emotional aspect of care, concern, and regret. It can refer to genuine repentance (Matt. 21:29, 32) and may also refer to a regret and remorse that is not accompanied by an abandonment of sin (Matt. 27:3). *Metanoëō* is used to note the need to “have another mind” by changing one’s opinion and purposes (Matt. 3:2; Mark 1:15; Acts 2:38). The dominant idea of *epistrephō* is a change of mind that may result in accompanying emotions and consequent reformation.

Elements of Repentance. True repentance has intellectual, emotional, and volitional elements. Intellectually it involves a change of mind about God, sin, Christ, and oneself. The resultant change of mind views God as good and holy; sin as evil and injurious before God and people; Christ as perfect, necessary, and sufficient for salvation; and oneself as guilty and in need of salvation. Such repentance is an essential element of missionary proclamation.

Repentance involves a change of view, a change of feelings and a change of purpose. The emotional aspect may be seen in the passionate pleas found in David’s repentance (Ps. 51:1, 2, 10, 14), and in Jesus’ testimony of the tax-gatherer’s feeling of remorse that led to faith (Matt. 21:32). However, when the emotional element stands by itself it is not true repentance (Matt. 27:3; Luke 18:23, cf. 2 Cor. 7:9–10). The sorrow that leads to repentance is a sorrow for *sin*, not only for its consequences. The volitional aspect of repentance is seen in the turning to God in faith (1 Thess. 1:9), and is an anticipated outcome of the church’s mission among the nations.

Elaboration of Meaning. Repentance may be defined as a change of mind that is produced by the Holy Spirit leading to trust in God. Repentance is a part of true faith (Acts 20:21). It is not meritorious in itself, for Christ’s death fully satisfies God’s righteousness (Rom. 3:25). While repentance may lead to such outward acts as confession of sin and restitution, these are evidences of repentance and not the repentance itself. Repentance is an inward act that results in outward manifestations. Psalm 51 is an illustration of true repentance. The resulting attitude of repentance is reflected in Jesus’ call to become like a child (Matt. 18:2–4) as well as in the first four Beatitudes (Matt. 5:3–6).

Subjects and Objects of Repentance. God has commanded the world to repent in order to avoid his judgment (Acts 17:30). His patience and kindness move him to be slow to wrath (Rom. 2:4; 2 Peter 3:9). God does not repent in the sense of changing his immutable perfection

Sexual Mores

(1 Sam. 15:29), but his roused emotion may prompt him to a different course of action in carrying out his sovereign plan (Exod. 32:14; Jonah 3:10). It may imply God's sorrow or grief over humanity's sin (Jer. 6:6).

Unbelievers and believers may be appropriate subjects of repentance. The mission of the church is to carry out God's declaration to the world to repent and trust in Christ. The church is to exemplify a repentant lifestyle (Ps. 119:128). Jesus' command to take up one's cross is another way of describing this attitude, elaborated in Romans 6:11–13.

Repentance may have a variety of objects. Scripture speaks of repenting from trusting in money (Acts 8:22) as well as from a lack of trust in God's Word (Zech. 1:6). It also speaks of repentance from dead works (Heb. 6:1), idols (Ezek. 14:6), and leaving one's first love (Rev. 2:4–5). Repentance involves dealing with anything that hinders one from living under the authority of God (James 4:1–10) and being reconciled to other believers (Luke 17:3–4). Biblically, missionary proclamation must include a call to unbelievers to "repent and be baptized" (Acts 2:38; 3:19; 17:30; 26:20).

Preaching of Repentance. Repentance is a key theme in the proclamation of the church to a lost world that stands in need of the Savior. It was characteristic of the prophetic preaching (Jer. 8:6; Ezek. 14:6), John the Baptist (Matt. 3:2), Jesus (Matt. 4:17), the Twelve (Mark 6:12), Peter (Acts 2:38), and Paul (Acts 20:21). It is a message that is to be proclaimed to all peoples (Luke 24:47).

Reformed theology stresses the fact that repentance is a gift of God and a result of regeneration (Acts 5:31; 11:18; 2 Tim. 2:22). Arminian theology stresses the human element in repentance and regeneration. God is recognized in the latter as the primary cause and the person as the less principal cause. In both theologies the human responsibility of declaring God's Word is embraced as the means that God's Spirit uses to work repentance (Luke 10:30).

