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Editorial

This issue of JEPTA is about mission. It is generally agreed that mission is central to Pentecostalism, a fact that partly explains the emergence of Pentecostal churches all over the world during the 20th century. David Garrard, a long-time missionary in central Africa, begins what turns into a debate within these pages. He argues that the incarnational model of mission, which has long been advanced as the preferred model, has serious practical and theoretical deficiencies. Andrew Lord disagrees, and explains why he thinks this is the case. David Garrard, in a short piece, replies. One other missionary, Peter Kay, again an experienced African hand, contributes to this debate by turning his eyes to the practicalities of incarnational theology.

Brad Anderson provides an article on missions in relation to training and education and argues that ‘a missional focus... will allow Christianity to remain vibrant and faithful’ within the postmodern milieu. Jackie Brock, a missionary to students in Japan, addresses this matter in relation to campus ministry in that vibrant and crucial Asian country. Both these pieces, and the debate between Garrard and Lord, implicitly rest upon a biblical foundation. This foundation is more carefully explored by Matthias Wenk who ranges widely over Old and New Testament texts. Finally, my article deals with the emergence of apostolic networks within Britain and their role in missions. This piece contrasts the function of networks with the function of missionary societies; it points out where networks may enjoy practical and ‘theological’ advantages.

So much for the content of the latest edition of JEPTA. Now, turning to the most recent EPTA conference that took place in Iso Kirja, Finland, in the summer of 2006, we are delighted to report that we have a new chairman, Paul Alexander, who is Principal at Mattersey Hall, England, and who intends to contact theological training institutions in Europe as a way of stimulating good practice and bringing European Pentecostals closer together. We are genuinely grateful for the service rendered by Christer Englund over many years and tributes were paid to him at the conference.

JEPTA itself intends to focus more closely on those undertaking theological education in Pentecostal institutions and, for this reason, you will notice in successive issues that greater attention is paid to the needs of the students and the excellent work they do.
Questionable Assumptions in the Theory and Practice of Mission

Dr David J Garrard

Abstract:
This article questions the value and effectiveness of the incarnational model of missions.

Introduction
There are some suppositions which missiologists and missionaries take for granted because they appear to have been part of thinking within the field for so long. When those suppositions are supported widely by scholars as a whole it becomes even more likely that it is safer not to question them. However, question we must.

Two areas in particular will be examined in this paper: the present emphasis upon incarnational theory and practice in mission and secondly, the view that missionaries should ‘work themselves out of a job’.

Incarnational Missionary Practice:
For more than a number of years it has been assumed by missiologists that the incarnational model of Jesus is the model which all practicing missionaries should follow. After all, if Christians involved in the proclamation of the Good News take Jesus as their role model it certainly makes sense that they should imitate their master’s methodology in any attempt to evangelise

---
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the population of planet earth. It makes logical sense therefore that this incarnational model should be the goal of each and every missionary.

The difficulty however, rests not merely in the use of the term but in what is meant by the incarnation and incarnational methodology. This is where it would appear that many missiologists have failed to think clearly at a theological level and have appeared to jump on the bandwagon because they like the term and because of the way it is interpreted identificationally. The incarnation certainly involves identification and without doubt Jesus’ incarnation was essential for the purpose of God’s overall plan. No one would deny the significance of Jesus’ identification primarily with the people of Israel and thereby with the human race in general but there is far more involved in his incarnation than identification. It was a theological necessity linked to his propitiatory work and was central to the provision of salvation for all. For this reason the incarnation may be viewed as missiological but in its essence it is soteriological, unique and unrepeatable.

Only the Son of God, as John clearly underlines in his Gospel, is the monogenes theos (Jn 1:18; lit. only begotten or born God) who comes from the Father to reveal the true nature of the Father and to do his will. This ‘will’ is centred on the fact that he must be lifted up and thereby draw all mankind to himself by his work on the cross. Inevitably, there is a degree to which this incarnation is involved with revelation and in this area missionaries could claim that they therefore have a parallel task in their going, their doing and in their proclamation but it would be at best presumptuous and at worst dangerous to take the similarity a lot further.

The incarnation answers the question as to how God can pay the debt for man’s rebellion and sin by becoming one with mankind in his humanity apart from its sinful nature.

Mankind is already ‘in the flesh’ which is in reality the source of their failing and their fallen nature. When it comes to their need, it is to take on the divine attributes, which reverse the consequences of their ‘infleshedness’. Only as redeemed individuals are missionaries able to reach out to their fellows in such a manner as to be able to offer them hope of the divine and thereby reflect the nature of the divine in their message and their demeanour. Theologically, therefore, the term can be applied only with great difficulty to the human task of mission.

The term is viewed to encapsulate the ultimate in the methodological

---

3 cf. Jn. 1:18 Despite the fact that all the best MSS favour the reading monogenes theos (only begotten God), it is an enigma that the majority of translations, old and new, opt for monogenes huios (only begotten Son). This is likely because the former has too many theological implications which we prefer not to contemplate.
approach necessary to convince the non-Christian of the need to convert to Christ.

Not only is the meaning of the incarnation primarily soteriological and for that reason it cannot be repeated nor can it be imitated fully by those involved in the task of missions today, it appears that many assume that by bandying about the use of the term ‘incarnational missions’ they somehow use a magical formula which automatically guarantees the kind of success and results for which all communicators of the gospel so passionately long.

It is assumed that if missionaries can reflect this elusive incarnational model, the people to whom they minister will automatically bow the knee to Christ and succumb to his demands.

There are a number of difficulties linked to this concept, not least the fact that even during the days of Jesus’ earthly ministry, the majority of the people to whom he ministered did not accept his claims and indeed were quiet content to have him crucified. His presence among the Jews, as a Jew, did not guarantee the endorsement of his teaching nor of his person.4

It has to be recognised that acceptance of Christ as Lord is more than a matter of his identification, and much more than association with individuals no matter what ethnic and cultural differences they may have. The basic predisposition of mankind is one of rejection when it comes to any exterior claims upon their mastery over self. The question is one of spiritual denial and an unwillingness to submit to claims which appear to demand surrender of self to any higher power. Sin is the difficulty and all that accompanies it is the basic problem; the other matters one may introduce as barriers to communication which are peripheral at best.

The Models in our own lands

If the incarnational model were the key to mission and the answer to communication then we would have to suppose that the lands from which we hail would all be thoroughly evangelised and have consequently submitted to the demands of Christ. After all, Christians in Europe and North America are indigenous members of those communities. They live there, speak like the rest, eat the same kinds of food and wear similar dress.

---

However, it is in these western nations, the very nations which have been for a long period of time the dominant force in evangelical missions, even if they are no longer so, that we now find the greatest apathy and the least response to the Christian message. Our presence, incarnationally, if that is how it is understood, has not made the difference which we suppose it automatically will do elsewhere. Are we thinking logically? I suggest not.

All things to All Men

Perhaps it would be more realistic and even more biblical, to suggest that rather than try to force an inappropriate term like ‘incarnational’ mission, it would be far better to accept that there are areas within the communication field of the missionary task which certainly need to be reappraised and acted upon. The terms used are more than mere semantic juggling because of the depth of theological implication that is involved. Paul recognised the significance of being all things to all men so that he may by all means save some. He makes it clear that although he is free he has limited this freedom so that he is able to convince as many as possible of the validity of the message he preaches whether they be strict Jews or not (1 Cor. 9:19ff.). This is where the flexibility and identification play an important role, but it does not at any time guarantee that all will accept the implications of the Gospel.

All that this flexibility and this willingness to restrict the missionary’s freedom do is remove any barriers which are obviously limiting or hindering the communication of the message of Christ. It also indicates concern, compassion and love for the target group to whom the missionary has gone with the message of salvation.

Perhaps it would be more correct to suppose that any accommodation on the part of the gospel messenger to recognise and adapt to cultural norms in the fields where they work will be a necessary part of the process of acculturation. This process, it is assumed, will facilitate all that is necessary when a messenger is expected to gain the trust of those within the people group targeted for evangelism and conversion. However, no matter how hard an outsider may try to look like an insider in a cross cultural context, he or she never will be one and it is folly to believe that it will ever be possible to identify to the extent that they will ever be considered as ‘one of us’ by that people group.5 There may be times when due to flattery individuals

---

within the group will call them ‘one of us’, but in the mind of those who do not accept their message they will never attain that status.

Westerners generally, because they have opened their nations to immigration, do not tend to have such fixed views as to identity and acceptance of outsiders within their communities. This is because of, among other things, multiculturalism and pluralism as a philosophy and political nicety.\(^6\) And again when we examine our past most of us came from somewhere else within the not too distant past. Therefore, it is easier for the outsider to be considered part of the whole after the passage of time in the west. At least, offspring after the first generation could be accepted as part of the whole.

However, this acceptance is, in many of the two-thirds’ world nations not present. Some examples would be the Tutsi born within the colonial borders of Zaire/Congo who were not permitted to be considered Zaireans during the Mobutu years. This question is still not totally settled in Congo today. Again Europeans or those of Asian descent born in Congo were never permitted citizenship in that nation. Indeed, Bantu offspring of former slaves in many Central African nations are still considered to be ‘slaves’ even more than a hundred years after the abolition of slavery.

These factors indicate that what missiologists see as the solution to identification and an open door to the message of the Gospel is far more complex a factor than has been recognised by authors on the subject. World view and all that goes together with it in terms of views on religion and faith or non-faith are only going to undergo the radical change that is necessary for conversion to Christ when full understanding of the message has been arrived at and when the conviction of the Holy Spirit has enabled a paradigm shift to take place in the minds and hearts of the hearers of the message. It has to be admitted that missionaries across the multitudes of frontiers of communication around the world, need to remove any barriers to that understanding which they possibly can do. They must be certain that their attitudes, and especially the western attitudes of superiority based upon our ethnocentric understanding of who we are must be put on one side. But it also needs to be remembered that it is not just westerners who are ethnocentric and that those messengers of the Gospel from all nations need more than a small dose of humility if they are going to be used of God to bring conviction and conversion to the peoples of the world.

\(^6\) Even where there are national positions of openness to immigration and multiculturalism, not all within those accepting nations are as open as the official policies may appear to be. When this occurs, ‘foreigners’ are tolerated but may not be openly accepted at a meaningful level by many within the society or there may be hostile subgroups to the outsiders in the larger society.
If the removal of these barriers and the application of the humility together with the clarification of the message is what is understood as incarnational, then we could probably excuse the term but it would appear that in the light of the theological implications it would be much better to look for an expression which avoided the propitiatory work of Christ.

**The missionary’s task is to do himself/herself out of a job**

It is generally held within scholarship today that the missionary task is a transient one and best pictured by the runner of a relay race passing on the baton to the national believer who will in turn take on the responsibilities involved and relieve the one who initiated the missionary process.

There are a number of matters involved in this entire issue most of which we are unable to examine due to the limitation of space. They could include such questions as: What has provoked the debate? Does scripture give us definitive models in this area? How are we to interpret the Great Commission? When is a task complete? Where does mission end and church commence? Do individual gifts change their emphasis and engagement over time?

The matter of the origin of the debate is of significance because there are legitimate reasons for any debate and there are others which may be forced and result in presupposed outcomes. To a greater or lesser degree the debate regarding timing within the missionary mandate is the result of the discussion over the indigenous church raised by mission scholars and practitioners from the mid 1850s. The circumstances were such that missionary organisations on both sides of the Atlantic found themselves under constraints in terms of the numbers of personnel and the limitations of finance. The foremost spokesmen of the day were Rufus Anderson of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and Henry Venn of the Church Missionary Society.⁷

Both saw the task of mission as in need of re-evaluation if its goals were ever to be fully achieved. At the time missions were primarily a western phenomenon. It was arduous and very slow to make the gains necessary to impact communities on a large scale. It was agreed that if the missionaries were to increase the tempo of Christian presence in any area there would have to be far more participation on the part of the believers being raised up in all nations. The ‘three self’ formula became popular where the matters of

---

self-government, self-support, and self-propagation were seen as essential for the release of missionary personnel, finance and decision making in each and every field of missionary engagement. It was maintained that where these ideals could be realised it would be possible for the mission to withdraw from these now ‘indigenous’ fields and move on to new and as yet untouched or unevangelized and unreached places. The thrust therefore, in pressing for missionaries to work themselves out of a job was due to the need to multiply the work force and the thought that missionaries needed to accomplish more than they were doing at the time.

There were a number of errors in the thinking as it pertained to the nature of the indigenous church and the ‘self’ part of the equation as has been pointed out by more than a few missiologists. But this certainly lay behind the modern emphasis that missionaries were to die to the needs of the field and recommence their ministries elsewhere. In addition to this emphasis the end of the colonial era and the guilt by association of being involved with anything that smacked of colonialism was passed onto missions and missionaries. This attitude was picked up by nations like China which unilaterally decided that they no longer desired foreign missionaries on their soil and thereby put in place the Three Self Church as the only legitimate body recognised by the Communist Government in the nation. It was not long before there were a number of former colonies calling for the departure of missionaries. The call of ‘Missionary Go Home’ was most conspicuous especially in the conferences and discussions of those groups associated with the World Council of Churches from the 1960s.

Evangelical missions, for the most part, did not accept the call for the moratorium on missions but they were certainly influenced by this thinking. At the same time Two-Thirds World missionaries were on the increase and toward the end of the Twentieth Century, short-term missions

9 It is not the purpose of this paper to look at the colonial question. There is much of what transpired during the colonial period which cannot be praised but it needs to be remembered that in many cases the missionaries were the spokesmen for the oppressed. This was certainly true in Congo where it was the Protestant missionaries who opposed King Leopold of Belgium and his abuse of the Congolese in his policies forcing them to produce rubber at all costs.
11 For more on the question of a moratorium on missions cf. The “All Africa Conference of Churches” held in Lusaka, Zambia, in May 1974 (the same year as the Lausanne Conference on Evangelism) called for a moratorium on missionaries but did not include in this finances from the West cf. Robert L. Niklaus, “Global Report” in EMQ.
were thought of by more and more local churches in the West as the answer for the missionary needs of the nations. At the same time, western missionary numbers were on the decline. Missionary agencies began to find commitment to long term missions a growing difficulty.

Other difficulties include those of a practical nature. Most of the early missionaries settled in a locality and learned the culture and the language of that area in order to carry out their work effectively. Most were young when they began their enterprise and many became very proficient in the languages they spoke and conversant with the cultural factors. To have to uproot from one culture and language context and to relocate to another, especially after a number of years is not a simple nor a practical suggestion for most missionaries. I know, I have done it! I never was as capable in the second language.

This difficulty together with the influence of the past appeared to skew theological thinking or at least force it in the direction of acceptance of the declaration that missionaries were only successful in their task if they were to work themselves out of a job.

It could be maintained that there are a number of difficulties with this concept, not least the fact that missionary work is a job. As with any biblical description of ministry in the New Testament, tasks and responsibilities attributed to individuals called of God are never jobs per se. They are callings which are only possible where and when God’s hand is upon the designated individual. Even if we are able to state that the ministry gifts of Ephesians 4:11 do not include the name -missionary- it is nevertheless evident that those called to these functions are called of God and gifted accordingly by Christ. It can therefore be logically assumed that where individuals are called of God to engage in what we today call ‘missionary service’ their work is ministry and in response to the gifts and calling of God and not merely a task for which they are to be adequately remunerated – salary wise – in any temporal understanding of remuneration which the way a ‘job’ is normally viewed.


12 It is not the desire of the author to enter into the debate regarding the nature of the missionary but it is sufficient to say that the apostellô group of words in Greek (to send) certainly give sufficient room for the fulfilment of the role of the missionary as that function is understood today even if we have to admit that today’s modern missionary would hardly be recognised by his New Testament equivalent.
In the light of the ministry and gifts involved in the fulfilment of this missionary ministry it should be understood that God does not withdraw his gifts. He may redirect the area in which the gifts are to be operated but the purpose of the gifts as the means of fulfilling the missionary task remain. The goals of the missionary may be multiple in terms of communicating the message of the Gospel, building trust, bringing men and women to the place of commitment, growth in Christian faith, and development in maturity but they do not cease once a target group of individuals in a given community have been convinced of their need to submit to the claims of Christ.

There may be a sense in which we could say that once certain activities or certain goals have been reached by the missionary that he or she is no longer needed. It would depend upon the goals which have been set prior to any planed involvement. If commencement, evangelism and church planting are viewed as the ability of the missionary concerned it may be realistic to say that once the Gospel has been preached, a local church or local churches have been planted, and pastors and elders have been put in place within the new churches that the missionary could move on to do the same elsewhere. But surely that is not the end of the matter. Evangelism and church planting are not all that is involved in missionary ministry. Evangelism and church planting, as important as they are, are not all that is involved in the Great Commission.

Once foundations have been laid there is the life-long process of making disciples. No one in a local church in the homeland would suggest that now that they are saved and baptised and members of a local Christian community that they could somehow stop. Stop because they were assured of eternal life now that they were within the fold. Each believer needs to go on. That is the theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews. That is the drive of the statement of Jesus that the disciples were to make disciples and teach the new believers to do all that Jesus did and said. To suggest that missionaries need to work themselves out of a job is to fail to recognise the theological implications of the Great Commission. It is to oversimplify what is involved in the process of making disciples. It is a declaration that we have abdicated the responsibility of building up the Body of Christ to engage in ministry so that the world may be saved before the return of the Lord himself at his Second Coming.

This does not mean that the missionary will not have to reappraise their role in the process and that they will perhaps have to be flexible in the areas in which they prioritise their various gifts and ministry. If they are at first more evangelistic because they have to preach the gospel in order to bring in the non-Christian by convincing them of their need to believe, then they may have to be more administrative to develop the structure of any new
community according to the needs of the culture, the people group and the specific context where they are located. All the time there will be the integration of new individuals and their gifts in the new churches planted and there will be not merely the passing of the baton but the sharing of the responsibilities and burdens so that there will be not so much of a handing over, in any official way, as there will be in an unofficial and practical way. The passing of the baton will not take place on any one occasion but in a variety of ways over a period of time as ability and gifting is indicated in obvious and practical areas.

There will be a flowing stream which finds its own level in a variety of circumstances. The missionary who is the founder of any work becomes a mentor, a friend, an advisor and a father/mother figure who may have to relocate and change gear in the way they minister but they will not automatically have to stop being a missionary because what they planted has grown and been established. They certainly will not continue on in exactly the same role as at first because there will be change and development in terms of what is necessary for local needs. The discipling will change in its emphasis and extent but it will go on. If it does not then the work which was initiated will fail totally.

Melvin Hodges points out the need for there to be a deep but transitory relationship between the missionary and new converts because the relationship needs to change.\(^{13}\) Perhaps it needs to be pointed out that transitory here could be misunderstood because it is the nature of the relationship which needs to change and not the fact of the relationship itself.