Results of Repentance. Christ's commission to the church to declare the message of repentance is motivated by God's kindness as God yearns for all peoples to taste the benefits that result from repentance. The Scriptures give the sad examples of the impenitent who refuse to live in agreement with God. Those who do repent become special objects of God's compassion. Repentance leads one to the experience of life (Acts 11:18), joy (2 Cor. 7:9), truth (2 Tim. 2:25), forgiveness (Acts 2:38), and the rule of God (Matt. 4:17). Repentance averts the wrath of God (Jonah 3:4–10) and leads to rejoicing in heaven (Luke 15:7, 10). An unrepentant church will no

longer reflect the light of Christ (Rev. 2:5) that alone can lead the world to repentance.

WILLIAM D. THRASHER

Bibliography. J. Goetzmann and F. Laubach, *NID-NTT*, I:353–59; V. P. Hamilton, *TWOT*, II:909–10; O. Michel, *TDNT*, IV:626–29; E. Würthwein and J. Behm, *TDNT*, IV:975–1009.

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

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

EBBIE C. SMITH

Shame. In order to inculcate and motivate morality in its members, a society may seek to instill GUILT for violating persons or moral rules. Or it may seek to instill *shame* for moral failure. Rather than motivating by the threat of punishment, such a society motivates by threatening disapproval and shame to those who fail to exemplify desirable virtues, and by offering honor and respect to those who exemplify prescribed character traits.

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

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

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

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

ROBERT J. PRIEST

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

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

Sociological Barriers

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.

Sociological Barriers. Jesus succeeded in breaking through social and economic barriers

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

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

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

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

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

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER

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

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

Teams in Mission

interactions of persons. Status refers to the position from which individuals act out their roles.

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

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

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

What most people call status, social scientists call "social status." This refers to rank, honor, and esteem. Max Weber called it "social honor." In virtually all societies, relative prestige becomes a measuring stick for ranking individuals. In some societies, economic resources determine social status. In others, personal resources such as courage, intelligence, and leadership ability serve to determine social rank. In complex soci-

eties, a combination of ascribed (race, ethnicity, gender, age, even ancestry) and achieved (wealth, education, income) statuses determine social ranking.

HAROLD DEAN TRULEAR

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

Teams in Mission. A ministry strategy and organizational structure that uses a small-group format and emphasizes interdependent relationships in order to accomplish a given task. Applied to the missionary context, the term has been used to describe a wide variety of structures and strategies, including short-term teams, evangelistic teams, church-planting teams, strategic-ministry teams, and structures in wider interagency partnerships.

The concept of team mission has found increasing popularity in recent years. Parallel to current management trends that emphasize employee empowerment and group decision-making, it also reflects a deeper understanding of community within the body of Christ by stressing interdependent relationships, mutual care and nurture, and the balance of spiritual gifting.

Team structures are therefore seen as providing a more biblically correct model of the nature of the church. When team members develop and use their own SPIRITUAL GIFTS and natural abilities and, in their areas of weakness, depend on the gifts and abilities of others, the newly planted church gains valuable insight into the interdependence necessary if it is to survive and prosper. Team structures are also an advantage in the process of CONTEXTUALIZATION, for theology is seen as belonging to the church collectively, and not to individuals or professionals. New contextual theologies grow out of the mutual efforts of many Christians to understand and apply the gospel to the specific context.

The emphasis on team structures is not entirely new. It has been suggested that Paul's missionary journeys involved a team structure that was both fluid and mobile. Several individuals are mentioned in Acts as ministering alongside of Paul and Barnabas (or Paul and Silas).

Team structures in mission have the advantages of providing companionship, continuity, and balance as well as strength and a greater objectivity in decision making. Weaknesses include increased potential for disagreement and disharmony, concentration of power, stifling of individuality and initiative, inflexibility, and the fostering of dependency. In some PIONEER MISSION WORK, concentrated team structures may be impractical. In such settings a sense of community and teamwork can usually be achieved on a wider scale rather than through immediate phys-

ical proximity. Healthy missionary teams strive to balance these advantages and disadvantages.

Teams should be formed before departure to the field. It is also recommended that teams include experienced as well as inexperienced missionaries, and that they have a realistic view in regard to continuity. Not all of the initial members will remain with the team, and new members should be added, especially where the goal is to create a structure that will readily include national members and eventually become the local ministry team.

Lastly, it should be pointed out that a true sense of team does not come with an organizational structure, but with dynamic interaction and the development of relationships over time and, most notably, through crisis and conflict resolution. People working in the same place may be a group, but it takes commitment and mutuality in the face of the task at hand to weave the fabric of a team.