One thing is certain and that is that it is impossible for someone whose life has been bound up in an area of missionary work to simply stop. Some talk about ‘phase out’\(^{14}\) thinking but it is doubtful for those who have always thought in terms of ‘phase in’ to realistically withdraw under the terms of what that means. Besides if a missionary is consistently working people into responsibilities and delegating new ones, according to their gifts, there will be no need to ‘phase out.’ It is only where the missionary has not been very successful at their task that they would need to think of handing over in the normally accepted sense of the word. In this instance working oneself out of a job would make no sense because the ‘job’ if we call it that, or that part of it which needs to come under new leadership has already been transferred.

\(^{13}\) cf. Melvin L. Hodges comments on this area of the question in his The Indigenous Church, (Springfield, Gospel Publishing House, 1953), pp.17-21.

The missionary has to be a master at handing on and delegating.\footnote{This is one area where experience appears to indicate that many pastors, in local churches are not so good at managing.}

Missionaries today and especially western missionaries, need not feel guilty for the errors of the past nor for the thinking of the majority of the theorists. They certainly need to make sure that they do not commit the same mistakes as those who went before. We do not want to appear to be superior just because we have been privileged to benefit from considerable financial resources and ‘knowledge’. We are no longer alone in the task of the propagation of the Gospel and for that we should be thankful. On the other hand it shows us that in spite of the faults of the past, something must have worked. Perhaps we should give the glory to God rather than be hasty to claim any so called successes for ourselves.

In the meantime, we need to acknowledge that methods and terms are not the only factor in sharing the Good News. We need to remove all barriers to the communication of the message of the Cross, but incarnation was and always will remain uniquely Christ’s. We imitate but not Christ’s propitiatory offering. Spiritual barriers will only be removed when the Holy Spirit is allowed to play his full role. As for the task – it is ‘until Jesus comes’. Missionaries need to continue their work even if they change their domain for its practice. They retain the gifts necessary to fulfil this charge and will need to be flexible in the application of all they do but to suggest that they need to work themselves out of a job is questionable and makes little sense in the long run considering the value of their experience and gifting. One thing is certain and that is that missionaries have no right to believe that the missionary mandate has been fulfilled and that it is time to quit.
Incarnational Partnership in Mission: A Response to Questionable Assumptions

Andy Lord

Abstract

Mission is vital to the life of the church and it is important that the call to missionary service is affirmed. This article argues that this requires a commitment to pattern our lives on the incarnational example of Jesus, entering humbly into the culture of others and seeking the Spirit’s guiding. In this it is important to recognise the Spirit’s enabling of all Christians in mission and hence that mission is always a ‘together’ thing. Mission may be enabled by particular missionaries but remains a partnership that draws people together with God to fulfil his mission in the world.

Incarnational Missionary Practice

It is useful to have our underlying assumptions challenged, and David Garrard in his article asks pertinent questions about the use of the term ‘incarnational’ as applied to missionary practice. Garrard starts by outlining a theological understanding of incarnation as being the “soteriological, unique and unrepeatable” act of Jesus being born of God to “reveal the true nature of the Father and to do his will.” Incarnation is inescapably related to Jesus’ “propitiatory work” and “answers the question as to how God can pay the debt for man’s rebellion and sin.” On this basis, the term incarnation cannot be applied to people in mission as they are fallen and cannot be the authors of salvation. Garrard then questions the assumption that ‘incarnational mission’ is needed to bring success in mission, assuming mission is about bringing people to faith in Christ. Clearly, the incarnation of Jesus did not guarantee a great Jewish response to the gospel and the incarnational presence of Christians today in the West has not brought about a great response to the gospel. Total identification is not possible across cultures, and even if it was, the key point here is that identification is
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1 Revd Andy Lord MA is an Anglican minister working with three churches in Southwell Diocese. Trowell, 2006 Email: andylord@freenet.co.uk
not sufficient – a “radical change… is necessary for conversion to Christ.” However, Garrard does allow that “gospel messenger” does need “to recognise and adapt to cultural norms in the fields where they work” and any “attitudes of superiority” need to be left aside. In this way some of the positive aspects of ‘incarnational mission’ can be appreciated, if within a different framework.

Obviously, various assumptions have been made by Garrard and it is perhaps appropriate to start by asking some questions about these. Firstly, is it appropriate to subsume all consideration of the incarnation under a particular understanding of salvation? Thinking clearly at a theological level demands that attention is given to wider understandings of both incarnation and salvation. Even considering just evangelical theology, a wider understanding of the biblical notion of salvation has been growing over many years. This links with a second question: can mission be reduced to the communication of a gospel message that aims at conversion? Focusing on the mission of Jesus, this alone seems much wider as evidenced in the ‘Nazareth manifesto’ of Luke 4 against the context of the prophecy from Isaiah. Paul’s understanding of the gospel is also wider than Garrard seems to allow for. The wider theological reflection on missio Dei also suggests a more holistic understanding of the missionary work of God in the world. More recent understandings of missio Dei focus on the work of God outside the church, and even if we would not want to go as far as many in the implications of this, there remains a third question: is God’s work mainly limited to the church with a one-way communication from the church to the world? Biblically it is hard to limit God’s working to the church – consider God’s working through Persia in the Old Testament; in the lives of Gentiles in the New Testament; or God’s working in creation generally. If God is at work outside the church, may not also God speak to the church through the world in a way that challenges our appreciation of God’s ways of salvation? If we allow for wider answers to these questions than Garrard

---

allows, as seems necessary on biblical and theological grounds, then our understanding of incarnation needs to stretch also: Jesus’ incarnation illustrates God’s relationship with the whole of creation as well as being the basis of the redemptive work on the cross; in particular, Jesus’ incarnation is the basis for his kingdom transformation of lives and communities, even where there was no faith response; and Jesus’ incarnation expresses his love for and action in the whole world, especially amongst those who were outside the ‘true faith’ community. On these grounds we may say that the term incarnation can validly be applied to the mission of Christians today. This can be done without abandoning the unique and unrepeatable sacrifice of Christ on the cross and the need to respond to Christ in faith.\footnote{See also how Andrew Walls considers the incarnation as the basis for Bible translation in mission without denying the uniqueness of the Cross, \textit{The Missionary Movement in Christian History} (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 28-29.}

The passage that is commonly used to support an incarnational outlook is Philippians 2.1-11 which can be seen against this wider background. Here the self-emptying of Christ in his incarnation is presented as something that should affect our attitude and thinking as Christians today. Christ here ‘emptied himself’ by taking the ‘form of a slave’ – God taking on human existence. It is the “servant nature of Christ’s incarnation” that is in view here and which we are called to imitate in our attitudes.\footnote{Gordon D. Fee, \textit{Paul’s Letter to the Philippians}, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 212.} It is this incarnational way in which Christ brought salvation that can be applied to us, even if the means of salvation remain with God.\footnote{See the wider argument of Fee, \textit{Philippians}, 202-13.} The emphasis here is on imitating Christ rather than on ‘success’ and incarnational mission is vital if we are to carry out mission in Christ’s way as shaped by the Spirit, leading to the fruit that God desires. We are all members of particular cultures and yet in mission we are called to let go of our cultural background (not to deny it) and willingly enter into the culture of others. We seek to “be all things to all people” that God may work out his salvation through the humility of those willing to let go in order that others may also bow before Christ as Lord.

**Missionary’s Task to do themselves out of a job**

Garrard then moves on to address the question as to whether missionaries are to do themselves out of a job. Understanding the missionary call in terms of the Great Commission (Matthew 28:16ff.) he argues that a missionary is called to evangelism and church planting, but also to the “life-long process of making disciples.” Thus the missionaries particular tasks may...
change over time and it may be possible that at some point certain (or all) of the missionaries’ gifts may no longer be needed. Yet the life-long call to make disciples means that to do themselves out of a job is to abdicate the responsibility that God has given them. After all, relationships are key in all of this and relationships can not be developed on a ‘transitory’ basis. The pressure for a contrary view is seen in practical and historical terms: the limited missionary resources; guilt over the colonial era; and the rise of Two-Thirds World missionaries. In this view, experience has dictated theology rather than theology dictating practice, and we need to recover and encourage the life-long missionary call.

It is important to encourage the value of the missionary calling at a time when it is under threat, at least in much Western Christianity. Yet rather than reaffirm a missionary model from the past it is important to re-envision one for the present state of the world and the Christian church. Perhaps one of the most encouraging outcomes from the practical and historical pressures of the last century has been a renewed appreciation of the role of the local church in mission. Thus the missionary task can be seen as the responsibility of all Christians and of Christian communities, rather than the near exclusive domain of the lone missionary. The Great Commission is given to all Christians and we share together in the task of disciple-making with Jesus. This may involve travelling across cultures to share in the (holistic) gospel of Christ, but it also involves travelling to our workplaces, our shops and schools, our communities with that same gospel. It is within the general call of Christ to all to be involved in mission that we can appreciate the particular call to evangelistic, church planting or disciple-making mission in other places. We need to treasure the riches of the missionary movement and reinterpret them in terms of the missionary call we all share from Christ.

Mission is an individual calling to all, but it is also a communal call – it was the life and mission of the early church in Acts that was a powerful witness across the world. Obviously there is a vital need to bring such mission communities into being where none exist, and pioneering mission work is still required across the world. But this is best carried out by small communities with the aim of establishing new growing communities. Such communities can grow together in mission with the ‘newer’ Christians having as much to contribute as the pioneers. Indeed, the history of the missionary movement shows that much of the growth came not from the missionaries, but from the indigenous evangelists. God’s call is to all, with the younger involved as much as the older – as in the parable of the vineyard

10 Bosch, Mission, 368-73.
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(Mt 20.1-16). This will involve a relinquishment by the pioneers, a dying to self that others might live, and this may require pioneering missionaries to leave the new church completely. It is not that the missionaries’ gifts and calling have changed, but that these are always subservient to serving Christ and his church. Herein lie many difficulties, challenges and wrestlings with God, but such is the way of service.

So should each local church be getting on with mission on its own as soon as is possible, without the help of outsiders? Some literature seems to head in this direction, and the general rush towards congregationalism in ecclesiology supports this. Against this it is importance to place the growing appreciation of partnership over recent decades. God calls us to a partnership in mission that is both his and ours, and calls the church to a mission in partnership. Partnership “is not such much about what the church does as what it is.” Mission and discipleship is a together thing: for congregations; across nations; and across the world. For these tasks God calls and gifts people across the world in ways that can work together wonderfully for the good of all. Within the shared call of all in mission lies the need to welcome the outsider and consider how their gifts alongside ours can better enable the life, discipleship and mission of the church where we are. In this missionaries, or ‘mission partners’ as some mission societies now call them, may remain in a place long-term. But there remains an underlying hope that their ministry will be a shared one, with others growing greater as they grow less.

The biblical model for such an understanding of missionaries is the apostle Paul and his missionary journeys. Paul followed a pattern of spending time in a city making disciples, forming churches and appointing leaders before moving on. His trust in the gospel and the power of the Spirit gave him the confidence that churches would grow without him having to remain there. Of course he kept in touch and visited when able, but he trusted in the gifts the Spirit gave for the common good (cf. 1 Cor. 12). It was this example that challenged Rufus Anderson to rethink the nineteenth century model of missions to articulate the ‘three self’ understanding. Similarly the example of Paul challenged Roland Allen to think differently in the early twentieth century, and it was Allen’s ideas that became influential on pentecostal

missiology, particularly through Melvin Hodges. This thinking has deep theological roots in an understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit in mission – particularly a confidence in the Spirit’s gifting of local churches and His desire to draw all people to Christ. Whilst we might not want to say that all missionaries are to model themselves primarily on Paul, it seems unavoidable that the model of Paul should influence all missionaries.

**Conclusion**

It is important that we question the assumptions we often take for granted in the theory and practice of mission. At the present time it is vital that we keep a missionary heart in the life of the church and key to this is developing appropriate understandings of missionaries and incarnational mission practice. On the one hand it is important that we value and encourage the missionary call that God gives and the salvation that comes uniquely through Christ. Yet, I have argued, we need a deeper trust in the work of the Spirit as he moves us in mission. We need to humbly accept the Spirit’s directing of ourselves and his working in the lives of others, ultimately valuing God’s working above our own ideas. The Spirit will lead us beyond our comfort zones into cultures that are not our own and we need to let God shape us through his working in those cultures. Only in these ways will we be a humble, holy people that see God’s salvation spreading to the ends of the world.
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A Response to Andy Lord’s Critique

David J. Garrard

This response is set out in reply to questions posed by Andy Lord where he raises a number of issues springing out of the original article and invites further examination of them. In brief the matters are the following:

- Is it appropriate to consider the incarnation under a particular and limited understanding of salvation?
- Is mission really reduced to the communication of the gospel message that aims at conversion?
- Is God’s work mainly limited to the church with one-way communication from the church to the world?
- Is our understanding of a missionary call limited by a model from the past?
- Is it not appropriate to consider the incarnation under a particular and limited understanding of salvation.

The article which was set out in order to question theological assumptions in the area of missiology was intended first and foremost to challenge the theory behind missionary practice. It is not possible in an article of this nature to answer nor anticipate all the possible questions regarding the wider implications of the missio Dei, or as Yohannes Agaard would prefer: missiones Dei, and all that is included in the length and breadth of soteriology in modern scholarship.

Again, the purpose was not to write merely as a theoretician but as one who has been involved in the forefront of propagating the Gospel and discipling believers in a cross-cultural context for more than thirty years. Few would dare to suggest that the missio Dei is not broader than the incarnation event, even if this author would state without apology that it finds its focus as well as its locus in the chronological outworking of the will of the Trinity in the particular form which made it possible for the Word to become flesh and dwell among us (Jn. 1:14). Without the incarnation as it is reported in the Gospels, it is this author’s understanding that there would be no salvation.


2 Not only did I spend 23 years in actual missionary work in what is today the Democratic Republic of Congo (then Zaire) I am very much involved in cross-cultural mission today both as a participant and as the UK director of Central African Missions.
in any sense in which that word is understood across the pages of the New Testament. There would be neither need nor purpose for mission. This is after all one of the reasons why Pentecostals have in the past believed that it was incumbent upon them to engage in the task of mission where mission was clearly and specifically concerned with all that meant proclaiming the unique nature of the Gospel and the need for all to “call upon the name of the Lord” if they were to be saved because there is certainly no salvation in any other message or person (Acts 4:12).

To conclude this section it needs to be stated that mission as it is expressed in the original article is not inclusive of all that God does in the earth. It is focused on what is necessary to reconcile mankind with God rather than remaining in a place of rebellion and enmity. The incarnation is central to that and therefore mission has to ensure that this remains central. When it comes to the nature of mission today, even Aagard, recognises that not all the modern church calls mission is worthy of that name:

...a large part of the work of traditional “missionary” institutions and personnel is not missionary at all, but belongs rightly under the heading “inter-church aid” or “church cooperation.” which is most certainly a necessary and interesting matter, but not mission.

Is mission really reduced to the communication of the gospel message that aims at conversion?

Mission is not reduced to the communication of the gospel message but it certainly starts out with this communication. If there is no proclamation and there are no converts where would we be? This is the heart of the problem with the Church in the West. We are very knowledgeable and very theoretical. We are good at telling the Church in the rest of the world ‘how to do it’ but usually we fail to put into practice what we suggest to others. In all of this we are certainly not very good at convincing people of their need to believe in the Christ. That is why our churches are shrinking and in many places counted as irrelevant. The two-thirds world churches are not

---

3 I know that there are many today, and that includes those who find themselves in Evangelical and Pentecostal churches, who believe that we need to be careful not to be so dogmatic. However, even the Evangelical Alliance in the Acute report on The Nature of Hell, London, 2000 makes it clear that “universalism remains a largely non-evangelical view” p.27
4 I know that today Charismatics and Pentecostals often appear uncertain as to their theological views and this is the reason why I state that this is what took place in the past. I happen to be one of those who still holds to these views.
as hesitant as we are and their churches are growing. It is only once converts are added that it is possible to talk of things like Christian influence and the manifestation of the love of God and of Christ.

Without conversion the Church will die within a generation. How can we get away from the primacy of preaching, and of the need to be converted? Jesus repeats the words of Isaiah and talks about the people who refuse to ‘turn’ (be converted) because they are callous and indifferent (Mt. 13:15). Those words are just as descriptive of this generation as they were of his. The healing of their souls depends upon a willingness to be converted. How can conversion not play a major role in the individual salvation story? It is not all that is involved in mission by any means but birth – the new birth – is an absolute. Even when holistic ministry may appear central to many it is meaningless without a body of converts to Christ to implement its actions. Mission starts with conversion and then it continues in a host of other spheres which work themselves out in the discipleship of those who have been converted. Indirectly, it also touches on the lives of unbelievers but even if they benefit from the works of Jesus they do not participate in his final salvation unless they become converts. Rather they share in his wrath (Rom.1:18; 2:8).

Is God’s work mainly limited to the Church with one-way communication from the Church to the world?

The answer to this question is yes-mainly. Despite all that has been written regarding the ekklesia sayings in Matthew 16:18 and 18:17 by modern scholars, it is evident that the apostolic church believed that its mandate was to continue to build the Church and that this was Christ’s plan as well as the reason for the discipleship of the Twelve. It has been through the Church both directly, as planned, and indirectly, without indication of planning, that missions have developed and it is through the Church that there are as many followers of Christ throughout the nations. The corollary is also true – that because of the failings of the Church there are as few Christian believers throughout the earth as there are today. The Church has not always been attentive to the leading of its master and has often been sidetracked by secondary issues and even non-issues, from a biblical perspective.

Andrew Walls may draw parallels between the incarnation and translation but he also goes on to say that when Christ became man he did not become man in general but a man in particular and in a particular context.6 This is exactly what I have been trying to say. The incarnation is

---

particular and specific and cannot be repeated even if there are parallels between the purpose of Christ and the goals of mission and the missionary. With all due respect to my mentor, what anthropologists and linguists would more likely refer to as dynamic equivalence in translation is not the same as incarnation theologically – even if there are parallels. The purpose of mission is the transmission of the message of God in multiple contexts. It means the message can change and be modified. Christ’s message has to be gleaned from the Gospels and from the interpretation left us by the Apostles. It is nevertheless, unique even if it is understood variously. It does not change. When we try to liken our attempts to identify and present a dynamic interpretation of the meaning of Scripture to the incarnation we will detract from the integrity of its meaning which has to focus fully on Christ and all he means as the bearer of salvation.

Anyone who has read his Bible with care and observed what is happening in our world knows that there are times when God works independently of man and He is able to use any individual or organisation to bring about his will. I have met individuals in Ethiopia who have related to me how they have been called to Christ from Islam through revelation (dreams and visions). However, in this present New Testament dispensation the Church is the focus of God’s attention and the tool by which he calls the world to attention and to salvation. It is only through the expression of the love of Christ through the Church that the community ‘without faith’ is going to be able to interpret what the incarnation is all about. This is why mission is imperative in the sense in which we discuss it here. Because we live in the day of grace certainly everyone benefits from the incarnation as it has allowed a parenthesis in time during which the wrath of God is withheld, but its implications are meaningless without the Church highlighting all that is involved and what choice, as well as what non-choice, means. When scholarship goes outside the bounds of “what is written” (1 Cor. 4:6) it becomes irrelevant biblically even if it may be mentally challenging, and this is unfortunately where many venture.

As far as the statement presented by Andy Lord from Philippians 2:1-11 is concerned, exegesis demands, as he says, that this text be understood in the light of example. The humiliation of Christ is an example for each believer. However, the example to be imitated is related to the servant heart and not to the incarnation. The incarnation highlights what that meant to Christ who

---

8 I am not referring to the Gospel message changing but the way in which it is transmitted.
was equal with God but we are never called upon to attempt to undertake anything similar. What we are called upon, as Andy Lord again says, is to demonstrate the servant heart and the flexibility of each context by ‘being all things to all men’ (1 Cor. 9:22). The problem really is hermeneutical. It is unwise to press parallels and illustrations of any nature in Scripture too far, as in the end the outcomes will be distorted. It has nothing really to do with mission but with interpretation. So when one tries to apply what was meant to have a theological significance in a different context to what we understand as a contextualization matter in mission there is bound to be a distortion in the outcomes.

**Is our understanding of a missionary call limited by a model from the past?**

It is presumed that by: ‘model from the past’, Andy Lord is referring to the model of the professional missionary which seems to appear concurrently with the appearance of the Church of Rome as it came to be. However, before we look at this, it could be stated that if we go back as far as the Acts of the Apostles, many of the central players in the book of Acts were missionaries and church planters. They were key in the spread of the Church. They were also key in interpreting the meaning of the Christ and their primary purpose was to evangelise and proclaim the word of Christ. As an aside it would difficult to justify our modern views of holistic ministry (other than the manifestation of care and love) from their model.\(^9\) Indeed if we look at the central figure from chapter 9 onwards Paul is arguably missionary before all else (even if scholars treat him primarily as a theologian he is not their sort of theologian). If he happens to be a model from the past then certainly we could benefit from much that is within the model of the Pauline and the other apostolic missionary teams.

The models from the post-Reformation period and particularly from the modern period of mission (normally dated from William Carey but by some from Zinzendorf and the Moravians) may demonstrate numerous inadequacies and faults. Nevertheless, despite the faults and errors committed, without those men and women and even with all their failings, the Church of Jesus Christ has been spread through many, if not the majority, of the nations of this globe. Again, this was primarily because those missionaries, kept the main thing – proclamation, conversion, discipleship

---

\(^9\) It is my contention that what we understand as holistic mission is only a problem for Westerners because they have the resources which the Two-Thirds world does not and they are so concerned about not being confrontational that they try to find alternative ways of presenting the verbal message of the Gospel.
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– the main thing. The world and its governments may have moved on and the Western Church should not be as audacious as to pretend that any successes on the ‘missionary’ front are due to its input. However, a belief that a watering down of its priorities can be changed in preference of models that are so vague that no one knows that there is a mandate anymore is the equivalent of the Church’s abdication of its divine prerogative.

Many people in the church today are totally confused as to the mandate of mission. They think that merely attending church services and being part of what pastoral ministry emphasises constitutes a ‘mission church’ is all that is required. Few believers in the West have understood their role as ‘the Church’ even when they are not assembled and how they should be taking clear stands in terms of the ethical, and unethical issues in society. It is unlikely that this brand of Church is going to engage in mission in the sense in which the New Testament presents the concept.

This article was never intended to look at the mission of the Church vis-à-vis the mission of the individual. Mission is a calling to all and it is also an individual call. Perhaps it was confusion over the nature of the community call in the 3rd and 4th Centuries which led to our confusion today. No local church can get off the hook that easily, that is certain, and the fact that there are many local churches which are attempting to reappraise their role in mission is to be commended. However, because many local churches think that sending a few short term missionaries to a ‘mission field’ for what often amounts to nothing more than missionary tourism is the reason why we need to ask the question: Do we need to do ourselves out of a job? The question likely raises the whole area of understanding of what is involved in being a missionary in the 21st century. In the same way that not everything the Church does is missions, so too R. Pierce Beaver points out that it would be a fallacy to see all believers as missionaries. The apostolate of the Church may have a mandate to missions and the overall plan of the Church is that of extension, growth and maturity, but not every Christian is automatically a missioner even if he/she is certainly involved in mission as part of the thrust of the local church.10

If being a missionary is merely being involved in holistic ministry which concentrates on making the world a better place then let’s leave missions to anyone and everyone, including the secular agencies, who often have a better infrastructure and more organizational skills than Christians do. If however, missions is still basically what it used to be apart from the misconceptions of superiority and power, then perhaps it is still a valid one. The secular agencies can cater for the physical needs of mankind but they

10 R. Pierce Beaver, The Missionary between the Times, (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1968,) pp.6,21
are not the least interested in the spiritual which Jesus declares means we will live forever (The location for that eternal life, is determined by the fact that people need to turn to Christ).

Do we really need long-term missionary specialists? Alexandre Vinet (1797-1847) writing to believers in Switzerland on the subject of the Priesthood of all Believers points out that all Christians have the right and responsibility to live lives which commend their faith in Christ. However, he states that it would be beyond reason to think that this means that there are not, as in any area of expertise in life, those who have specific calls, and gifts which enable the rest of the Body of Christ to function to its best capacity.\(^\text{11}\) When those gifts and those individuals are marginalized then the tasks with which they could help us will be left undone. This example may seem to be extreme but if we take the equivalent of missionaries in this specialized and gifted (restricted if you like) sense and look at pastors in a local church context, who would ever dare suggest that because a local church has been in existence for some years we can now do away with pastoral oversight? The parallel does not fit exactly here because the missionary is not only responsible for overseeing one local church but may well be responsible for initiating a movement and or movements and then helping with the continuation of the movement through discipleship.\(^\text{12}\) This does not exclude the need for indigenization and role change. In addition to this missionary work is not monolithic. Missionaries are called upon to engage in a multitude of different sorts of activities. Some of these continue, some do not. Some areas of activity are passed on to others while others become superfluous.

The section on the missionary and his task does not envisage any set ministry and or any and every possibility in terms of the integration of others in the continuation of ministry. Neither does it mean that the one practicing this ministry will continue to maintain the exact same role indefinitely. But this individual remains, not merely one of the Body of Christ but one whose role is to be considered commensurate with those Paul describes in his Epistle to the Ephesians (4:11). They are *equippers* and will remain so. This does not mean that the Body and the Priesthood of all Believers and all the coincidental things like indigenization of the national churches will not accompany this fact within the mission context.


\(^{12}\) This is not an overstatement. One such example would be that of W.F.P. Burton who together with James Salter, set out in 1915 to commence missionary work in today’s Congo Democratic Republic founded a movement that today has multiple thousands Pentecostal churches and hundreds of thousands of Christian believers in an area that is far greater than the United Kingdom.
Personal Reflections on Incarnation as the Model for Mission

Peter K Kay

Abstract

Practical considerations about mission, including actual engagement with Christians and others outside our own country, support incarnational attitudes and actions. This follows both from the teaching role of missions and in relation to intercessory prayer.

‘We would not normally think of giving support to missionaries’. I was shocked when this remark was addressed to me by members of the African diaspora now resident and worshipping in England. They elaborated their feelings that they felt that almost by definition missionaries were often detached from the life experience of Africans and dismissive of their cultural practices and values. The implication was that on many occasions the Christian faith had been communicated in spite, rather than through, the medium of the lives of the missionaries.

Is there a clear biblical model on which good communication and cross-cultural rapprochement can be built? I think there is. That the incarnation is used in the NT as a model for Christian behaviour in Philippians 2:5-11 and 2 Corinthians 8:9 is a commonplace of biblical studies. For all that the incarnation of the Son of God in the person of Jesus son of Mary is an unrepeatable and pivotal event in the history of salvation, it is also spoken of as an example to be followed by Christian believers.

It is my contention that in a similar way the incarnation is the soundest

1 Working in Burundi and Nairobi, Kenya Peter and Jenny Kay were on the staff of the Nairobi Pentecostal Bible College from 1984-1993 working with the Pentecostal Evangelical Fellowship of Africa (PEFA) churches. Since then they have been engaged in academic study, pastoral work and teaching mission as well as leading seminars in Burundi (with the FECABU churches) since 2000. They have recently returned to NPBC where they will be teaching on the new degree programmes. They also plan to make regular teaching visits to Burundi as well as being involved in the work of reconciliation and rebuilding following the virtual ceasefire and end of the civil war. Email: pandjkay@googlemail.com

model for Christian mission. Missionary proclamation and teaching involves a Christ-like immersion in the world and thought forms of nationals and students. It is as missionaries follow this pattern that they will be most likely to fulfil their calling. Darrell Guder has expressed this idea in these terms: ‘To speak of the incarnation missionally is to link who Jesus was, what Jesus did and how he did it in one great event that defines all that it means to be a Christian’. Incarnation is not just a doctrine it also serves as an ethical guide.

The fact that Christ related to lost humanity that he came to seek by taking on the identity of a contemporary Jewish male is an example to those involved in cross cultural mission. In the same way his washing of his disciples’ feet teaches us about spiritual leadership. Out of this identification flows true communication and authentic modelling of the radical alternative offered by Jesus Christ to cultural norms of authority and power – surely one implication of the self emptying of the incarnation. As a child born out of wedlock, within a despised and enslaved community, to parents who could not provide proper accommodation, Jesus identified with the poor and weak of the world. This identification, which the Book of Hebrews rendered as ‘to be made like his brothers’ and ‘not...unable to sympathize with our weaknesses’, created (it seems) a common bond of mutual understanding between Jesus and the people to whom he came to minister (Hebrews 2:17; 4:15; cf 5:2). They would listen to him because they knew he had the insight gained through personal experience of their life condition. I am persuaded that this is relevant to the call to Christian missionaries. It is as they share in the weakness of those whom they are aiming to bring to discipleship, they will make a ready pathway along which men and women may come to learn Christ. But this is neither simple nor popular.

It is, I believe, a truth, confirmed by the experience of many mission workers, that missionaries who demonstrate and do not conceal bodily weakness, paucity of resources, a simple lifestyle and a non-dominating attitude are able to share God’s word more effectively than others. For one thing, it becomes clear to the receivers that it is in Jesus Christ and not in the merits of Western culture or the missionaries’ own resources that true strength and grace are to be found. How often otherwise, do they merely create a longing for participation in the technology of the societies they represent?

Secondly, there is a deeper willingness to imitate a person whose life

---

relates to our own in some respects. Where there is identification between the missionary and those to whom they are sent there is a true sense of partnership and Christian fellowship which benefits all parties (Rom 1:11; Phil 4:14). My wife and I have been building relationships with the same African leaders over a twenty year period. Through a process of cross-cultural education in interpersonal relating, these have developed into friendships based on giving and receiving and mutual respect. They are now becoming a source of more fruitful Christian work. Learning together is another area where incarnation is a good model. If Jesus learnt about humanity and the value of faith and obedience, for example, from those he ministered to, how much more may missionaries learn together with their mission partners about issues relating to biblical interpretation and to culturally appropriate application of its message.

What are the views of the African Church itself? There is little available research on the current attitudes of African leaders – a sign perhaps that most studies are carried out from the missionaries’ own perspective. One example of what there is suggests that this ambivalent reaction to missionaries is to be found not just in expatriate Africans in English churches but in the current, indigenous, national leadership. Larry Lambert outlines his findings with reference to the mission triangle of sending churches, missionaries and receiving churches. His research points to signs of misunderstanding and mistrust; suspicion of lack of mutuality in the form of hidden agendas and desire for control. Communication which Lambert sees as ‘the key in breaking down barriers of mistrust and culture’ is inadequate.4

A significant consequence of the incarnation is thus to be found in reference to the foundation and purpose of Christian ministry. The Word-made-flesh is both the content and the form of the Church’s message. Ministry is to be a matter of words and deeds – it is to be seen to be believed; or if it is to be believed it is to be seen. Jesus’ credibility grew because he lived a life of holy and sacrificial love before he died a holy and sacrificial death. His life illustrated his teaching. In terms of mission, one can make the claim that the Christian life in all its aspects has as its goal the incarnation of Christ in the life of the believer. For as Alan Neely has said, ‘Believers find the most significant implication of the incarnation… that Jesus Christ can be fleshed out in the lives of those who follow in Jesus’ steps (Galatians 2:19,20; 1 Peter 2:21).’5 For the Christian believer ‘For me to live is Christ…’ As the beginning

of Christ’s life entailed his identification with human beings in the full range of their life circumstances – personal and communal, historical and political – so Christian mission should involve the closest interaction with its receptor groups. Guder, in the same passage, put it another way: ‘Jesus is the messenger, message and meaning for all who follow after him’.  

I want to apply this to a further aspect of the missionary – the teaching role. This is in the making of disciples which may be considered to be the end result of teaching as indicated in the words of Jesus’ commission in Matthew 28:16-20. The emphasis is on teaching as a feature of making *disciples* – an emphasis reinforced by the grammatical structure of Matthew’s words in which ‘make disciples’ (28:19) is the main verb. The missionary task is the formation of disciples who in turn make disciples. This constrains examination of the means employed by Jesus as disciple maker. Michael Griffiths, a missionary and theological educator, has written of the self consciously offered example of Jesus in his lifestyle, habits and attitudes as determinative for the training of the next generation of disciples. It is by imitating the original contours of the life of Jesus that disciples were to produce every new generation of disciples. In John 13:15 for instance when Jesus cites his own example of service, *as/so* vocabulary is used to underline the centrality of the imitation of what has been observed. His method is best understood and practised in terms of an incarnational model of learning. Griffiths quotes P.T. Chandapilla:

> Jesus used every available elemental and ordinary thing in life for teaching and communication. This quality enabled Him to take any situation or experience through the 24 hours of the day for the purpose of communication....The disciples learned and perceived new truths through daily life and situations...the purpose was not the transfer of some information, intellectual presuppositions or philosophical notions, but *the impartation and reproduction of Himself* whereby His own core of ideas, knowledge and insights would become part of his disciples.  

Griffiths lists seven basic ideas to describe this process:

1. the original imitation is the imitation of God.
2. the archetypal model is the Lord Jesus himself.
3. the apostolic missionary models himself on Jesus.
4. the missionary in turn becomes a model to others.
5. the apostle’s protégé, Timothy, as his child in the faith, shows a family resemblance, and so will remind them of the authentic lifestyle.

---

vi) there is an authenticated godly succession of imitators – Paul and Silas having suffered in Philippi, went on to suffer in Thessalonica, demonstrating a pattern of suffering which the Thessalonians in turn demonstrated to others.

vii) the imitating is not only of holiness of life, but in willingness to suffer and work hard.8

Paul holds up the example of Jesus as one for Christians to follow repeatedly but as mediated through his own personal following and learning of Christ (1 Corinthians 4:14-17; 2 Corinthians 11:1; Phil 3v17; 4:9). Similarly, Peter teaches others by virtue of being a witness of Christ (1 Peter 5:1; 2:16). We also see Peter apparently modelling the ministry methods of Jesus, for example in praying for the sick (Acts 9:40-42 with Mark 5:40-42).

Paul also follows an incarnational model, I believe, in the way that he employs secular models as the basis of his teaching. An example from the very detailed work The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians by Robert Dutch illustrates how in 1 Corinthians Paul employs his detailed knowledge of the socio-historical context of Corinth with its status scenario and its profound respect for the educated elite. He does this to teach the Corinthians how for all their participation in the elite gymnasia and their physical prowess at the (athletic) Games they have failed to show true Christian maturity. As Dutch puts it, ‘Paul metaphorically enters the domain of the educated elite, into their socially privileged area. From there he tackles the problems they are causing…. community conflict is addressed through the conflict in Games and gymnasia’.9

The starting point for Christian instruction is a deep understanding of local cultural norms and aspirations. This is further illustrated in the missionary context in a discussion of patron-client relationships. This, too, is a theme which is relevant to our understanding of New Testament teaching on ministry and discipleship.10 An awareness of the dynamics and cultural importance of this relationship is seen to underlie successful Christian mentoring. The patron-client nexus is arguably among the most common forms of African hierarchical relationship structure and a channel along which teaching traditionally flows. It is thus relevant to the way in which an African will relate to and learn from a missionary who is often perceived to be of higher status by virtue of his wealth, education or experience. Delbert Chinchen elaborates four steps which must be taken for

---

8 Griffiths, The Example..., 63-4.
such a relationship to be established: admiration – visit – token gift – request. These stages in the development of the relationship ensure its reciprocity, whereas what often happens is that a missionary may fail to understand the process and feel that the token gifts insult him/her and the requests are little better than begging letters. In the establishment of effective patron-client relationships there is a shared sense of need – the patron is aware that the client can benefit him with information or contacts which in the traditional setting enhances the patron’s influence in the community. Time is spent in visiting, leading to the sharing of gifts. In a missionary context the impartation of knowledge and teaching will work better if founded on this relationship; in fact the impartation of spiritual truths and gifts may itself mirror procedure for the exchange of material gifts. A missionary working in Africa hamstrings her effectiveness if she does not follow these local cultural methods of communication because she is stubbornly wedded to a Western knowledge of learning as taking place solely in an academic setting. As Chinchen says, ‘He is bankrupt and a complete failure if he is devoid of close, committed, “thick”, relationships’11 and ‘as missionaries enter deep, long-lasting, patron-client relationships, they will find cherished Christian values flowing from them to their disciples’.12

Finally, and tentatively, I suggest that Incarnation is itself a model for the Spirit’s indwelling and intercession. It is through the work of the Spirit that the missionary is able to identify (in part at least) with the often painful circumstances of those among whom he is called to minister. It is in following the Christ who ‘became poor that through is poverty we might become rich’ and through the Spirit ‘who intercedes on our behalf with inarticulate groanings’ (2 Corinthians 8:9; Romans 8:27). And it possibly in our identification with the sufferings of our brethren rather than in any great projects or preaching, that we encourage them most. In hearing that my wife and I were going to devote some of our time to working in Burundi – a country recovering from the ravages of 15 years of civil war and grieving over the loss of so many personal and physical resources – a Burundian Christian said to me recently, ‘I am honoured that you should come and sit with us and talk with us and eat with us and share our lives. In doing those things you build us up and encourage us even more than by giving us material things.’ He had lost 70 members of his family and there are many like him. In one sense it is a delusion fostered only by success-oriented minds to think that missionary work with all its infrastructure and

even financial resources is going to rebuild a nation. But by sharing joys and sorrows in the name of Christ we affirm the experience, encourage the hopes and cooperate with the Holy Spirit to impact the lives of Burundians who can achieve far more than we can. It is by doing all we can to incarnate our lives in the culture and environment of those among whom we have gone to be mission partners that we shall be following in the steps of Jesus. In the words of Matthew, we will find that he is already there – He is “God with us” when we are on mission (Matthew 1:23; 28:20).
Missional Orientation and Its Implications for Pentecostal Theological Education

Bradford A Anderson

Abstract

Postmodernity has left much of Christianity unsure of both its identity and its practices – the bases of missiology, ecclesiology, and theological education, to name but a few areas, have been called into question. Taking this on board, and building on the work of Lesslie Newbigin and David Bosch, missiologists and ecclesiologists have begun to call the church to become ‘missional’ in orientation, to rediscover the missiological thrust that lies at the heart of the Christian faith. It is a missional focus, so these scholars claim, that will allow Christianity to remain vibrant and faithful in the contemporary milieu. While this mindset has become quite common in missiological and ecclesiological circles, it has yet to exert much influence in the realm of theological education, another discipline of the church which is facing an identity crisis of sorts. The present essay, then, is an attempt to draw out what the implications of a missional orientation might be for Pentecostal theological education.