PAUL F. HARTFORD

Bibliography. M. S. Harrison, *Developing Multinational Teams*; J. R. Katzenbach and D. K. Smith, *The Wisdom of Teams*; S. L. Mackin, *EMQ* 28:2 (April 1992): 134–40; D. A. McGavran, *Readings in Third World Missions*, pp. 187–89; K. O'Donnell, ed., *Missionary Care*; D. W. Shenk and E. R. Stutzman, *Creating Communities of the Kingdom*; R. D. Winter, *Crucial Dimensions in World Evangelization*, pp. 326–44.

Volunteer, Volunteerism in Mission. Voluntary association with or participation in the missionary activity of the church, Christians choosing on their own to become involved in intercultural missionary outreach.

Biblical Background. In the Old Testament, the renewal of the Mosaic covenant at Shechem under Joshua was an early demonstration of collective voluntarism (Josh. 24:1–4). Other examples include the prayer association of the Nazarites and the Jews organized by Nehemiah to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem.

In the New Testament, Jesus invited people to follow him, signifying a willing commitment. The basic ethic of Jesus' ministry was based on a willing, voluntary response and service. DISCIPLESHIP, in essence, was an act of one's own choosing. The cost of discipleship was a voluntary commitment (Luke 9:23; 12:32ff.). In his encouragement to prayer, Jesus again taught a voluntary principle: "Ask . . . seek . . . knock . . ." (Matt. 7:7).

The early church of the first century expanded through the voluntary acts of the disciples and apostles. The apostles followed a voluntary pattern, including the economic support of the community (Act 2:37–47). The concept of doing loving acts (charity) for others in the early church soon evolved into a more formal structure of good works in the imperial church.

The Emerging Theological Basis of Christian Voluntarism. During the period of medieval monasticism, Christians practiced voluntarism on a highly intense level. Thomas Aquinas (1226–74) provided a theological rationale for such effort by defining charity as "the mother of all virtues" because "it initiates the action of other virtues by charging them with life." FRANCIS OF ASSISI (1181–1226) and his followers serve as one of the great examples of this newly found collective Christian activism that catalyzed change in society.

The Launching of a New Era. Two important roots link the eighteenth-century religious awakenings and the rise of religious voluntarism. First, the GREAT AWAKENINGS in North America unleashed spiritual forces among large numbers of common people in the colonies. The mass meetings of GEORGE WHITEFIELD (1714–70) attracted thousands to his sermons of evangelism and discipleship, and led to the establishment of orphanages, academies, and pro-revival churches. Similarly, JONATHAN EDWARDS (1703–58) is connected with the English Prayer Call movement and other renewal forces in the colonies, and unleashed spiritual energy that led naturally to tangible forms of Christian service, typically in the form of new voluntary associations.

The Wesleyan movement was the second impetus that led Methodism to create numerous avenues of Christian service for its followers. JOHN WESLEY pioneered outdoor preaching and itinerant evangelism, and modeled a burden for the working classes and underprivileged.

By the 1780s the basic voluntary paradigms were in place. The catalyst that ignited the general cultural outbreak of voluntarism was WILLIAM CAREY, who pioneered a strategy whereby large numbers of people with modest resources could be involved in the work of missions.

The Evangelical Century. The voluntary association was the primary vehicle for the growth of the evangelical movement during the nineteenth century. Four emphases marked evangelical voluntarism in the latter half of the century: the holiness movement, the conservative/liberal debate, evangelistic missions in the empire, and humanitarian concerns. The perfectionist theology of CHARLES G. FINNEY (1792–1875) had a direct influence on the holiness tradition in Britain as well, and found institutional expression in several kinds of voluntary associations such as the KESWICK CONVENTION (1875). Various voluntary associations also grew up in response to the challenge to biblical authority from liberal theologians. In universities and among the churches, missionary and study societies, such as the Intercollegiate Christian Union (1877) and the Bible League (1892), grew up in support of the new evangelical concerns. The expansion of the British Empire provided a further field of interest for

Wealth and Poverty

Victorian evangelicals. In India, a dozen associations were formed between 1848 and 1876, with at least ten more formed in China.

North American Developments. The earliest forms of voluntarism in the United States were denominational, and this was followed by cooperation among the denominations. THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS was formed in 1813 and became the parent of all the cooperative voluntary mission associations at the national level.