Introduction

The postmodern turn, however one defines this, has decisively affected the theological framework of the Western world. Doubt has been cast on, amongst other things, long held views concerning missiology and ecclesiology, not to mention the role of theological education and pastoral formation. While various polarized reactions to postmodernity can be seen within Western Christianity, one constructive attempt to move forward in this milieu has been a renewed focus on the missiological thrust that lies at the heart of Christian theology. The term ‘missional’ has become shorthand for this type of orientation, and has had a notable impact within the realm
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The discussion, however, has not moved very far outside the walls of the church. What of theological education? Can a missional orientation also help theological education clarify its role in a postmodern context? The present essay outlines some of the shifts that have brought about missional thinking, and explores the possible benefits of a missional orientation for Pentecostal theological education and formation. I hope to show that while missional thinking has proven beneficial for Western missiology and ecclesiology, regaining a sense of the mission of God as expressed in a missional orientation can also serve as a catalyst for renewal in Pentecostal theological education.

The Missiological Crisis and the Retrieval of Missio Dei

Jet den Hollander points to some of the difficult questions that have arisen as the modern era of mission has come to a close, where many involved in mission are trying to come to terms with the various challenges posed in our present era ‘characterized as post-modern, post-colonial, post-missionary and globalized.’ She notes the following:

Decolonization, secularization and unprecedented intercultural circulation brought a shift of power between nations in north and south, and subsequently raised questions about power relations between the churches there. Spearheaded by the ecumenical movement, the churches have explored at length the missiological questions implied in these global shifts. How should mission be understood now that the era of western expansion, at least in a geographical sense, has come to an end? Could it still be spoken of in the language of ‘project’, as discipling the nations and spreading the gospel throughout the world? How should first- and third-world churches relate in an increasingly interdependent world? Who should be doing mission? And where should it be done, now that the myth of the ‘Christian West’ has been exposed?

David Bosch lists six elements of change in this period that have brought about this missiological crisis: 1) the advance of secularization; 2) the steady de-Christianizing of the West, on which the missionary enterprise was founded; 3) religious pluralism replacing a binary ‘Christian’ and ‘non-Christian’ world; 4) Western Christianity’s guilt concerning their participation in colonial practices; 5) the growing economic gap between

---

2 Milfred Minatrea notes that the term ‘missional’ was first used by Charles Van Engen of Fuller in 1991 with regard to ‘missional relationships’ (Shaped by God’s Heart: The Passion and Practices of Missional Churches [San Francisco: JosseyBass, 2004]).
rich and poor and the subsequent wealth of Western Christianity; 6) the replacement of Western theology and ecclesiastical norms with indigenous practices and theologies around the world.\(^5\)

Though a detailed examination of it lies outside the scope of the present study, Pentecostal missiology has been no less affected by these changes. In spite of considerable success this past century with regard to worldwide numerical growth, both Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen and Gary B. McGee have urged Pentecostals to move ‘beyond triumphalism’ and face up to the current spate of issues facing the movement’s mission.\(^6\) Kärkkäinen notes several issues of concern: first, the pragmatic and strategic focus of Pentecostal mission has meant that we have not taken enough time to develop a clear theology of mission. Second, the emphasis often placed on ‘crisis experience’ over that of sustained spiritual growth has led to a focus on personal salvation and at times a lack of social concern. Third, Pentecostals have yet to adequately distinguish between evangelization and proselytism, an issue that is most sharp in countries where Roman Catholicism and Orthodoxy are still predominant. And finally, Pentecostals have a grave unease concerning efforts relating to Christian unity, and further discomfort with regard to their movement’s relation to the various world religions.\(^7\) Allan Anderson has voiced his own disquiet in relation to a Pentecostal missiology for the ‘majority world’: here the relationship of evangelism and socio-political action is underdeveloped, mission is still often seen as ‘out there’ and separating ‘us’ (Westerners) from ‘them’ (the rest of the world), and there remains a residue of colonialism in the triumphalist attitudes concerning the past effectiveness of primarily ‘white’ mission work.\(^8\)

It is precisely into this situation that both Lesslie Newbigin\(^9\) and David
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Bosch\textsuperscript{10} spoke in the second half of the twentieth century, paving the way for missional thinkers who would further their influence. Though it is a gross simplification, the contribution of Newbigin and Bosch to the missional conversation can best be seen in the areas of biblical and theological reflection on \textit{missio dei}\textsuperscript{11} as the driving force of Christianity and a focus on the need for holistic and contextualized mission. A few remarks from each of these scholars may help set the discussion in context.

First of all, Newbigin spends a good deal of time expounding the idea of a ‘missionary God’ and its implications.\textsuperscript{12} The basic idea is that as God sent his Son, and as Jesus sent the Spirit, so the godhead has sent the church. Newbigin writes,

From ‘the beginning of the Gospel’ (Mark 1:1) when Jesus came into Galilee preaching the kingdom of God, the concern of mission is nothing less than this: the kingdom of God, the sovereign rule of the Father of Jesus over all humankind and over all creation...It is the proclamation of the kingdom, the presence of the kingdom, and the prevenience of the kingdom. By proclaiming the reign of God over all things the church acts out its faith that the Father of Jesus is indeed ruler of all. The church, by inviting all humankind to share in the mystery of the presence of the kingdom hidden in its life through its union with the crucified and risen life of Jesus, acts out the love of Jesus that took him to the cross. By obediently following where the Spirit leads, often in ways neither planned, known, nor understood, the church acts out the hope that it is given by the presence of the Spirit who is the living foretaste of the kingdom. This threefold way of understanding the church’s mission is rooted in the triune nature of


\textsuperscript{11} On the history and usefulness of the term missio dei, see Bosch, \textit{Transforming Mission}, 389-393. Cf. H.H. Rosin, “\textit{Missio Dei”: An examination of the origin, contents and function of the term in Protestant missiological discussion.} Interuniversity Institute for Missiological and Ecumenical Research Department of Missiology: Boerhaavenlann 43, Leiden, 1972. My thanks to those at the EPTA conference 2006 who gave constructive comments on this issue.

\textsuperscript{12} Newbigin, \textit{Open Secret}, 19-65.
God himself. If any one of these is taken in isolation as the clue to the understanding of mission, distortion follows.\textsuperscript{13}

It follows that because God is a missionary God, the body of Christ is a missionary people: mission stands at the heart of Christian identity. Yet somewhere along the way this understanding was lost, especially in the Western world. This can be seen in the work of Bosch, who notes that as he reflected on missiology in his native continent of Africa, he noticed that missiology and theology could not be separated.\textsuperscript{14} However, this is not the case in the West.

For many centuries Westerners have lived in the climate of Christendom, which operated on the basis of a symbiosis between church and society and in which there were, officially, no nonbelievers...The study of theology in this period reveals the same mentality, particularly as it was ‘reformed’ and standardized by F.D.E. Schleiermacher. He established the ‘fourfold pattern’ in theological education, namely, the disciplines of biblical studies, church history, systematic theology, and practical (or pastoral) theology. In this division, the first three disciplines represented \textit{theory}, the fourth \textit{practice}. With the collapse of Christendom and the disentanglement of society and church, this did not change. Rather, the pattern was reinforced...It is clear, in this paradigm, that theology has no interest in the world outside the church, except insofar as the church might wrest ‘territory’ from the world and incorporate this into the church. As a matter of fact, when the modern Western foreign missionary enterprise was initiated, this is how mission was understood, to a significant extent: chunks of the ‘pagan’ world outside Europe had to be conquered and incorporated into Christendom, or, at the very least, into the Christian church.\textsuperscript{15}

Bosch goes on to explicate how this affected ‘mission’ in the western world:

When it became clear that the church also had to do something about the growing numbers of Westerners who had, practically, turned their backs on the Christian faith, this enterprise was referred to as ‘home missions’... Gradually, however, a change of terminology was introduced: ‘mission’ was now used only in respect of work in traditional ‘non-Christian’ countries. Reconversion work in the West was referred to as ‘evangelism’ (or ‘evangelization’). The latter was judged to be \textit{theologically} different from the former.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{13} Newbigin, \textit{Open Secret}, 64-65.
\textsuperscript{14} Bosch, \textit{Believing in the Future}, 27-28.
\textsuperscript{15} Bosch, \textit{Believing in the Future}, 28-29.
\textsuperscript{16} Bosch, \textit{Believing in the Future}, 29.
Evangelism is thus relegated to the attempt to ‘redress the balance, reclaim lost ground, and re-recruit people into a cultic community that is aligned chiefly on their individual salvation and their pastoral care’. While mission has developed in much more nuanced ways than has evangelism, ‘mission continues to belong to the *adiaphora*, not to the essence of the church. It remains a contingent activity...It remains peripheral, just as the discipline of missiology remains peripheral, in Western European institutions: only those interested in “overseas” work or in exotic theologies take these courses’. This, however, is exactly what Bosch says mission should *not* be.

Because God is a missionary God, God’s people are missionary people. The church’s mission is not secondary to its being; the church exists in being sent and in building up itself for its mission...Unless the church of the West begins to understand this, and unless we develop a missionary theology, not just a theology of mission, we will not achieve more than merely patch up the church [sic]. We are in need of a missiological agenda for theology, not just a theological agenda for mission; for theology, rightly understood, has no reason to exist other than critically to accompany the *missio Dei*.

Consequently, mission goes beyond evangelism; it is, in Newbigin’s words, ‘the proclaiming of the kingdom of the Father, and it concerns the rule of God over all that is’. However, this has been a problem in our modern culture, where good news in word and deed have often been separate.

The concern of those who see mission primarily in terms of action for God’s justice is embodied mainly in programs carried on at a supra-congregational level by boards and committees, whether denominational or ecumenical. The concern of those who see mission primarily in terms of personal conversion is expressed mainly at the level of congregational life.

Thus, a more holistic approach to mission is needed. This holistic approach will include preaching the Gospel; yet ‘the church [is] led by the logic of its own gospel to move beyond preaching into actions of all kinds for the doing of God’s justice in the life of the world’.

Finally, both Newbigin and Bosch spent many of their final years struggling with the issue of contextualization. Newbigin writes in *The Gospel*...
in a Pluralist Society that ‘there is not and cannot be a gospel which is not culturally embodied’. Both Bosch and Newbigin felt that the incarnation stands as a direct confrontation to Enlightenment objectivism that has been at the core of much modern theology and missiology, and laid heavy stress on the fact that cultural engagement and contextualization are vital in a postmodern context.

The impact of this reconceptualization of missiology has not been limited to those involved in traditional mission work. Indeed, the work of Bosch and Newbigin is becoming quite influential in ecclesiological study and discussions revolving around the relationship of gospel and culture. In North America, the Gospel and Our Culture Network has led the way, with its seminal work, Missional Church: A Vision for the Sending of the Church in North America. As the authors note, ‘Bishop Newbigin and others have helped us to see that God’s mission is calling and sending us, the church of Jesus Christ, to be a missionary church in our own societies, in the cultures in which we find ourselves’. They concede, however, that ‘Neither the structures nor the theology of our established Western traditional churches is missional’. The church can no longer employ mission as a program; rather, the church needs to see itself as the instrument of God’s mission. ‘Either we are defined by mission, or we reduce the scope of the gospel and the mandate of the church. Thus our challenge today is to move from church with mission to missional church’.

Outside of North America the influence of missional thinking can generally be seen in discussions of fresh expressions of faith or in conversations concerning the emerging church. The Church of England has recently released a book exploring these issues entitled, Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context. Meanwhile, throughout Europe, Australia and New Zealand there is much

22 Newbigin, Gospel, 189.
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discussion revolving around the concept of an emerging-missional church in a postmodern context.\textsuperscript{27}

Thus, the renewed missiological thrust of Christianity as set out by Bosch, Newbigin and others has indeed moved beyond missiology into the realm of ecclesiology. But if such an orientation affects one’s ecclesiology, then surely it must shape theological education, the place where theology, missiology, and ecclesiology converge with pastoral and spiritual formation. But if so, how? It is to this issue that we now turn.

\section*{The Crisis in Theological Education}

Much like missiology, various aspects of theological education and training have been called into question in our contemporary context.\textsuperscript{28} Allan Harkness notes that students, churches and lay people all have serious concerns with ministerial training and other forms of theological education as it is now handled.\textsuperscript{29} These concerns tend to revolve around the ‘schooling’ paradigm: is this paradigm really conducive to the nature of learning? How are values transmitted in a schooling setting? And how does the teacher/learner relationship reflect Christian attitudes toward leadership and spiritual formation?\textsuperscript{30} Robert Banks, remarking on theological seminaries, states that with few exceptions, they all formally recruit qualified faculty, use critical methodologies, and value academic accreditation. Most still tend to view pastoral ministry as a profession, and provide training in relevant skills. Only rarely do they question the dominant paradigm by which they fashion their lives. Seminaries have often adopted secular models of education, rather than subject them to rigorous or practical evaluation: even where such questioning takes place, it often parallels what is taking place in higher education or training for the professions generally, not on any distinctive grounds.\textsuperscript{31}

These issues are not foreign to Pentecostalism, which from its very

\begin{flushleft}
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inception has had a deep-seated ambivalence regarding theological education. The issue in Pentecostalism revolves around the relationship between rationalistic learning and the role of the Holy Spirit in formation, a dichotomy which is often translated as dry, academic learning versus relevant, Spirit-led empowerment. This issue has become more obvious as Pentecostal institutions have gained greater recognition and have become generally accepted in the wider arena of academia. The question of whether or not we have tied ourselves too closely to a model which takes us away from our core values is beginning to surface. Though attempts have been made at rethinking the enterprise of Pentecostal education, there is much work to be done, especially in relation to the interconnection between not just theology and education, but ecclesiology and missiology as well.

Missional Orientation and Theological Education

A few attempts have been made to apply the missional focus of Bosch and Newbigin to the pedagogical crisis of theological education. These studies have pointed out several advantages to a missional orientation in theological education.

First of all, missional orientation can provide renewed vision for theological education in its present state, where it often lacks clarity and focus. This missiological thrust is able to incorporate mission in the classical sense, but at its core is much more than offering an additional module on mission or an occasional overseas trip. Instead, a missional mindset proffers ‘an education undertaken with a view to what God is doing in the world’, focusing on the fact that the people of God are the visible expression of the kingdom of God on earth both locally and globally. Whatever our institutions do, it is done for the furthering of this kingdom.

33 Allan Anderson notes that this problem was exacerbated by the alignment of Pentecostalism with American fundamentalism, which at its roots is deeply tied to Enlightenment thinking and hostile to Pentecostal theology and spirituality. See his ‘Pentecostal-Charismatic Spirituality and Theological Education in Europe from a Global Perspective’, PentecoStudies 3:1 (2004): 6-10. Online: http://hollenwegercenter.net/PSpage/PS_Anderson.pdf.
37 Banks, Re-envisioning, 142.
A second advantage, which follows on from the first, is what Harkness calls a ‘praxiological agenda’. Here, for instance, theology is taught missiologically and pastorally, the result of which is a rich relationship between theory and practice. A byproduct of this is a greater focus on interdisciplinary measures, both inside and outside of the classroom, forcing our faculty, students and institutions as a whole to become more holistic in their approach.  

Thirdly, this praxiological agenda in a missional orientation can be beneficial because it allows for flexibility, creativity and participation in the learning process. This can take place in several ways. To begin with, there is freedom to move outside the classroom and provide experiential learning experiences in a multiplicity of situations. Harkness notes, ‘From the perspective of pedagogical effectiveness, and moving from a teaching to a learning orientation, active participation is a characteristic of effective learning, and field work can achieve this in ways which a classroom setting cannot’.  

Because of this, missional values in a training context can help institutions in the current changing context of education adapt to meet the needs of lay people, part-time students, long-distance learners, and people who find academic work particularly difficult.  

Finally, missional orientation can be advantageous because it encourages a symbiotic relationship between training institutions and churches, which forces a more radical contextualization of the learning experience. The practical upsides to this are obvious: churches are nourished and affected in tangible ways, and the strain between church and training centre is reduced as the two are seen as partners with mutual input into the development of one another. Furthermore, the abstract nature of theory is forced to interact with the contextualized situations students find themselves in, embodying Newbigin’s plea for a realization that ‘there is not and cannot be a gospel which is not culturally embodied’. Thus, a greater level of cultural engagement and understanding will be expected of the church at large.  

Leanne Van Dyk helpfully summarizes the situation by reminding us that ‘If the missional church is called to embody the reign of God, then that sense of community and accountability is appropriate in the theological seminary as well’.  

---  
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Missional Contribution to Pentecostal Theological Education

The question with which this essay began still remains: how appropriate is a missional orientation for Pentecostal theological education and pastoral formation, particularly for those of us in the West? Furthermore, does this approach have any particular benefits for Pentecostalism? And in what ways would Pentecostal education need to adapt in order to become missional in outlook?

I would submit that not only is a missional orientation appropriate for Pentecostalism, but that Pentecostalism in general is particularly suited to such an approach, as seen in the following characteristics. To begin with, the missional focus on the Trinity and its sending of the church resonates theologically with a Pentecostal focus on the sending role of the Holy Spirit. Though some have argued that Bosch and others have not given adequate attention to Pentecostalism in their research, this nevertheless seems to be an area of overlap that could yield much fruit in the future. Second, Pentecostalism has been driven by mission from its beginning. Though the initial thrust may have been eschatologically motivated, there is no reason to shy away from the fact that mission has always been a driving force in the corporate identity of Pentecostalism, and to build on this heritage.

Third, Pentecostalism is by nature participatory and experiential, and thus may be more flexible than many of its evangelical siblings with regard to broadening pedagogical horizons. It should be noted that a purely academic approach to education has never settled well in Pentecostal circles as a whole. Any attempt at an integrative approach to education may be warmly welcomed by the Pentecostal church at large. And finally, Pentecostalism has valued contextualization, at least in ‘foreign mission’, even before such thinking was considered crucial in a missiological context. To continue to think contextually might be seen as natural in Pentecostal tradition.

Having said this, there are several ways in which a missional orientation challenges Western Pentecostalism. While Pentecostals have always seen mission as a priority, this has primarily been relegated to work done ‘out there’ to ‘others’, and as one program which the church offers among many. Moreover, the focus of mission has often been solely on conversion,

as opposed to holistic ways of being the bearers of God’s kingdom on earth. While there are voices within Pentecostalism challenging this, much work remains to be done in the dispelling of this popular notion.\(^48\) Again, both Bosch and Newbigin have helped us understand that mission in this paradigm is no longer acceptable or relevant in our current religious climate.

Following on from this, if Pentecostals are to adopt a missional orientation there will need to be a greater focus on contextualization in the Western world, particularly in our postmodern, post-Enlightenment context. While our missionaries early on found contextualization to be a pressing need in their various situations, the Pentecostal church in the West has not been as quick to reflect and engage with the culture it finds itself in. The same holds true of Pentecostal training centres, where there has been a general homogenization of what one learns and how one is taught, following the Schleiermachean model. As Anderson helpfully remarks, ‘The way forward might be…to acknowledge that for our theological education to be truly contextual, its content must change’\(^49\).

Subsequently, a missional orientation would also require Pentecostals to step outside of the constraints of Enlightenment pedagogical methodology. The most obvious and natural way for this to happen in a Pentecostal context is a renewed focus on the role of the Holy Spirit in terms of learning and spiritual formation. However, while this discussion is beginning to take place,\(^50\) it cannot be the only issue being addressed by Pentecostals. Indeed, inquiry as to the role of the Spirit in education needs to happen alongside the other questions being proposed here if it is to have any lasting effect.

Finally, a missional focus can only take shape if Pentecostal theological education reconnects to the local church and its development in relation to the kingdom of God. Beyond the benefit of localized contextualization, a reconnection of church and training institutions helps insure that the body of Christ as a whole is a part of the *missio dei*, as training and equipping are made available to lay people and those not suited for academic study.

**Conclusion**

The renewal of a missiologically driven faith as proposed by Bosch and Newbigin seems particularly relevant for Pentecostal theological education.

---

50 See Hittenberger, ‘Pentecostal Philosophy’, 217-244.
And, as we have seen, Pentecostalism has intrinsic qualities that could allow a missional orientation to take root quite naturally. A change of perspective of this magnitude will take time, and old ideas concerning mission and education will not die easily. But we would be wise to remember these words of Newbigin: ‘The mystery of the gospel is not entrusted to the church to be buried in the ground. It is entrusted to the church to be risked in the change and interchange of the spiritual commerce of humanity’.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{51} Newbigin, \textit{Open Secret}, 189.
Campus Ministry in Japan
Jackie Brock

Abstract
Students represent the most responsive group towards Christianity in Japan. Statistics show that in the post-war period, 61% of Japanese Christians baptised in water are of school age and a further 12.9% are baptised between the ages of twenty-three to twenty-six. While campus ministry groups are experiencing some measure of success, the issue still remains: how can the 2,760,000 university students in Japan be more effectively reached with the Gospel? Japanese society is changing at an unprecedented rate and this has important missiological implications for student ministry in Japan. This paper will seek to suggest ways of reaching the current generation of university students growing up under the powerful influences of postmodernism and globalisation.

Postmodernism and Campus Ministry in Japan
The results of an NHK survey on Japanese Religious Consciousness indicated that “while students have a negative image of organized religion they nevertheless express a strong interest in mysterious or supernatural phenomena.” Certainly the statistics show that, in their search for the supernatural, many young people are joining those religious groups that emphasize personal spiritual experience. While interest in spiritual phenomena is not a new characteristic of Japanese society, it can nevertheless be argued that the rejection of the meta-narratives and the acknowledgement of the unknown and the mysterious is a modern characteristic of Japanese society.

1 Jackie Brock worked in Japan as a UK Assemblies of God missionary from 1999 to 2006. She has recently returned to the UK and is currently working on her PhD. Email: jaxjapan@aol.com
of the fallibility of science in the postmodern era have boosted the quest for
the supernatural among the youth of Japan. In the Church and in campus
ministry also, there needs to be an emphasis on a personal encounter with
God and freedom for the expression of the spiritual gifts. Increasingly,
young people in Japan can relate to supernatural experiences such as the
baptism in the Holy Spirit, divine healings and physical manifestations of
the presence of God. Therefore, a renewed emphasis on the place of the
mystical in prayer and the supernatural work of the Holy Spirit is necessary
to reach this generation of university students.

Worship in Postmodern Japan
Worship also has an integral part to play in reaching the new young of Japan.
Be it loud and enthusiastic, or quiet and contemplative, it needs to generate
an atmosphere where the presence of God is real and tangible and where the
Holy Spirit is welcomed to touch lives and perform miracles. In addition,
highly creative approaches to worship and spiritual reflection thrive in the
current postmodern context of Japanese society. Worship that incorporates
the use of multi-media resources, IT, videos, and DVDs appeals to students,
as do innovations in liturgical and traditional worship. However, above all
in the contemporary youth culture, young people want to be involved in
worship. It is not a spectator activity but is interactive, multi-faceted and
multi-sensory, and the young will express their love and enthusiasm for
God through actions such as jumping, clapping, singing and dancing.

Prayer and Preaching in Postmodern Japan
In postmodern Japan, where the young people are accustomed to stimulation
of their senses through T.V. commercials, computer games and recently
even 3-D hoarding advertisements, prayer needs be creative, interactive
and multi-sensory. Preaching should emphasise the narrative of the Gospel,
using parables, illustrations, visual images, and movies, and in so doing
dispel the image of God as an impersonal force and rather paint the picture
of God as a transcendent Person concerned for the individual.

Evangelism in Postmodern Japan
Like worship, evangelism in the postmodern society needs to be participatory.
No longer should non-Christians be invited to Christian meetings to be mere
passive listeners, rather the invitation should be extended for them to exercise
their skills and abilities. For example, in November 2001, the Assemblies of
God Chi Alpha Group located at one of Japan’s most prestigious private
universities – Keio University⁵ – invited university students to join their Gospel choir and a total of nine non-Christian students – eight from Keio University and one from Aoyama Gakuin University – attended the Gospel practices held at a recording studio in Shibuya and at Mizunokuchi Christ Church.⁶ A few weeks after the Gospel Concert performance, the male student from Aoyama Gakuin University was baptised in water.

**Relationships in Postmodern Japan**

While Japan’s shift from the modern to the postmodern society has profound consequences for the contextualisation of the Gospel in Japan, it nevertheless holds true that, it is “Japan’s own non-Christian heritage continues to prove the basic categories for understanding Japanese personality and identity”.⁷ Traditionally, Japan is a group-oriented society, and successful outreach in such a context requires an understanding of the indigenous models for human relationships.

In his landmark work, *The Anatomy of Dependency*, psychoanalyst Takeo Doi, gives an insightful description of Japanese psyche by explaining human relationships based on the Japanese concept of *amae*. The significance for the contextualisation of the Gospel in Japan is that *amae* can literally be described as the invisible thread that connects human relationships on every level of society. Consequently, conversion in the context of student ministry in Japan must incorporate the Japanese understanding of community and emphasize the kingdom of God principle that one is saved into the community of the body of Christ.

Although it is evident that Japanese young people today are becoming increasingly individualistic, there nevertheless remains a sense in which personal identity is considered in terms of the relationships within the sociological group. Thus, Japanese individualism in the postmodern era must be viewed in terms of the “individual within the group” or the “individual-within-community” and as Grenz rightly perceives, the Gospel “must address the human person within the context of the communities in which people are embedded.”⁸ Therefore, Sheppard seems to accurately assess that, in order for the Church or campus ministry group in Japan

---

⁵ According to an *AsiaWeek* magazine survey conducted in 1997, Keio University and Waseda University are Japan’s most prestigious private universities. Bacani, Cesar, “Asia’s Search for Excellence”, *AsiaWeek*, Vol. 23, No. 20, 23rd May 1997, p.35.

⁶ Incidentally, staff and church members themselves only numbered seven people.


to “reach and keep the young; it must provide a social web within which the individual can be secure, discipled and affirmed in their individuality, gifting and call.” The question is: how can this be achieved? One answer at least seems to be that contemporary outreach to students on campus must incorporate the use of small group ministry.

**Small Group Ministry**

In a nation where a large percentage of pastors are past retirement age, and the number of people attending Bible School is on the decline, the training and equipping of university students for leadership in the small group environment is vital to the survival of Christianity in Japan. Young people must be trained and mentored by the missionary, local pastor, or campus ministry staff member in the context of the small group. The traditional sensei-seito relationship that places a strong emphasis in the distinctive roles of the full-time minister and the young believer is put to one side, as in the “in-service” type setting of the small group the young person can receive training and discipling from his or her mentor. Assemblies of God campus ministry staff implementing this principle maintain that it is encouraging to witness the accelerated rate of spiritual growth in students who within weeks of being baptised in water are learning how to lead worship and facilitate the Bible study in the safe environment of the small group under the guidance and direction of campus ministry missionaries.

**What format should the small groups take and why are they effective?**

Bible study groups that adopt a discussion format can be highly effective on campus because they challenge students to assess their worldview. Further, in light of the high number of disintegrating families, postmodern people are searching for extended family relationships within the Church. They desire intimacy, and in the new atmosphere of honesty in postmodern Japan, young people are much more likely to share their problems in the safe environment of the small group setting. Thus, through the small group, the Christian students of Japan can first receive healing and then in turn be equipped and released to minister to the hurting and confused on the university campus. In addition, the small group can be the place where the young people of Japan can have a direct and personal encounter with God.

---

10 In a telephone conversation on 6th December 2004, Mr. Hanazono of the Church Information Services reported that the average number of students per Bible school in Japan was 7.2 in 1991, 7.0 in 1997 and dropped to 6.3 in 1998.
Globalisation and Campus Ministry in Japan

In addition to postmodernism, globalisation is also exerting its influence on Japanese society. The impact of globalisation on Japanese youth is easily recognisable. Due to the influence of television, advertising, films, and music, Japanese youth have no trouble identifying global fashion trends and are often seen sporting the same “uniform” as their counterparts in the Europe and America, such as Levi jeans, Reebok trainers, bleached hair, body piercings and tattoos. Further, concomitant with the seemingly ubiquitous presence of the virtually instantaneous information technology of the Internet and mobile phone,\(^\text{11}\) which simultaneously offer increased individuality and privacy, the limits of time and distance are being so eroded that Japanese youth today have more in common with their peers in the United States and Europe than the older generation in their own nation. This is a new phenomenon for Japan. While traditionally Japan has managed to maintain a strong sense of national identity and culture in the face of the infiltration of western modernity, the changes taking place among the youth of this globalised postmodern society of Japan, are tugging at the very heart of what it means to be Japanese. While the affects of the increased individualism and freedom on today’s young generation have yet to be fully revealed, it is evident that a new generation is emerging, one that the media have labelled \textit{shinjinrui} meaning “new breed of person” because its experience is so vastly different to any generation preceding it.

For the new young of Japan, globalisation offers a greater sense of freedom and choice for the individual than ever before. While it is too soon to assess \textit{exactly} how Japan will react to globalisation, it is evident that many young Japanese have shifted from the \textit{wakon yosai} attitude of the post-war generation and instead are searching inside their own heritage and culture to rediscover their identity as Japanese. Indeed, a recent advertisement posted on the walls of Omotesando metro station seemed to encapsulate the way Japanese youth are responding to the process of globalisation. The billboards read: “Heritage Meets Innovation”.\(^\text{12}\) Lately, on Japanese television there have been images of young people innovating elements of their heritage, for example, playing the \textit{shakuhachi}\(^\text{13}\) clad in jeans and leathers instead of the traditional \textit{kimono}, or conversely artistes wearing the \textit{kimono} while singing the traditional \textit{enka} in a new and ultra-modern style.

---

\(^{11}\) Today’s young generation in Japan are known as \textit{keitai-zoku} (cell phone tribe) due to the proliferation and dependency of the youth on this form of communication.

\(^{12}\) This advertisement for the Timberland 2004 \textit{Kabuku} collection appeared in Omotesando Station in November 2004.

\(^{13}\) A traditional Japanese musical instrument like a vertical flute made out of bamboo.
In addition, it seems that a kind of fusion of traditional Japanese culture with global phenomena is another means currently being explored by Japan’s young people. Certainly, on the university campus, young people are redeeming traditional elements of their cultural heritage, synthesising them with global trends and reinventing them. For example, dancers at the Waseda University Festival known as *Wasedasai*\(^{14}\) recently performed several pieces that were a combination of traditional Japanese dance movements and western break-dance moves, set to a contemporary reworked version of traditional Japanese music. The picture of the young people dressed in outfits, which though distinctly Japanese were some kind of cross between the traditional Japanese *yukata* and modern day sports dance wear, was a good example of the innovations and type of fusion that are taking place across the board in youth culture in Japan today.

**What can the church learn from how the young people of Japan are responding to globalisation?**

The way the new young are responding to the pressures of globalisation has important missiological implications for student ministry in Japan. For Christianity to be successfully propagated on the university campuses of Japan, it may be that just as the young of Japan are seeking to reinvent themselves and redefine what it means to be Japanese, that similarly campus ministry groups in Japan also need to re-assess the most appropriate way to effectively contextualise the Gospel and respond to the needs of the young people growing up in globalised Japanese society. This may mean that campus ministry groups should not seek to emulate American or western models of Church but seek indigenous Japanese models for worship and outreach. Thus, it may be that Japanese young people will decide to rework and reinvent elements of Japanese tradition to create an indigenised type of worship and dance for outreach on campus and it is probable that such a local assimilation of Christianity will result in a more dynamic expression of Christianity in Japan. For this to be realised, the Church or campus ministry group needs to provide an outlet for the expression of the individuality and creativity of Japanese young people, particularly in the areas of music, worship and dance.

Further, the church or campus ministry group in postmodern, globalised Japan may need greater flexibility in regards to the time and place to meet with students. Perhaps the meeting will not take place in a conventional university classroom but rather in a restaurant, cafeteria or a coffee house.

---

\(^{14}\) *Wasedasai* was held on 12th-13th November 2004 on the university campus.
There also needs to be a strong emphasis placed on relationships within the group. For the new generation of young people in Japan, relationships are of paramount importance.\textsuperscript{15} As previously alluded to, traditionally “community” and “group consciousness” (shudan ishiki) are extremely important elements of Japanese society. Although Japan is experiencing transformations whereby there is more freedom of individuality and choice, there still remains a strong sense of loyalty and allegiance to the group among Japanese young people. Thus, while it is important to appeal to individuals to follow Christ, it should not require a total severing with their existing network of relationships. Campus ministry groups should focus on strengthening the bonds of group consciousness and identity in the campus ministry small group to create a safe environment that promotes the freedom of expression for the individual. In so doing, Sheppard contends,

The church of the new young in Japan could be a model for the church of the 21st century in the West for it will maintain a strong sense of community within which individuals have freedom to be innovative. This is in contrast to the western model of church, which is often merely a group of individuals who have difficulty relating in a meaningful communal matter.\textsuperscript{16}

In light of this, it is evident that a paradigm shift is also necessary in the methodology of outreach in the globalised society of Japan. Campus ministry groups in Japan must acknowledge the need of young Japanese people to feel this sense of belonging to the group or community because once Japanese students realise they are loved and accepted as they are they will be more open to the message of Christianity.

As previously alluded to, campus ministry groups must also acknowledge the desire of the young for a personal encounter with God and the hunger for individual spiritual experience. This generation namely thrives on experience and places greater emphasis on the experiential than on the cognitive or rhetoric. Consequently, campus ministry groups need to regularly hold events where young people can encounter God for themselves in a real and personal sense, where there is a freedom of expression of spiritual gifts, and an expectation to see the miraculous. In recognition of this, the Chi Alpha Japan campus ministry group has organised several so-called “Power Praise Nights” where there is inevitably a rise in faith levels, as young people expect to receive a “touch” from God, and empowerment

\textsuperscript{15} Of fifteen students surveyed at random at the University of Tokyo in November 2004, fourteen of them indicated that as either the first or second priority they were most likely to go to friends for advice about life and important decisions.

for ministry through the laying of hands in the extended prayer time at the end of the meeting.\textsuperscript{17}

**Missions**

Research undertaken by Professor of Practical Theology at Tokyo Union Theological Seminary, Thomas Hastings, has shown that, particularly if contemporary Japanese young people are placed in a situation where they can meet face to face with authentic Christians living out their faith radically for Christ, then they are more likely to respond positively towards Christianity.\textsuperscript{18} Consequently, it is of fundamental importance that campus ministry groups seek to provide increasing opportunities for such encounters to take place. That involves not only inviting overseas teams to minister on university campuses in Japan, but also providing opportunities for Japanese young people to travel abroad to meet Christians who have an authentic relationship with God.

Another feature of missions in the postmodern, globalised era is that students have more access to information and have consequently a greater awareness and sense of responsibility towards domestic and international issues than in previous generations. The response of the young in the aftermath of the Hanshin Earthquake in 1995, when great numbers of them flocked to help disaster victims, proved that this generation are concerned for fellow man and desire to have hands on involvement in relief work. Missions in the globalised generation therefore needs to be holistic and extensive, providing opportunities for young people to express their concern for their world not only through traditional evangelistic methods but through diverse and wide-ranging means such as social and relief work.

**Conclusion**

Students represent the most responsive group to the Gospel in Japan. As the church and campus ministry groups grapple with the rapid shifts taking place in Japanese society, and engage with the effects of these on the youth of Japan, it is clear that new methodologies and strategies need to be developed

\textsuperscript{17} At a Chi Alpha Campus Ministry Training Seminar in August 2004, ten young people from various church backgrounds expressed a desire for a personal encounter with God and showed openness to the supernatural as they received prayer for the gift of speaking in tongues through the laying on of hands.

for effective student ministry. Evangelistic outreach in the postmodern era requires new strategies such as the utilisation of multi-media, the Internet and i-mode, etc. to facilitate the spread of the Christian message. The increased use of small group evangelism and discipleship could also prove to be advantageous. Finally, it seems that a renewed emphasis on the supernatural in the Church and in campus ministry groups is necessary in order for Christianity to attract, and make an impact on the young people of Japan. Nevertheless, with a proper understanding of postmodern thought patterns and the effects of globalisation on the youth of Japan there is surely no reason why Christianity cannot make the relevant adjustments in the approach to evangelism and discipleship, and begin to flourish in present day Japan.
Apostolic Networks and Mission

William K Kay

Abstract

Traditional missionary societies have tried to control missionary activity from a distant overseas headquarters. Even ‘faith missions’ have been deficient in their decision-making processes. Apostolic networks, springing out of the new churches that grew from the charismatic renewal, offer a fresh model for missions, one that, by placing missions within the scope of apostolic ministry, inverts the traditional scheme. This has the effect of steering missions from the ‘top’ of the organisation and ensuring coordination between sending churches and receiving countries.