The positive experience of churches with voluntary associations quickly lent itself to other forms of Christian endeavor. During and after the Civil War Christian voluntarism was especially concerned with the American South, fostering education societies, missionary bodies, and literacy bands. American cities also provided a fruitful arena for a variety of voluntary ministries dealing with housing shortages, poor sanitation, inadequate schools, crime, and unemployment. No other area of voluntary expansion better illustrates the pulse beat of American religious life in the late nineteenth century than women's work. Over two dozen associations of women for missions were formed to send women to mission work at home and abroad.

New Directions for a New Century. The twentieth century witnessed ecumenical voluntarism, particularly in the area of student missions. In 1886, the STUDENT VOLUNTEER MOVEMENT for foreign missions was formed and spread quickly to Britain and Europe. Out of this emerged InterVarsity in the United States in 1941. Similar to InterVarsity are the Navigators (1943), Youth for Christ (1930), Pioneer Clubs (1939), Young Life (1941), and Campus Crusade for Christ (1951).

In the later decades of the twentieth century new forms of religious voluntarism have arisen in the United States. One type is related to translating a religious perspective into political activism: the National Association of Religious Broadcasters and the Moral Majority. Another form is the organizational network centered on mass evangelism. Both radio and television evangelists have established vast networks of voluntary "prayer partners" and supporters.

The turn of the century calls the future of voluntarism into question. Does global change and increasing complexity threaten voluntarism as the primary means of doing Christian mission? Is voluntarism declining in the West as some suggest? What about the generation of aging Baby Boomers nearing retirement? Will they step into the gap as second-career mission volunteers? Will voluntarism spread from the West to the emerging churches in the majority world who venture to missions frontiers? Historians summarize the enduring values of Christian voluntarism as empowerment for groups of people, experimental spontaneity to respond to needs as

they arise, the creation of new leadership, and its singularity of purpose—various types of Christian mission. To the extent that voluntarism continues as a values-driven movement it will survive.

STEVE HOKE

Bibliography. W. H. Brackney, *Christian Voluntarism in Britain and North America: A Bibliography and Critical Assessment*; idem, *Christian Voluntarism: Theology and Praxis*.

Wealth and Poverty. One of the great social problems that faces those who would bear witness to the Christian faith in a global manner is that of distributive justice. There is an extreme divergence between the rich and poor of today's world, a contrast often described in terms of the North-South divide. Experts in demographics estimate that early in the third millennium, the world's population will be 6.3 billion, and by 2025 it may reach 8.5 billion. Moreover, 95 percent of the global population growth over this period will be in the developing countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. By 2025, Mexico will have replaced Japan as one of the ten most populous countries on the earth, and Nigeria's population will exceed that of the United States.

Despite progress made in economic growth, public health, and literacy in the third world, at least 800 million live in "absolute poverty." This is defined as a condition of life where malnutrition, illiteracy, disease, squalid housing, high infant mortality, and low life expectancy are beyond any reasonable definition of human decency. The stark reality is that the North (including Eastern Europe) has a quarter of the world's population and 80 percent of its income, while in the South (including China) three-quarters of the world's people live on one-fifth of its income. Also, approximately 90 percent of the global manufacturing industry is in the North. While the quality of life in the North rises steadily, in the South every two seconds a child dies of hunger and disease.

Still the contrast between wealth and poverty does not correspond exactly with the North-South division. Many OPEC countries are rich, while poverty is found in North America and Europe. In the United States 14 percent of people and 30 percent of children are beneath the poverty line. In Britain over 10 percent live below the legal definition of poverty, and another 10 percent to 15 percent are close to this point. A great disparity between wealth and poverty is found not only between nations but also within them.

On the other hand, one-fifth of the world's population lives in relative affluence and consumes approximately four-fifths of the world's income. Moreover, according to a recent World Bank report, the "total disbursements" from the

wealthy nations to the THIRD WORLD amounted to \$92 billion, a figure less than 10% of the worldwide expenditures on armaments; but this was more than offset by the “total debt service” of \$142 billion. The result was a negative transfer of some \$50 billion from the third world to the developed countries. This disparity between wealth and poverty is a social injustice so grievous that Christians dare not ignore it.

God has provided enough resources in the earth to meet the needs of all. Usually it is not the fault of the poor themselves, since for the most part they were born into poverty. Christians use the complexities of economics as an excuse to do nothing. However, God’s people need to dedicate themselves not only to verbal evangelism but also to relieving human need as part of sharing the good news (Luke 4:18–21), both at home and to the ends of the earth.

This explains why Christians in the two-thirds world place issues of poverty and economic development at the top of their theological agendas. Some Christians in the North have difficulty understanding why “liberation” is so central to the thinking of their counterparts in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, but they have never faced the stark, dehumanizing reality of grinding poverty (see also LIBERATION THEOLOGIES).