Introduction

Around 1990 Paul Cain gave a prophecy to a New Frontiers leaders’ meeting in Brighton. He said,

This is a matter of a sovereign work of apostolic character and nature and chemistry and the Lord is going to use it to change the expression of Christianity all over the world. And that’s the word I came to bring. The Lord will use you here in a sovereign way to change the expression of Christianity throughout the world (Virgo, 2002: 192).

The prophetic announcement given by Cain indicated that New Frontiers International was to make ground-breaking changes to the expression of Christianity and, consequently and among other things, to the way mission is carried out. To understand this fully and to assess whether the announcement is credible, it is necessary to look back on Protestant missionary enterprises to see historically how they have operated. The focus here is largely upon the structures through which mission is actuated rather than the theology driving it though, as we shall see, theology *is* of crucial importance in the conduct of mission within apostolic networks.
Typology of missionary societies

Klaus Fiedler (1994) devised a typology of Protestant missionary movements and arranged them on a timeline. Like many others (e.g. Latourette, 1976; Edwards, 1997) he regards *An Enquiry into the Obligation of Christians to Use Means for the Conversion of the Heathen* written by William Carey in 1792 to be crucial. The first group within his typology comprises denominational missionary societies (like the Baptist Missionary Society of 1793) that were organised independently of any individual congregation but were strongly related to the denomination as a whole. Missionary societies were usually organised as voluntary associations ‘in which every member other than the missionaries – to whom the principle of voluntary association did not apply because they were employed by the mission – had a say’ (page 20). These denominational missionary societies reflected the internal structures and ecclesiologies of the denominations with which they were connected.

The second group are inter-denominational missionary societies. The first of these was the London Missionary Society of 1795 and it followed a similar pattern apart from the greater range of congregations offering financial support. Within such missionary societies a board was convened for the control of missionary activity in ways similar to those utilised by denominational missions. Regular communication to and from the field enabled the board to feel that it had an appreciation of the progress and problems confronting individual missionaries; boards responded by giving written instructions and sending or withholding money. The Basle Mission founded in 1815 functioned in this way and regularly sent out men and women to Africa where, in the early years, most of them died. In one gruesome statistic, there were for several years more deaths among missionaries than converts. As the mission boards became more adept at their work, language training, cultural preparation, biblical teaching, financial systems and the provision of visas and other documents, became part of their role. Missionaries, in both denominational and inter-denominational missions, often confined themselves to mission stations or secure compounds where they lived in relative safety and with the ability to go out to preach, offer medical help, supervise the building of schools and run local congregations. Inter-denominational missionary societies were obliged to ensure that no doctrinal controversy among the missionaries themselves blighted the work and it was common, in such circumstances, for policies on water baptism to be settled in advance (Fiedler 1994: 21).

---

2 According to Fiedler the strategy might be to set up a chain of mission stations across hostile terrain each fifty hours of travelling time from the next, p 73f.
As ecumenical and liberal movements took place within the churches of Europe and North America, denominational and inter-denominational missionary societies converged and differences between them became blurred (Fiedler, 1994: 21). In both instances the missionary was the agent of the board. It seems incredible to 21st century commentators that, for example, the Basle Mission should send out wave after wave of young men and women to work in appalling conditions where their life expectancy was low, where they had little control over what they did and where there could be disciplined by the withholding of finance if they disagreed with the board’s decisions. In many instances those who were sent out, however, were tenant farmers or in other ways obligated to their social superiors who sat on the board. ‘People like us have always told people like you what to do’ was the attitude of the board and an attitude accepted by the missionaries. Denominational missionaries appeared to fare little better even though, in theory, those who sat on the board, were fellow members of the same denomination. Had the missionaries functioned as ministers within their own country, they would never have accepted the interfering directives that they had to put up with on the field.

In 1865 Hudson Taylor founded the China Inland Mission (CIM) and established it along faith lines; that is to say, CIM missionaries received no salary beyond that which they received through prayer to God communally and centralised distribution on the field. The missionaries were not employees of the mission or subject to the board but were members of the mission and, more than this, their calling to China took pre-eminence over cultural norms within the country of their origin. CIM Missionaries were expected to identify with the Chinese people, to dress like them, to eat their food, to learn their language and, when strategic decisions had been made, these were made on the field by other missionaries within the same society and not handed down from distant boards in the countries where money was collected. Faith missions were the third group in the typology.

It should be emphasised that this discussion is not intended to diminish the heroic and sacrificial efforts of many missionaries in the 19th century. Nor is it intended to be an exhaustive classification system. Mission societies changed over the course of time and could diversify their activities so that they became less close to their originating type. For instance, although

---

3 Jon Miller’s answer at EPTA 2005 to a question posed during a visit to the Basel Mission.
4 It is true that later pledged support was used by these missions, cf SIL/Wycliffe.
5 Protestant missions in Africa trebled between 1886 and 1895. Many died young (Ferguson, 204: 158, 160).
faith-based missions were intensely evangelical, they could also engage in charitable works like the building of schools and hospitals (as was the case with the CEM founded by W F P Burton in 1919). Equally faith missions might also be inter-denominational in their composition – as was the CIM – while inter-denominational missionary societies might emphasise to their missionaries that funds could not be guaranteed and that, as a consequence, personal faith for provision was required. The Pentecostal Missionary Union made this kind of stipulation: its missionaries were not guaranteed an income even though the PMU council in Britain did attempt to raise money inter-denominationally and to control the activity of its missionaries from afar. During the 19th century and within the first part of the 20th century many missionary societies were founded so that, for instance, Fiedler needs nine pages to enumerate all the different societies, particularly since the sending countries were situated all over the world (pp 92-101). Between 1918 and 1940 19 new missionary societies were founded solely for the evangelisation of central Africa.

Denominations and networks

Alongside this typology of missions, can be placed a typology to include denominations and apostolic networks. The denomination is usually contrasted sociologically with the church where ‘church’ is applied to a broad grouping like Roman Catholicism that stretches its jurisdiction well beyond national boundaries (Weber, 1930; Wilson, 1963; Berger, 1967; Bainbridge, 1997; MacLaren, 2004). Churches may also be more limited and operate within nation states and, in such circumstances, are often identified with the ruling elite. Anglican churches are part of the British establishment and their bishops have, by right, seats in the House of Lords. Traditional religious structures, as we shall see, contrast with such structures as are put in place by apostolic networks.

Within the Presbyterian systems ministers are all equal with each other but power is vested in bodies to which ministers may be elected and to which all have an equal chance of being elected. Each congregation may have its own presbytery and then, above this, may be a regional presbytery or an...

---

6 Though the earliest form of association dates to 1915. Burton himself was an apostle by any definition of the word and the Congo Evangelistic Mission he founded showed many of the characteristics of an apostolic network.

7 It is also true that Cecil Polhill’s Practical Points Concerning Missionary Work did distinguish between mission stations and church planting. It also warned against becoming occupied with education, medicine and philanthropy.
executive presbytery. It is not that the individuals who sit on the executive presbytery outrank ministers on presbyteries lower down the system but that one presbytery, defined by constitution, does outrank another. The voting system expresses the reality of the equality of the ministers within their denomination. The constitution, because it is also agreed by voting, ensures that where denominational authority is exercised, consent is implied.

Denominational missionary societies set up within this structure operate by electing members to a presbytery or collective group (which may be called a Missions Council or Missions Board) and this has power over the special category of ministers within the denomination that are designated missionaries. In this sense the missionaries are directly subject to a higher authority within their denomination. Additionally missionaries are not able to be both on the home board or council and, at the same time, to be on the field; distance precludes this. Consequently missionaries are always excluded from and subservient to their governing body and, since they must communicate with it individually and directly, are rarely able to act collectively to make their opinions count.

The point is that missionaries are answerable to their boards within denominational settings. In the case of inter-denominational missionary societies, the board also wields power since it collects the finance from contributing churches. In practice, it is difficult to discern a greater degree of missionary autonomy within inter-denominational missions than is the case in denominational missions. In short, it is arguable that many missionary societies of the 19th and early 20th centuries derived their ethos from the social and theological presumptions of the denominations of their day. These denominations were largely authoritarian in outlook, and their hierarchies ran in precise parallel with the social stratification of the age. Only faith missions where authority is vested in a collection of missionaries on the field can be seen to give missionaries the degree of control over their own lives and strategy that many of them might wish. Only faith missions escaped the worst results of class-based governance.

In almost every case the work of missionaries is determined by someone other than themselves. It is true, and was especially true when global communications were slower and more fragile than they are today, that missionaries in practice enjoyed a measure of autonomy whatever their mission boards might dictate. Nevertheless the missionary was obliged to carry out tasks assigned to him or her by the board, and the tasks did not necessarily, or even usually, involve the planting of churches. Missionaries

---

8 Thousands of young men were sent, apparently uncomplaining, to their deaths in the trenches of the 1914-18 war. This was an age of duty and deference.
were teachers, evangelists, carers, supporters and administrators within indigenous churches but the planting of churches was rare partly because this capacity required rare gifting but also because church planting was uncommon within the Christian culture from which the missionary had come. For example, for many years the Baptists in Britain planted no new churches and so it is hardly surprising that their missionaries overseas were also deficient in this respect.

Apostolic networks were established in the 1970s in Britain. They defined themselves by avoiding the obvious hallmarks of denominations and emphasised that their own method of ‘doing church’ was relational rather than hierarchical or official. Where denominations set up hierarchical systems, apostolic networks ensured that their own structures were as flat as possible. While denominational systems achieved decision-making through voting, apostolic networks eschewed all forms of balloting. Where denominational systems appointed committees, apostolic networks prioritised spiritual and ministry gifts. Essential to the structure and functioning of apostolic networks was the role of the apostle himself (in almost every case this was a male). The apostle was viewed as someone with a God-given the capacity to plant and design congregations. He was, in Paul’s words, a ‘master builder’ (1 Cor 3.10) and specifically modelled on the apostolic pattern found within the Book of Acts and in the Pauline epistles. The apostle was concerned primarily and specifically with the creation of new congregations and, once a congregation had been planted, it was the apostle who had the authority to appoint elders. Apostolic networks are consequently made up of a series of autonomous congregations governed by elders over whom there is an apostolic figure who normally works with a complementary team of ministers. The connection between the autonomous congregations and the apostle is relational: it is not legal or encased in denominational tradition. The apostle does not own the building used by the congregation nor does he have the right to impose his will upon the congregation’s elders even though, in practice, the elders, since they have been appointed by the apostle, are likely to value his advice.

Although the apostolic network carries echoes of an episcopal system of government (since the apostle is analogous to the bishop) there are huge practical differences between the two forms of operation. Whereas within an episcopal system the bishop outranks all those within his diocese and,
by virtue of ecclesiastical law or constitutional precept, has power over
the congregations and ministers under his charge, the apostle has a lighter
touch. Moreover, and importantly, the apostle is not put in place by a voting
system or by government appointment but is a truly charismatic leader
whose authority stems from his gifting and ministry. The congregations
ask the apostle if he will take them under his wing and, since the apostle
has a record of planting churches or of re-structuring older ones, it is
apparent that the apostle possesses the gifts that define his calling. Or, to
put this another way, bishops are appointed to fill empty spaces within an
ecclesiastical structure, and the man appointed in this way may or may not
be suitable for the task. Apostles draw a network around them and are only
able to do so because of their obvious gifts.

When apostolic networks begin to work overseas, it is the apostles who
begin to plant churches in new locations and to appoint elders in new fields.
This is where the contrast is most sharp. With traditional missionary work,
the missionary is sent to function within a new field while the bishop or
denominational officials stay at home. In the apostolic network, it is the
apostle who goes overseas and facilitates the work and who then calls upon
the resources of the network at home to support the church overseas. So
missionary work in apostolic networks is typically performed by apostolic
figures who, to use conventional terminology, are the most senior people
within their grouping. This immediately changes the dynamics of the entire
process. Mission is driven from the top of the church and not from the
bottom. Additionally the apostle is a travelling figure who may stay a short
while overseas ministering to elders and congregations and who, on his
return home, has the influence to send out other people within the network
for short-term purposes. The apostle is not, like the missionary, sent overseas
where he may be forgotten but comes and goes as he sees fit. The apostle,
unlike the missionary, can set up training in the home country or determine
what social or medical needs could best be deployed overseas.

The great strength of the apostle in networks in respect of church
planting is that it is apostles who have planted or facilitated new churches
within their own cultures who venture overseas to carry out the same
function there. Equally important is the determination of apostolic
networks, and of New Frontiers International in particular, to confine
their work within the parameters of local churches. There is, as a result,

---

10 Senior positions, including Archbishops, within the Church of England are appoint-
eted by the Prime Minister though, obviously, he takes advice from the church. But for
many Anglicans this arrangement expresses the church’s undesirable subservience to
the state.
no missionary parachurch organisation separate from the local church with its own financial responsibilities and authority structure. On the contrary parachurch organisations – and missionary societies must be seen in this light – are deemed to be outside the New Testament pattern and therefore undesirable.

Examples and reflections
All the major apostolic networks within Britain have overseas work. New Frontiers International, as the largest network, best exemplifies the strengths of the new form of organisation. The early contact with overseas churches were through the travelling ministry of the founding apostle, Terry Virgo, and can be traced directly to his preaching itineraries in India, in South Africa and in North America and in other parts of the world. The decision-making systems within New Frontiers International are, as we have already said, specifically charismatic. About three times a year the leaders within local churches in Britain are called together for two days of prayer and fasting and, at these events, prophetic utterances and visions are manifested. The prophecies are recorded and subsequently evaluated by the apostolic team but they function to provide not only a huge stream of creative impulses but also to motivate the assembled leaders. There is no debate at these gatherings where a vote for a proposition may be passed by the 51% to 49%. Rather the leaders who gather come to pray and, once charismatic utterances are given, the content of these utterances may be woven into intercessory prayer. In this way leaders leave the meetings motivated to carry out prophetic direction even if the transformation of prophetic utterance into policy rests with the apostolic team using whatever methods seem fit to it.

New Frontiers International grew rapidly in the 1980s and early 1990s but, as the overseas work became more important, prophetic insight provided a vision of a bow and arrow, with the bow being pulled back over northern England and fired south. This showed how the balance between the work at home and work overseas needed to be re-adjusted. There was no point in concentrating entirely upon overseas work to the detriment of work at home. Equally the work at home did not exist simply as a self-contained Christian enterprise. It existed within wealthy Britain for the sake of poorer countries. So church planting was initiated in Britain conscious that successful new congregations would help resource mission overseas.

There is, in this way, a seamless connection between what is taking place at home and what is taking place overseas. In both locations there is church planting and the justification for this is that the New Testament pattern knows no other way to establish the gospel in any geographical
area. Congregations are the forum for the development of spiritual and ministry gifts and there is no human culture that negates this principle. The dynamics of congregational growth at home can be the same as the dynamics of congregational growth overseas.

Although faith is fundamental to everything that is carried out by New Frontiers International, the faith principle is not elevated to the basis of life as it was in the faith missions. This means that resources are moved around the network to meet the needs of the poorer parts of it without a danger that men and women working overseas will find themselves impoverished or insensitively controlled by a supervisory body. Indeed it is arguable that the benefits of the faith missions (the devolution of decisions to the field, an incarnational theology encouraging missionaries to identify with the local culture and freedom to operate with a range of church configurations) are also to be found within the overseas work of New Frontiers. Certainly there is a devolution of decision-making to the overseas location, especially when fresh apostles emerge within the network, as happened in the case of New Frontiers where one of the apostolic team in Britain went overseas to lead the work in South Africa. Equally, particularly because elders are appointed from indigenous congregations, there is an implied incarnation theology that permits local churches to organise themselves as they wish though, clearly, the style of worship and ministry will tend to follow what has been tried and tested in Britain.

**Theology and practice**

The theology that drives apostolic networks flows out of a restorationist matrix. Because of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at the beginning of the 20th century, charismatic gifts are being restored the church. For the same reasons apostolic and ministry gifts (Eph.4:11) have also been restored. Apostolic gifts are historically therefore an expression of restorationist theology and are not the product of power struggles within denominational hierarchies. Moreover apostolic gifts are seen as intended to produce congregations. In this they contrast with various types of mission, particularly faith missions, where the driving motivation was concerned with the salvation of the lost. The missionary society in the 19th century might be seen as a mechanism designed to rescue men and women from a hell. This is not to denigrate these missions since their motivation needed to be powerful to move them out of the comfort of civilised Europe into the more primitive conditions to which they went. But the point of the contrast is to show that whereas missionary societies were concerned with evangelistic activities that might lead to the formation of congregations, apostolic activities are primarily set on building congregations. Both kinds of mission may superficially appear to generate
the same result but, in reality, there are enormous differences between them. In practice networks produce congregations that are themselves apostolic: the churches are not only restorationist in orientation in terms of ministries and charismatic gifts but also are inspired to produce indigenous apostles who will further extend the network.

Equally there are differences between the old-style missionary societies and apostolic networks in relation to exit strategies. The exit strategy of the old-style missionary society concerns the gradual withdrawal of the missionary from control over the entire operation to an advisory or supportive role and then complete departure. Apostolic networks have no exit strategy because congregations are connected with the apostle and remain connected whether the apostle is in one country or another. In this respect apostolic networks deal with their congregations in exactly the same way regardless of the country where the congregation is situated. There is no need for the apostolic network to devise a transitional exit strategy. The network appoints elders and the elders run the congregation with the supervisory help of the apostolic team.