The Western missionary movement reflects an affluence that has developed as a result of the threefold revolution that has given Europe and North America a standard of living that is the envy of the world (see also MISSIONARY AFFLUENCE). Since the sixteenth-century the scientific, industrial, and political revolution has unleashed an avalanche of material goods that has raised the West from poverty. Most of the world has not shared in this achievement. When missionaries from the West went to preach and minister in other lands during the nineteenth century, they often believed that God favored them materially and scientifically so that they could overawe the heathen. As recently as the 1970s a missionary could observe that “Economic power is still the most crucial power factor in the western missionary movement. It is still the most important way that the Western missionary expresses his concept of what it means to preach the gospel” (Bernard Quick). The fact that most Protestant missionaries serve in some part of Africa, Latin America, or Oceania, those parts of the world where most of the poor reside, indicates that missionaries are economically superior in the social contexts of their ministry.

There have always been a few individuals who have pointed out that Western missionaries can take for granted a level of material security, lifestyle, and future options that are beyond the wildest dreams of the people among whom they work. As the twentieth century progressed others joined in calling attention to the unforeseen and

unwelcome effects of this economic disparity. At the TAMBARAM CONFERENCE (1938) a report was presented that clearly showed the dilemma between the comparatively “wealthy” missionaries and the “poor” people to whom they ministered. By the very nature of the situation missionaries were looked upon as the representatives of a wealthy and powerful civilization who introduced a new standard of economic values. The people that they served looked upon them not as proclaimers of a new faith, but as sources of potential economic gain. The problem of the personal affluence of Western missionaries when compared to the indigenous peoples was spelled out more explicitly in books such as *Ventures in Simple Living* (1933) and *Living as Comrades* (1950) written by Daniel Johnson Fleming, professor of missions at Union Theological Seminary (N.Y.). Writers like Fleming pointed out that the wealth of the West obscured the message of Christ, and led to feelings of helplessness and inferiority on the part of those to whom the missionaries ministered.

However, the problem of global economic disparity was once again obscured in the post-World War II period, when the North American missionary rank increased from less than 19,000 in 1953 to over 39,000 in 1985. These new missionaries were mostly from evangelical missionary groups who tended to neglect the work of the denominational agencies and focused on personal conversion, often ignoring economic and material problems.

Yet the work of authors such as Viv Grigg and Jonathan Bonk as well as a number of contributors to the *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* and *Missiology* focused attention on the obstacle to Christian witness inherent in the issues of wealth and poverty. Many of these writers counsel Christians in the more developed lands to share their material means with others. This can be done by supporting public and private efforts to aid the poor, by scaling down their standard of living, and by working for the empowerment of those who do not have the ability to represent themselves.

ROBERT G. CLOUSE

Bibliography. J. Bonk, *Missions and Money, Affluence as a Western Missionary Problem*; R. G. Clouse, ed., *Wealth and Poverty: Four Christian Views of Economics*; V. Griff, *Companion to the Poor*; K. Koyama, *Waterbuffalo Theology*; J. A. Scherer, *Global Living Here and Now*; J. V. Taylor, *Enough Is Enough: A Biblical Call for Moderation in a Consumer-Oriented Society*.

Witness. A witness is one who bears testimony about a person, place, or event. While the modern term frequently is associated with seeing (e.g., an eyewitness), the underlying Hebrew and Greek terms focus more on testifying than on observing. Throughout the Bible the term is used in

Women in Mission

forensic contexts to indicate one who is able to explain what has happened due to personal experience of an event or issues related to the event being investigated. The purpose of such testimony is to establish truth so that appropriate judgment may be determined. To do so, however, two or more independent witnesses were necessary to establish accusations against the accused (Deut. 19:15). Bearing false witness against someone was forbidden (Exod. 20:16), and punishable by giving the false witness the punishment due the accused (Deut. 19:16–21).

In addition to the legal concept, a witness may authenticate accounts of an event or meaning outside of legal proceedings. Paul, for example, calls God himself as a witness of Paul's commitment to pray for the Christians in Rome (Rom. 1:9). The Spirit also bears witness with our spirit that we belong to God (Rom. 8:16).

The term also develops a nonlegal but technical sense of bearing testimony about Christ. John the Baptist bore such a testimony (John 1:7, 15). The word signifies lifestyle and verbal testimony about Christ before non-Christians in the hope of persuading them to respond to the gospel. (Acts 1:8). Jesus promised the power of the Spirit for such witness and in Acts 4:33 the apostles showed the fulfillment of Jesus' promise. In Paul's vision, Jesus encouraged Paul that he would bear witness of Christ in Rome just as he already had in Jerusalem (Acts 23:11).