It is arguable that the theology of apostolic networks is more closely based on the bible than the theology of missionary societies. Missionary societies base themselves on the Great Commission of Matthew 28 and take the words of Christ given to the original disciples as a binding on all Christians. Normal exegetical methods would presume that the best way to understand the Great Commission would be to see how it functioned within the life of the early church, particularly within the Book of Acts. Here it is evident that the commission was carried out by apostles and the paradigmatic example of this is to be found in Acts 13 where Paul and Barnabas are sent out by the church at Antioch. Paul and Barnabas are the first missionaries. Yet, as Acts 14.14 indicates, Paul and Barnabas are ‘apostles’ and, as the first missionary journey is examined, it is evident that the work of these two men led to the founding of congregations. In this respect the example of Paul and Barnabas, the work that they did, the relatively short duration of their missionary trip, the charismatic gifts with which they were endowed, the guidance of the Holy Spirit both in initiating the journey and on the way, are very different from what is typical among missionaries in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Seen in this light apostolic networks conform much more closely to the Acts pattern than does the work of missionary societies. Terry Virgo puts it this way:

The word ‘missionary’ obscures rather than clarifies, since it does not honour Biblical definitions and categories. A modern missionary may be an agricultural worker, a nurse, a schoolteacher, a Bible translator, or a literature distributor (all very worthwhile and wonderful ministries). Some missionaries may in reality be evangelists or apostles. But the term
is vague and unhelpful, since it has come to indicate anyone who works overseas. Historically, some have established ‘mission stations’ rather than churches.\textsuperscript{11}

[without apostles] local churches were seen as static and built on Scripture, while isolated individuals could leave those churches and become ‘missionaries’. In contrast, our burning passion is to see apostolic churches focused on world mission together.\textsuperscript{12}

It may be that the days of the missionary society are, in any case and for other reasons, already numbered.\textsuperscript{13} This is because charity law in western countries places the control of assets within the hands of trustees who cannot themselves be beneficiaries of the trust they are administering. Thus missionary societies that currently delegate decision-making to the field may find themselves having to withdraw these governmental rights. This will complicate future missionary work and, in addition, as a consequence of anti-terrorist and money laundering regulations, missionary societies may find themselves much more closely scrutinised in respect of the transfer of funds. It would appear that apostolic networks are better placed to avoid the destruction of their overseas work than missionary societies.

**Conclusion**

Is too early to say whether apostolic networks will change the face of Christianity as Paul Cain predicted but there is evidence that they may change the face of missions. As yet, the impact of apostolic networks, particularly British ones, on traditional mission fields is relatively small though, given the numbers of people involved and the amount of time that has elapsed since apostolic networks were founded, impressive. Although this paper has considered New Frontiers International, there are other apostolic networks springing up from the non-western world. These also may have an impact upon emerging nations and even upon traditionally Muslim nations. It is too early to make a judgment. What does seem evident from this analysis is threefold: apostolic networks have the capacity to function as missionary organisations; they fit the post-modern, globalised, non-hierarchical world well; and, in doing so, they have both theological and practical advantages over old-style missionary societies, even the faith-based societies that delegated decision-making to the field.

\textsuperscript{11} \url{http://www.newfrontiers.xtn.org/magazine/vol2issue4/article_index.php?id=147} (accessed 28.06.06)

\textsuperscript{12} \url{http://www.newfrontiers.xtn.org/magazine/vol2issue4/article_index.php?id=147} (accessed 28.06.06)

\textsuperscript{13} I am indebted to Dr David Garrard for this information.
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Abstract

It is the aim of this article to elucidate the interrelatedness between holiness and the experience of Gods’ salvific restoration of his people in regard to the church’s mission in this world. In order to do so, the New Testament metaphor of “light”, as it relates to a missiological context, shall be examined, first in terms of its Old Testament background and secondly as it is reflected in the writings of Luke and Matthew. Based on these findings, some implications for a Pentecostal theology of missions shall be outlined in the concluding section.

Introduction

Since the rise of Pentecostalism the movement has been characterised by its vivid zeal for missions and evangelism. Already in the first issue of The Apostolic Faith it was stated “… God has been working with His children mostly, getting them through Pentecost, and laying the foundation for a mighty wave of salvation among the unconverted.”¹ Some 50 years later Leonhard Steiner, preaching at the World Pentecost Conference of 1955 in Stockholm, proclaimed:

I am humbly but firmly convinced that the truth embodied in our movement supplies the answer to the problem of World Evangelism. It is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost in its Scriptural fullness and purpose that enables the Church as well as the individual Christian to meet the challenge of a world still filled with heathen darkness. Without boasting

¹ The Apostolic Faith (September 1906), p. 1
we can be proud of the fact that our Movement from its beginning has been a Missionary Movement.²

Referring to this missionary zeal in the beginning of Pentecostalism, Anderson points out some of the more problematic aspects of it, especially in its encounter with ‘pagan’ cultures:

They went out, like many other Christian missionaries before them, with a fundamental conviction that the North Atlantic was a ‘Christian’ realm, that they were sent as ‘light’ to ‘darkness’ and that the ancient cultures and religions of the nations to which they were sent were ‘heathen, ‘pagan’ and ‘demonic’, to be ‘conquered’ for Christ.³

In looking at the above quoted statements, two subjects surface in regard to Pentecostalism and Missions:⁴

• The central role of the Spirit. This comes as no surprise, since Pentecostal Pneumatology is by definition Lukan in its orientation; and Luke also has a strong emphasis on missions.⁵

• The church over against the ‘pagan’ or ‘non-converted’ environment. Hence, the church (= light) is confronting the ‘world’ (= darkness) with the Gospel message: “Oh, what a dark, sad land this seems to


³ Ibid., p. 8. For a full range of examples cf. ibid., pp. 7-12.


be, and the longer one lives in it, the more one feels the darkness all around.”

However, there are two other vital aspects in Pentecostal spirituality:

1. The emphasis on holiness; “The Pentecostal Movement owes its inspiration and formation to the Wesleyan Holiness revival of the 19th century.” This aspect of Pentecostal spirituality is reflected in Jonathan Paul’s statement “This is what Pentecost means – victorious life.”

2. The strong notion that the healing and helping presence of the Lord is still to be experienced in our days: “Nowhere is the essentially restorationist impetus of Pentecostal and charismatic theology more markedly shown than in the area of healing.” Pentecostals believe “that the presence and power of God may be apprehended within the contemporary world.”

It is the aim of this article to elucidate the interrelatedness between these two subjects (holiness and the experience of God’s salvific restoration of his people) in regard to the church’s mission in this world. In order to do so, the New Testament metaphor of “light”, as it relates to a missiological context, shall be examined, first in terms of its Old Testament background and secondly as it is reflected in the writings of Luke and Matthew. Both authors draw from this Old Testament metaphor, and both are known

---

6 G. Elkington, “Partabgarth”, Confidence 7/12 (December 1914), p. 238 as cited in Anderson, “Christian Missionaries”, p. 9. This adverse relationship between church and world is most drastically expressed by F. Trevitt: “Satan through them hates Christ in us”. F. Trevitt, Confidence 5/9 (May 1912), p. 215, as cited in Anderson, “Christian Missionaries”, p. 8. For further examples, cf. ibid., pp. 7-12. For an argument that in early Pentecostalism the church was perceived in opposition to the world, cf. D.M. Coulter, “Pentecostal Visions of the End: Eschatology, Ecclesiology and the Fascination of the Left Behind Series”, JPT, Vol. 14.1 (2005), pp. 87-88. However, coming from a New Testament background, we find that the church against the world (Jn. 15,18-19; Rm. 12,2; Gal. 1,4; 1 Jn. 3,13) is not the only in which the relationship between the two has been expressed. There are indications toward “the church for the world” (Mt. 5,14; Jn. 3,16; 6,33, 51; 20,21; 2 Cor. 5,19), “in the world” (Jn. 16,33; Tit. 2,12) or even “with” (Rm. 8,18-30), or “above the world” (1 Cor. 1,27; 2,6; Col. 2,20). Niebuhr has described it in terms of „The Christ against culture, through culture and above culture”: H. Richard Niebuhr, Christ and Culture (New York: Harper, 1951).


9 W. K. Kay, Reader, p. 47.

10 Ibid.
for their missiological emphasis in their writings. In a last section some implications for a Pentecostal theology of missions will be outlined.

The definition of holiness, as assumed in this article, is more relational in its orientation than “inward, personal or even private”; it is a perfection of love, always with a strong impact on the social context and the world in which the church lives.

Old Testament Perspectives

In regard to a theology of missions, the Old Testament reflects two slightly different notions in which the term “light” is used:

Sapiential Tradition

Especially the sapiential books and some of the Psalms reflect the idea that the Torah is “light” and thus brings “light” (orientation and successful living) to a person walking in the ways of the Lord: Sir. 32:16; Ps. 43:3; 119:105; Pr. 418-18; 6:23; 20:27 (where the LXX states that the φῶς κυρίου watches over the righteous). This notion is also reflected in Isaiah 51:4, however this time with a universal (”missiological”) perspective: “Listen to me, my people; hear me, my nation: The law will go out from me; my justice will become a light to the nations.” Hence, the Torah will ultimately become the light for all the world, and through it God’s justice will fill all creation. Similar is 2 Baruch 59:2: “For at that time the lamp of the eternal law which exists forever and ever illuminated all those who sat in darkness.” In this later

11 The Gospel of Matthew reflects a strong missiological perspective, introduced with the Magi who come to see Jesus, continued in the statement about the disciples’ role being the light and climaxed in the great commission of the disciples to go into “all the world and preach the Gospel” by ascending Jesus. For the Lukan writings, see above.
Jewish writing the Torah is given to Israel as well as a light for daily living and thereby brings light to the entire world.

Although the Torah never defines itself as “light”, Deuteronomy 4:5-8 reflects a similar thought concerning Israel’s Torah faithfulness as a manifestation of God’s nature to the people around them:

“See, I have taught you decrees and laws as the LORD my God commanded me, so that you may follow them in the land you are entering to take possession of it. Observe them carefully, for this will show your wisdom and understanding to the nations, who will hear about all these decrees and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. What other nation is so great as to have their gods near them the way the LORD our God is near us whenever we pray to him? And what other nation is so great as to have such righteous decrees and laws as this body of laws I am setting before you today?”

Isaiah

Isaiah refers to the “light” in several places: 9:2; 42:6; 49:6; 51:4. There is a certain ambivalence concerning “the light” in these passages: Who, or what, is the light? As mentioned above, in 51:4, it seems to refer to the Torah that “comes from Israel to the nations” and thus brings light to them. In Isaiah 9:2 light is juxtaposed with darkness, and this present darkness is referring to Israel’s desolate political and religious situation, in particular to the Assyrian devastation of the country.14 “Light”, in contrast, is the experience of God’s restoring help and therefore best understood as a soteriological metaphor. Thus, the child to be born (9:5) is not the light, but restores “light” to Israel.15 In later rabbinic tradition this light of Isaiah 9:1-2 also became associated with the “oral Torah” (Midr. Song of Songs, 1,3), and there is a certain interface between light as the Torah and light as the experience of God’s salvific intervention for his people, often related to the messianic age. This later merging of the two concepts comes as no surprise, since one

---


15 This is also reflected in structure: The light that will break forth, causes the people to rejoice and sing. Verses 4-7 then indicate with a threefold “for” the occasion that has led to the renewed light and thus to the joyful singing: a) the release from oppression (verse 4); b) the cessation of war (verse 5); c) the birth of an ideal ruler (verses 6-7) (Cf. Barry G. Webb, The Message of Isaiah : on eagles’ wings (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1996, p. 68). Hence, the ideal ruler is not the light, but his reign is one of the reasons that Israel “experiences light” again, it enjoys again the covenant blessings, the shalom of God.
characteristic of the messianic age was Torah faithfulness (e.g. Ez. 37:14).\textsuperscript{16}

Both similarly and slightly different are 42:6 (“I will keep you and will make you to be a covenant for the people and a light for the Gentiles”) and 49:6 (“I will also make you a light for the Gentiles, that you may bring my salvation to the ends of the earth.”). Both passages occur within one of the so called “servant songs”\textsuperscript{17}, and both speak of “a light for the nations”. The question arising is: Who is this servant? Is it Israel\textsuperscript{18}, the Persian king\textsuperscript{19}, or the prophet\textsuperscript{20}? And consequently: what – or who – is the “light for the nations”? Building on Stamm\textsuperscript{21}, Schreiner\textsuperscript{22}, and Aalen\textsuperscript{23}, Stegemann argues that, whether this servant represents an individual person or Israel, the light is mediated to the nations through the servant’s experience of God’s saving acts. In the restoration of Israel, God’s salvific righteousness (in light of 51:4 including the Torah) is made manifest for the nations. “Light”, therefore, is, as in 9:2, the visible manifestation of God’s salvation of Israel in front of all the nations, including in later rabbinic thought the restoration of the Torah. Having said this, it is important to note that according to the proposed reading of these Isaiah passages, Israel is not turning herself towards the nations, but it is the Lord who is working on Israel in a way that is visible to all the nations. Hence, “light” is a soteriological metaphor rather than a picture for an activity of the servant per se. The light that is shining is defined as the breaking forth of salvation, which can be summarised as the manifestation of God’s righteousness and justice in front of all nations.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{16} For further rabbinic references, cf. Strack-Billerbeck, \textit{Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch} (Munich: Beck, 1956), vol. 1, p. 162; vol. IV, p. 961. One always needs to be aware that compared with the New Testament writings, some of these passages reflect a later development and are as such not representative for New Testament Judaism.

\textsuperscript{17} That vv. 4-9 are part of the first “servant song”\textsuperscript{a}, is not unanimously accepted (cf. O, Kaiser, \textit{Jesaja} [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976], Vol. 2, pp. 82.

\textsuperscript{18} So Kaiser, \textit{Jesaja}, p. 83, or Webb: “The servant in this passage seems to be a figure who embodies all that Israel ought to be but is not.” (Webb, \textit{Message}, pp. 170-71).

\textsuperscript{19} K. Elliger assumes for 42,6 that the servant in 42,6 refers to the Persian king, and in 49,6 to the prophet himself (K. Elliger, \textit{Jesaja} [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukrichener Verlag], 1970ff), vol. 2, p. 239.


\textsuperscript{22} J. Schreiner, ‘Die Berufung Isaels zum Heil der Völker’, BiLe 9 (1968, pp. 94-106.


Summary of Old Testament Background

Light, both in the sapiential writings and in Isaiah, is primarily a soteriological metaphor: The people of God receive light; either through the Torah (Wis. 18:4) or through God’s redeeming and restoring salvation, as exemplified in Ps. 27:1: “The Lord is my light and my salvation.” In her experience of light and salvation, Israel becomes in turn a “light for all the nations” who see God’s powerful restoration of his people, but Israel nowhere is summoned to “carry the light to the nations” or anything such as that.

New Testament Perspectives

Lukan Writings

The relevant passages in the Lukan writings are Luke 2,32 (Nunc Dimittis), 8,16 (par. Mat. 5,15 and will be dealt with in this context); Acts 13,47 and 26,23.25

Luke 2:32

Although the Lukan formulation, “a light for revelation to the Gentiles” (φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν εἰς εὐνών), does not exactly reproduce Isaiah 42:6 and 49:6 (εἰς φῶς εἶναι εὐνών), it is mostly assumed that these passages are alluded to in Luke 2:32,26 since all three texts speak of the final restoration of Israel.

Central for our question concerning the light is verse 30: “For my eyes have seen your salvation” (τὸ σωτηρίων σου). The question at stake is: is σωτηρίων to be understood chistologically27 or soteriologically?28 Building on Isaiah 42:6 and 49:6, Stegemann argues for a combination of the two:

25 Lk. 1:78-79 also echoes Isa. 9:1 but does not refer to φῶς when it speaks of the “rising sun” that “will shine for those living in darkness. “The passage clearly has a soteriological purview: the child to be born (John the Baptist) will “give his people the knowledge of salvation” (Lk. 1:77). Hence, the “rising sun” is neither John the Baptist nor Jesus, but the salvation experienced to which the Baptist testifies.


28 Whereas the NIV translates ‘your salvation’, the German Luther version reads ‘your saviour’.
in Jesus, Simeon sees the personification of God’s salvation, however, the emphasis falls on God’s salvation. But more importantly, Stegemann differs from many commentators in his reading of verse 31: Following Kilpatrick, he argues that verse 31 does not yet represent a universalistic perspective and the formulation κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν should not be read as “in the sight of all people”, but should be taken as a reference to the tribes of Israel; God’s salvation is for all of Israel. In regard to Verse 32, Stegemann, after a detailed analysis, comes to the following conclusions:

- Luke 2:30-32 is a statement about Israel’s salvation.
- This salvation will be revealed also to the nations; they will be able to participate in it, since it is “a light for revelation to the nations”.
- The light has this universal soteriological function only after and inasmuch as it is the salvation of Israel, and thereby also becomes the glory of Israel.
- Although Israel’s future salvation in 2:32 is personified in the little infant, the main emphasis falls on the salvation in which the child is instrumental.
- Hence, the universal perspective of salvation in Luke 2:30-32 is inseparably linked with the salvation of Israel.

In this sense Luke 2:32 agrees with the perspective represented in Isaiah 42:6 and 49:6: light is above all a soteriological metaphor, and light “comes to the nations” (or is revealed to them) in the restoration and salvation of Israel.

**Acts 13:47 and 26:23**

Acts 13:47 is part of Paul’s defence of his Gentile mission in Pisidian Antioch, addressing his fellow Jews who became jealous about Paul’s success and began to oppose the apostle. Paul’s (and Barnabas’) justification for turning to the gentiles is supported with the quote from Isaiah 49:6: “I have made you a light for the Gentiles that you may bring salvation to the ends of the earth.” Often the reference to the “light for the Gentiles” is understood as referring to Jesus (or to Paul who proclaims the message of Jesus), thus, light is again understood Christologically.

---

32 The quote in Acts 13,47 omits ἰδεῖν and εἰς διαθήκην γένως. Other than that it follows exactly the LXX. Concerning the omission: Perhaps Luke followed a more faithful Greek version to the original Hebrew text than we have, since the Hebrew does not have the reference to God’s covenant either.
However, coming from Isaiah 46:6, 49:6 and Luke 2:32 we have seen that “a light for the nations” refers to the final salvation of Israel as the manifestation of God’s glory in the eyes of all people. Therefore it seems best to read at Acts 13:47 along the same line; as a soteriological statement: The quote is introduced with, “For this is what the Lord has commanded us”. The Lord (κύρος) seems to refer to God himself. Less clear is to whom the pronoun “us” refers. Many take it as referring to Paul and Barnabas, since they are already the subject of the “we clause” in verse 46. But this would present a certain inconsistency with the singular “you” in verse 47b (“I have made you”). In addition, Acts 13 nowhere tells us of any commissioning of Paul and Barnabas to turn to the Gentiles, unless Acts 13:47 refers back to 9:15. But there it is said that Paul will carry the name of the Lord before the Gentiles, their kings and the people of Israel; he is not to be “a light” for them.

Differing from many commentators, Stegemann has argued that the “us” does not refer to Paul and Barnabas but rather, as in Isaiah 49:6, represents the collective, the members of the synagogue – and Paul and Barnabas are part of this collective – that God has made “a light for the Gentiles”. This collective “we” is already introduced in 13:32-33: “We tell you the good news: What God promised our fathers he has fulfilled for us, their children, by raising Jesus.” But since the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch opposes the “word of the Lord”, and thereby the realisation of their salvation (13:45), Paul and Barnabas have to turn directly to the Gentiles. Following Stegemann’s reading, it is again Israel that is called to be the light for the Gentiles. But in rejecting Jesus as the fulfilment of God’s eschatological restoration of Israel, the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch does not function as “light for the nations” and therefore Paul and Barnabas address the Gentiles directly. The reference to “light for the nations” has thus again a specific soteriological function of Israel on behalf of the Gentiles in view, a function that has been made possible because God has realised his promise to the fathers (13:33). “Light” thereby refers to the hope in the now realised salvation, guaranteed in the resurrection of Jesus.