Contemporary Issues. In many evangelical circles, *witnessing* refers to the act of evangelism. Typically it is used of verbal proclamation of the gospel and may be divorced from lifestyle.

Lifestyle witness (see also LIFESTYLE EVANGELISM) refers more specifically to our testimony to the truth through the concrete way we live. If detached from some type of truth proclamation (verbal, written, etc.), however, lifestyle witness will inevitably be read through the WORLDVIEW of the observer (see also PRESENCE EVANGELISM). In cross-cultural settings, the observers' worldviews may have little or no Christian orientation, and the lifestyle they see will be interpreted in categories that make sense to the observers rather than to the witness. While it is true that our lives bear witness for good or ill, lifestyles without corresponding sensitive and appropriate explanation to the receptor will always be read in light of the receptor's categories.

In ecumenical circles, witness refers to "the total evangelizing presence and manifestation of the church" (Bria, 1067), and is all that the church is and does. *Common witness* was popularized in ecumenical circles from the 1970s, and refers to the joint witness of the universal church in all of its efforts. It was built on the theological reflection that no single church fully manifests Christ to the world; it takes a universal effort to achieve such global witness. Particular attention

in this understanding is given to cooperative efforts which display UNITY in mission, however imperfect they may be. Such efforts stand as a witness before the world of our unity in Christ and God's love for humankind. Common witness is broader than just cooperative efforts, however. It is also reflected when we live lives which honor our Christian commitments and display an accepting, ecumenical attitude toward Christians who are from different ecclesiological backgrounds.

A. SCOTT MOREAU

Bibliography. I. Bria, *DEM*, pp. 1067–69; H. D. Buckwalter, *EDBT*, pp. 765–69; F. W. Danker, *ISBE Revised*, pp. 1086–87; T. Stransky, *DEM*, pp. 197–200; A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness*.

Women in Mission. Women have a long history of responding to God's desire to use them in carrying out his purposes on earth. From Miriam, the sister of Moses (Exod. 15:20; Micah 6:4), Deborah, a judge chosen by God to rule (Judg. 45), and Huldah, a prophet carrying God's message (2 Kings 22:14–20; 2 Chron. 34:11–33) to Catherine Booth of the Salvation Army, MOTHER TERESA in her ministry to the poor of India, and ELISABETH ELLIOT, the great missionary writer, God has chosen and empowered women to do his bidding through the ages.

In Jesus' day, women traveled from town to village with Jesus and the disciples, helping support them out of their own means (Luke 8:13). They remembered Jesus' words concerning his death and resurrection and were ready for their first assignment of telling the disciples the Good News that Jesus had risen from the dead.

In the early church, women were active in the mission of the church. In Philippi, the Lord opened Lydia's heart in response to Paul's words and, after she and her household were baptized, she opened her home for believers to meet and grow in their faith (Acts 16:14, 15, 40). Priscilla was used by God to touch people in at least three different nations: Rome, Greece, and Asia Minor (Rom. 16:35; 2 Tim. 4:19). Priscilla's name is usually listed before her husband's in the biblical record and, since this is not common for that day, it most probably indicates her importance in the minds of the New Testament writers and her prominence in the church.

Many women were martyred for their love for Jesus in the first two centuries of Christianity. Santa Lucia of Sicily, who lived about A.D. 300, was involved in Christian charitable work. After marrying a wealthy nobleman, she was ordered to stop giving to the poor; she refused and was sent to jail. There she was persecuted and condemned to death. Melania, coming from a wealthy family in Rome with estates all around the Mediterranean, used her resources to give to

the poor and build monasteries and churches for both men and women in Africa and in Jerusalem. Her missionary journeys started as she fled from Rome during the invasion by the Goths in A.D. 410. As a refugee, she and many other women played an important role in this great missionary movement. Some women were taken as hostages to northern Europe, where they later married their captors and evangelized them (Malcolm, 1982, 99–100). Clare, who lived and worked in the early thirteenth century, was a reformer where Christianity had forgotten the poor. She founded the Franciscan order of barefoot nuns in Italy (*ibid.*, p. 104). Women who chose to remain single served God through living the cloistered life and were given the opportunity through the accepted ecclesiastical framework to proclaim the gospel.

In the Catholic tradition, priests, bishops, and nuns built churches and hospitals and founded schools and orphanages to establish the faith. Women who experienced a call to mission first had to join a celibate religious order. Catholic mothers were to have families as their primary responsibility. Not until the mid-twentieth century could lay women freely participate in official foreign missions with the full sanction of the Church. Catholic sisters were the first trained nurses in the United States. They nursed the wounded during the Revolutionary War and founded some of the first American hospitals for the poor in the early nineteenth century. Mother Mary Joseph in the 1920s founded the Maryknoll Sisters, who focused on direct evangelism, seeing themselves fully participating in the church's apostolic work. Six of the Maryknoll Sisters went to China as missionaries in 1921.

The Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century brought about changes in the role of women in Christianity. The Reformers reemphasized that women's role is in the home and supportive of men. ARTHUR GLASSER writes: "The reformers also subjected women to the confining perspective that their only recognized vocation was marriage. With the dissolution of the nunneries women lost their last chance of churchly service outside the narrow circle of husband, home and children" (1979, 91). Within Protestantism the problem then arose as to whether women had the right to respond to the promptings of the Holy Spirit to proclaim the Word of God.

Ruth Tucker emphasizes that because women were restricted in serving in leadership within the institutional church, they were attracted to responding to serving God in mission work, where the limitations were less restrictive (1988, 9). This was due to the fact that mission leaders focused on reaching a lost world for Christ. Though male leadership within the church has limited how women can use their God-given gifts

at home, the urgency of fulfilling the GREAT COMMISSION has required all available assistance.

In the early days of the Protestant mission advance, most women who went to the field were wives of missionaries. Many men even began looking for a wife to accompany them after they were appointed as missionaries. Women often felt a deep commitment to missions, but were required to marry before they could fulfill their own missionary calling. Discerning male missionaries recognized that contact with women in most non-Western societies was impossible. So it was that the missionary wives not only managed the home and children but developed programs to reach local women and girls. ANN JUDSON, wife of Adoniram, demonstrated how wives not only cared for the family and ran a household in a foreign country, but developed their own ministry as well. Ann ran a small school for girls, did evangelistic work with the women, was a pioneer Bible translator in two languages, and was the leading female missionary author of the early nineteenth century. Her letters and journals of their work with the Burmese inspired many in the homeland to support missions and consider missions as a vocation.

Single women were first sent to the field to care for missionaries' children and serve alongside the missionary family. Little by little as opportunities arose, single women missionaries began to supervise women's schools for nationals (Beaver, 1980, 59–86). Quietly they helped reach out to the local women who were secluded from society. In 1827, CYNTHIA FARRAR responded to a field request from India for a single woman to supervise the schools for national girls that had been started by the mission and was appointed by the American Board, the first unmarried woman sent overseas as an assistant missionary by any American agency. In 1839, ELIZA AGNEW went to Ceylon to serve as principal at an established boarding school for girls. She held that post until she retired forty years later. Many of her students became Christians. She endeared herself to her students and visited former students in their homes.

By 1837, when it became recognized by evangelical missions that female missionaries needed a more advanced level of training, Mount Holyoke Female Seminary was founded by Mary Lyon. The five basic areas of education included: (1) religious, (2) benevolence, (3) intellectual, (4) health, and (5) service. Students at the seminary were guided to develop a spirituality of self-sacrifice for the sake of the gospel and others. By 1887, Mount Holyoke had sent out 175 foreign missionaries to eighteen countries (Robert, 1996, 93–104). Soon graduates from Mount Holyoke were involved in starting similar training schools for women in many parts of the world.

Women in Mission

The Civil War in the United States became a catalyst for change in women's role. Women were mobilized into benevolent activity on behalf of the soldiers. The death of the largest number of men in American history created an entire generation of single women. Since denominational mission boards were still dragging their feet on sending single women to the field and the supply of committed women was greater than ever, the Women's Missionary Movement was born. The first women's sending board was the Women's Union Missionary Society, an interdenominational board founded by SARAH DOREMUS in 1861. In quick succession, women of many denominational boards founded their own female missionary organizations.

A. B. SIMPSON, founder of the Christian and Missionary Alliance in 1887, held and promoted an open policy for women in ministry. He saw the issue as "one which God has already settled, not only in His Word, but in His providence, by the seal which He is placing in this very day, in every part of the world, upon the public work of consecrated Christian women" (Tucker and Leifeld, 1987, 287–88). When criticized for his views, he strongly suggested, "Let the Lord manage the women. He can do better than you, and you turn your batteries against the common enemy" (ibid., 288). This mission, along with many other FAITH MISSIONS in their zeal to reach the unreached and focus wholly on evangelism, attracted women who were usually restricted from regular theological education and ordination, but who felt strong calls to ministry and service and were willing to live in poverty and insecurity for the sake of the gospel. For the task of world evangelization, the whole church was mobilized and women were welcomed to serve as evangelists.

By 1900, over forty denominational women's societies existed, with over 3 million active women raising funds to build hospitals and schools around the world, paying the salaries of indigenous female evangelists, and sending single women as missionary doctors, teachers, and evangelists (Robert, 1996, 129). By the early decades of the twentieth century, the women's missionary movement had become the largest women's movement in the United States and women outnumbered men on the mission field by a ratio of more than two to one (Tucker, 1988, 10).

The fifty-year Jubilee of the founding of separate women's mission boards was celebrated in 1910–11. College-educated women were leading the woman's missionary movement at this time. Results of the Jubilee included the collection of over \$1 million for interdenominational women's colleges in Asia, the founding of the World Day of Prayer, and the founding of the Committee on Christian Literature for Women and Children in Mission Fields (Robert, 1996, 256–71). The latter

provided reading material from a Christian perspective, often in the form of magazines that encouraged indigenous Christian artists and writers. The Jubilee also spearheaded the most successful ecumenical mission publication series in American history. Of the twenty-one mission study texts produced by the Central Committee on the United Study of Foreign Missions from 1900 to 1921, fourteen were written by women and one by a married couple (ibid., 257). Summer schools of missions were offered for training leaders in the textbook material for teaching during the year. "In 1917, for example, nearly twelve thousand women and girls attended twenty-five summer schools around the country. Mission study, Bible study, pageants, and fellowship marked the summer schools" (ibid., 261).

Gradually from around 1910 to the time of the Second World War, the institutional basis of the women's missionary movement was eroding through the forced merger of women's missionary agencies into the male-dominated denominational boards. Because of reduced giving from the local churches in the 1920s and pressure within denominations, the women's missionary movement was dismantled and the male-controlled general boards took the money raised by the women (ibid., 305). Though women have since had less place of genuine influence and participation in administrative offices, board membership, and policymaking, the trend now is to include women. R. PIERCE BEAVER writes, "The big problem is that of personal and congregational commitment, involvement, and participation in world mission. The greatest loss consequent to the end of the distinctive, organized women's world mission movement has been the decline of missionary dynamism and zeal in the churches" (1980, 201).

Women have played an outstanding role in the modern missionary movement. Dana Robert shows that women's mission theory was holistic, with emphasis on both evangelism and meeting human needs (1996, xviii; see HOLISTIC MISSION). Women in mission have shown a deep commitment to and concern for women and children. Education, medical work, and struggles against foot binding, child marriage, female infanticide, and oppressive social, religious, and economic structures were commonly the focuses of their work. With their holistic approach to missions, women were committed to healing. Thus MEDICAL MISSIONS were dominated by women for many years. Women have been permitted great latitude in Christian ministry with their work ranging from EVANGELISM and CHURCH PLANTING to BIBLE TRANSLATION and teaching in seminaries. Since women were less involved in denominational activities and more focused on human need, it was easier for them to be ecumenically-minded and risk cooperation for common pur-

poses. Women therefore often took the lead in founding ecumenical mission organizations.

MARGUERITE KRAFT

Bibliography. M. Adeney, *Missiology* 15 (1987): 323–37; R. P. Beaver, *American Protestant Women in World Mission: A History of the First Feminist Movement in North America*; A. Glasser, *Women and the Ministries of Christ*, pp. 88–92; K. T. Malcolm, *Women at the Crossroads: A Path Beyond Feminism and Traditionalism*; D. L. Robert, *American Women in Mission: A Social History of Their Thought and Practice*; R. A. Tucker, *Guardians of the Great Commission: The Story of Women in Modern Missions*; R. A. Tucker and W. Liefeld, *Daughters of the Church: Women and Ministry from the New Testament Times to the Present*.

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

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

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

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

A definition that satisfies both of these approaches is that of Nash (1992): “A worldview, then, is a conceptual scheme by which we consciously or unconsciously place or fit everything

we believe and by which we interpret and judge reality.” Nevertheless, the philosophical/theological and cultural/societal traditions differ substantially in what they include in the concept of worldview and in how they apply it.

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

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

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

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

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

Worldview

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

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

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

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

would strongly condemn the removal of the elderly from the family to nursing homes.

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

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

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

KEN A. MCELHANON

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