In Acts 26:23 Christ, as the first one risen from the dead, is proclaiming light to both his people (λαός, as in Lk. 2:32) and to the Gentiles. But again,
the broader context is the “hope that God has promised our fathers” (26:6), a promise that the tribes of Israel are hoping to see fulfilled (26:7), and of which Moses and the prophets spoke (26:22). In 26:8 the hope is explicitly identified with the hope for the resurrection of the dead. Hence, the suffering and resurrection of Christ (26:23) are the fulfilment of this eschatological hope; it is God’s final salvation and thus “light to his own people and to the Gentiles.”

Summary

Luke 2:32, Acts 13:47 and 26:23 reflect a similar usage of the term “light for the Gentiles” as we already found in Isaiah 42:6 and 49:6: it is a soteriological metaphor; in the Lukan writings it is personified in Christ. It particularly reflects the salvation of Israel, guaranteed in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. It does, however, not refer to Paul’s missionary activity, nor is it a purely Christological statement (as it is in Jn. 8:12). Light is the experience of God’s salvific manifestation in this world, personified in and guaranteed by the resurrection of Jesus.

Matthew

Matthew 4:15-16

This passage introduces Jesus’ ministry and sets it in the context of the Old Testament fulfilment. There is a certain ambivalence in verse 16 as to whether “light” is to be understood more Christologically or more soteriologically. A Christological interpretation could be detected in the foregoing verses (12-14) with their clear focus on Jesus, as the reader is told about his move from the Jordan river back to Nazareth and to Capernaum. However, the verse following the quotation is a summary of Jesus’ message: “Repent, the kingdom of heaven is near”. Hence, the light could as well be identified with the nearby kingdom of heaven.

There are a number of exegetical problems with Matthew’s quote, especially related to his alterations of it, but not all of them are of equal

37 Ibid., p. 95.
38 Referring to Jerome’s commentary on Is. 9:1 where he reports of an old Jewish-Christian interpretation of Mt. 4:12-16, Davies and Allison give some support for reading “light” soteriologically; being the salvation brought to the land of Sebulon and Naphtali (W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison, The Gospel According to Saint Matthew [ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988], vol. 1; pp. 381-382).
importance for our purpose. We shall focus on those that contribute to resolving the question as to whether “light” is to be understood more Christologically or more soteriologically; is Jesus the light, or is light coming to the people because of his salvific ministry, defined as the nearby kingdom? Three observations may be of help in this regard:

In verse 16 Matthew uses in the verb καθημαί for those “living in darkness”, whereas the LXX uses πορεύομαι. In using καθημαί, Matthew seems to allude to Psalm 107:10 (LXX, 106:10: καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου; Mat. 4:16: καθημένος ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου), which is a song of thanksgiving of those redeemed from darkness. This possible allusion would encourage a more soteriological reading of “light” in Matthew 4:16.

He further changes the verb in verse 16b (“a light has dawned”) from λάμπω to σαντέλλω, this time possibly alluding to Psalm 97:11 (LXX 96:11) and Isaiah 58:10. In Psalm 97:11 the light shed upon the righteous is in proximity to the Torah but clearly has a soteriological connotation, whereas the light of Isaiah 58:10 could refer either to the righteousness of the faithful one that becomes visible for all who are around, or, could be read soteriologically, meaning: as you break the bread for the hungry, your own salvation will break forth and shine as a light. The statement “your light will break forth” has already been introduced in verse 8: “then (= when your share with the needy) your light will break forth like the dawn, and your healing will quickly appear”. Here it is clearly soteriological: your light = your healing. It is therefore better to read “your light” in verse Isaiah 58:10 along the same line, namely soteriologically. This understanding of “light” is further strengthened by the following antithetical statement: “and your darkness shall become noonday” (58:10c). Thus, Isaiah 58:10 shares with Isaiah 9:2, (and 42:6 and 49:6) as well as with Psalm 97:11, the idea that Israel’s light is her experience of God’s salvific intervention, and therefore, this soteriological connotation of “light” seems to be in view in Matthew 4:16.

Representing no alteration from the LXX, the statement “Galilee of the Gentiles” (Isa. 9:1; Mt. 4:15) has nevertheless raised some discussion, since an old understanding of it implies that there have been two Galilees; one with a mainly Gentile and one with a more Jewish population. According to Luz, however, Matthew neither believed that Galilee was at that time mainly inhabited by Gentiles, nor did he present Jesus’ ministry as being for (or among) Gentiles (cf. Mt. 10:5f.). Thus, the statement “Galilee of the Gentiles” foreshadows the salvation coming to the Gentiles. In light of this,
Matthew 10:5-7 with its prevention for the disciples to go to the Gentiles, could be understood as following: It is precisely in sending his disciples to the towns of Galilee with the message of the nearby kingdom and with the proclamation and realisation of their salvation (10:7-8) that Galilee becomes a light for the Gentiles and is thus “Galilee of the Gentiles”.

Matthew’s form of the quote of Isaiah 9:1-2 seems to support our finding thus far: Light comes to the Gentiles precisely in Israel’s salvation. In Matthew 4:16-18 light is to be read primarily soteriologically (this salvation is, of course, personified in Jesus; as it is in the Lukan writings).

**Matthew 5:14-16**

This text, immediately following the Beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount, serves to define the disciples’ role in the kingdom of heaven: “You are the light of the world” – and as such the disciples cannot be anything other than “visible”. The text is then followed by the call for the greater righteousness (5:17-20). This explains in part its structure, beginning with the indicative statement “you are the light” (following the Beatitudes) and ending with the imperative “let your light shine” (followed by the call for greater righteousness). The focus of the Beatitudes is on the indicative, whereas the following pericope clearly is ethical and paranetic in its orientation. Thus, Matthew 5:14-16 marks within itself the transition from the indicative to the imperative.

The text differs from all the ones previously dealt with in two regards:

- The question of a Christological understanding of “light” is literally out of sight. The focus clearly is on the disciples’ role, and it is this role that needs to be clarified.
- This is the only passage in the New Testament that identifies the disciples’ role as “light of the world”, something that otherwise is reserved to Christ and his ministry.

The introductory indicative of verse 15a is elucidated with two metaphors:

---

40 Luz points out in this context that it is from Galilee that Jesus sends his disciples into all the world. (Luz, *Matthäus*, vol. I, p. 235).
42 There are three other passages that might come close to Mat. 4:16: Jn. 5:35, where Jesus identifies John the Baptist as light – but this passage has to be read in light of the special role of the Baptist; Rm. 2:19 where Paul picks up rhetorically the Jewish self-understanding as being the light for the world – best understood a long the line of Isa. 42:6 and 49:6 as outlined above; and 1. Thess. 5:5 where the Thessalonian Christians are identified as “sons of the light” – here clearly ethical in its orientation.
a) in 15b with the – impossibility – of a city on a mountain not to be seen, and b) in verse 16 (par. Mk 4:21 and Lk. 8:16) with a lamp that is lit not in order to be hidden under a bowl but to light up a dark room. Both metaphors are not technically impossible per se, but logically improbable, especially the second one; it goes against the very nature and purpose of light as a means to give orientation to be hidden under a vessel.

As mentioned above, Jesus’ word about the disciples’ role as “light of this world” is concluded with an imperative statement in verse 16: “In the same way, let your light shine before men.” Hence, the disciples are first affirmed to be the light and only now summoned to let that light shine before men. They are, however, never called to anything like “becoming the light” or bringing that light to someone else.

The question arising is: In which way are the disciples “light for the world”, since there is no call to missions in the purview of the text? Explicitly and immediately within the horizon of the text, however, are the good works of the disciples: “… that they [inclusive for all people] may see your good deeds and praise your Father in heaven” (16b). Within the Jewish tradition “good works” were recognized as acts of mercy, charity and love, and therefore these seem to be in view in Matthew 5:16. In addition, these good works have been defined by large sections within Judaism as the fulfilment of the law, which has in some Jewish writings been summarised with the double command to love.

Thus far we can say that in Matthew 4:16-18 the disciples’ role as the light of this world combines both the soteriological aspect of “light”, their state of blessedness in relation to the inbreaking kingdom of heaven, as well

---

43 It has been identified as the eschatological city of God, who’s light brightens the night without human participation (J. Jeremias, Die Gleichnisse Jesu [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977], p. 215). Differently Luz, who argues that the only point in the metaphor is that the city is visible within far distance (Luz, Matthäus, vol. I, p. 299).

44 Both in Mark and Luke the emphasis is less on the nature of the disciples, but on the kingdom of God as light; the kingdom of God cannot other than shine and therefore being seen. Whoever does not see it seems not have listened carefully enough. – In contrast, Matthew omits the call to listen carefully in connection with the saying about the light.

45 Cf. Deut. 15:11; Tob. 4:5-11; Sir, 29:8; Test. Gad 6:1; Test. Seb. 7:2; Jub. 36:4; m Abot 5:13; Tos Pea IV: 19; bSuk. 49b as well as Lk. 3:10-14 where the fruit of repentance is defined along the same line.

46 Mat. 22:38-39; 9:3; 12:7; Test. Seb, 5:1; Test.Ben. 8:1: Test.Iss. 5:2; 7:6; Test.Dan, 5:3; Test. Jos. 11:1; Test.Ben. 3:3; 10:3; Philo in Spec. Leg. II.63; SLev. 19:18 (99b); SDt. 32:29; b Schabb 31a (cf. Tob. 4:15); Tos Pea IV, 19. For the double command of love as the focal point for Matthew’s ethics, cf. W. Schrage, Ethik des Neuen Testaments (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), pp. 146-165.
as a more ethical connotation: doing good works. It seems, therefore, that
the statement in Matthew 4:16-18 has in part been influenced by a usage of
“light” that is reflected in the sapiential writings, however, not in such a
way that the Torah (or the “will of the father in heaven”, to use a Matthean
phrase) is identified with the light, but that those who live according to the
divine will cannot be anything other than a light for this world. The thought
pattern is somewhat similar to Deuteronomy 4:5-8, although “light” is not
mentioned in this passage. The ethical horizon in Matthew 5:14-16 also
explains the indicative/imperative pattern: Those following Jesus are light
by participation in the nearby Kingdom (characterised in the Beatitudes)
and they let their light shine through their continuing obedience to the will
of God, especially identified with good works.

Summary for Matthew

In Matthew 4:16-18 the evangelist quotes Isaiah 9:1-2 and applies it along
the line of the Old Testament understanding of “light” in its missiological
context: In the manifestation of the kingdom of heaven, light comes to those
living in darkness, and this light shines for the Gentiles; reveals to them the
glory and mercy of God. With his alterations of the LXX text, Matthew even
more so underlines a soteriological understanding of “light”.

Matthew 5:14-16 reflects a different usage: Light defines the disciples’ role
in the world, both by their experience of blessedness as the manifestation
of the kingdom of heaven, and in their obedience to the divine will, visible
in their good works as an expression of Torah fulfilment. Differently to the
sapiential writings of the Old Testament, Matthew does not identify the
Torah as light, but rather the Torah obedience of the disciples, which in turn
will bring all people (τῶν ἀνθρώπων) to praise God.47

What does it have to do with a Pentecostal Missiology?

We set out noting that Pentecostal spirituality was characterised by a vivid
zeal to “reach the world” and that this world was often described in terms
of “darkness” that needs to be confronted with “light”. We further stated
that Pentecostal spirituality also comprised a strong emphasis on holiness
as well as on the presence of God’s restoring and helping power.

The survey of the biblical metaphor “light”, used in a missiological
context, has shown that it stands mainly for a soteriological experience: God’s healing and restoration of the people of God is their light that becomes

---

47 This ethical function of “light” is also reflected in the Johannine writings (cf. 1 Jn. 1:5-
7; 2:8-10, but also 1. Thess. 5:5).
visible and apparent for all the nations so that they too recognise God’s glory. Or, it stands for the Torah which brings light, orientation and thus a successful living to God’s people, similarly evident for the nations who thereby “see” God. This conclusion proposes that a Pentecostal emphasis on mission, on the one hand, and the emphasis on holiness and on God’s restoring and helping power present within the church, on the other hand, may be interrelated in several ways:

- Pentecostal missiology may not have to make a distinction between the church’s experience of God’s powerful and healing manifestation in her midst and her mission to those “outside”. It is precisely her experience of God’s healing and restoring power that stands out as a light for the world. Without applying the metaphor “light”, this is reflected in Acts 2:43 + 47: “Everyone was filled with awe, and many signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα) were done by the apostles… enjoying the favour of all the people (λαός). And the Lord added to their number daily those who were being saved.” According to Acts 2:42-47, the church’s “gift” to all the people around her was her experience of God’s healing and restoring power in her midst, personified in and guaranteed by the resurrection of Jesus.

- As long as the Pentecostal emphasis on holiness is defined more in social categories and as a quality of relationships characterized by love, justice and mercy (the good works of Matthew), such an emphasis becomes good news for the world in the most literal meaning of the word. A community of faith that embodies such a lifestyle of holiness cannot help but be seen – like a city on a mountain.

- Defining the church’s mission as the light for the world along the lines outlined above is less confrontational and even less fostering of the notion of “us against them”, it is rather “God among us for them”. The confrontation with the powers that results when the church fulfils its role as light may take place simply as the empowered and restored community of God shakes the power definitions and power structures of this world (cf. Acts 16:16-21; 17:6; 24:5).

Our conclusion is supported by an analysis among African Pentecostals in which Hollenweger concludes that “… we found that in the Third World

---

48 Signs and wonders are often associated with the Exodus salvation (Ex. 7:3; 11:9-10; Deut. 4:34; 6:22; Isa. 8:18; Jol. 3:3; but also Ps.-Philo 9:7-8). ‘Throughout Acts “signs and wonders” refer to God’s salvific intervention either through Jesus or his disciples.’ (M. Wenk, Community Forming Power. The Socio-Ethical Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts [JPTS 19, Sheffield: SAP, 2000, T & T Clark reprint.], p. 250.

49 A different kind of confrontation is told to us in Lk. 5:1-12, where Peter recognises his own sinfulness in confrontation with God’s loving help. Cf. Rm. 2:4.
– but perhaps not only there – people become converted either because of a healing (of themselves or of a friend or family member),… or because they have a friend who is a Christian”.50 Similarly the foundation of the first church of the BewegungPlus in Switzerland (formarly Gemeinde für Urchristentum): it was a direct consequence of the healings and deliverances experienced by these early Pentecostals, heard by the neighbours, who as a result sought help for their three epileptic children as well as the cattle that were suffering from a disease.51 Likewise the founding of the local church in which I am presently working as a pastor: After World War II the family of the local cheese maker went through a difficult time and sought help from people whom he knew had an experience of God’s healing and restoring power in their midst.52

Thus, Pentecostal missiology defines itself not by concepts, strategies or methods, but 1) by God’s will to restore this creation and bring salvation to all people, and 2) by the vision of an alternative community whose life is marked by the values and hopes of God’s coming kingdom. Pentecostal missiology is also and always pneumatologically motivated, since the Spirit is the church’s experience of God’s active presence in her midst – without thereby being restricted to the church.

51 Cf. Hans Widmer, Im Kampf gegen Satans Reich (published 1947), vol. 3, pp. 70-100.
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Asian and Pentecostal: The Charismatic Face of Christianity in Asia
Allan Anderson & Edmond Tang (eds)

A first collection of a series of articles from a wide range of academic authors, Allan Anderson and Edmond Tang are to be congratulated in putting these conference papers on Asian Pentecostalism into a book for the world to read.

Anderson aims the book for the academic community and yet manages to offer papers that will also be of interest to any church and mission leader in Asia. It would be a pity if those leaders did not read it. They would read of the excitement of first generational Pentecostalism, growth of churches independent from the West and the lessons still to be learned from Asia; all this is compacted into the book.

Individual contributors themselves indicate the range of thought and background of their experience in Pentecostalism, in Asia and in mission and church growth. Europeans, Chinese Americans, Chinese from China and Malaysia, Indians, Koreans. Japanese and Filipinos... the scholars from Asia are in high profile as should be the case in this subject. Not all have Pentecostal heritages but have observed the Pentecostal face of Asia in different ways. In fact my query came as to why other, non-Asians or those not involved long term in the Asian scene were included; objective observers? It did give them opportunity to hear of the variety and growth in the church in Asia.

Split into five sections, the book has a thematic and case study approach. A few papers are on Pentecostalism in general; these are followed by case studies in three geographic bands of Asia (South Asia i.e. Indian subcontinent) South East Asia (ASEAN nations) and East Asia (The Chinese, Japan & Korea) and finally Anderson and Chan sum it up.

It is comprehensive as far as covering the largest section of humanity on the globe can be. It is descriptive, discursive, while both general and specific. It is both historic and geographic in its range. It asks questions, stirs debate over historical origins of Pentecostalism (not being purely American) (W. Ma & Begunder and Anderson), over definitions of cross-cultural Pentecostal and Buddhist demonology (Yong), over women’s place in Pentecostal ministry (J. Ma), over indigenous variations on Pentecostalism in Philippines (Suico), China (Deng Zhaoming) and among Kerala’s Dalits (Pulikottali) or Myanmar’s Chin people (Chin Khua Khai). Missiologically it should help a new

---

1 Only hyper well-educated Buddhists would comprehend it and Yong asks more questions than gives any practical answers. The average Buddhist in the Thai market place would simply find an exorcist. Even a Muslim in Malaysia would not find it a problem. Perhaps some Christians do find it a problem?
understanding for those from the West going East and yet for those from the East it could bring a warning not to repeat old supremacist attitudes. Anderson’s own contribution here is hard on the old ‘superior’ missionary contribution, talking of ‘natives’, ‘boys’ and ‘heathen’ but a true historian reads that context as it was, not as it is today imposed on those times. Hopefully in today’s globalised world we can respect others on equal terms while still being aware of the darkness and battle that brings in proclaiming the gospel. Anderson verges on dismissing the ‘darkness’ of Hinduism or Islam but he may mean that missionaries’ assumption that thinking the light was ‘back home west’ was the wrong aspect.

The book brings up ethical and ecumenical contributions that are potentially new to many, at least Western, Pentecostals. Accusations of shamanistic syncretism in for instance Korean Minjung theology or santualan Filipino theology are faced and usually refuted by Asian scholars. Defining ‘pentecostalism’ has to be broad; classical Western or North American now has to give way to varieties – Catholic Asian, or indigenous East Malaysian or tribal Filipino. It illustrates how the new generation of Asian scholars are global in their understanding of Pentecostalism, often trained by Westerners, while Westerners rarely have such a comprehensive view. The Asians prize education and are asserting themselves appropriately in this Pentecostal scene. They apply their education to the cultural context and will set the scene for the next generation of global Pentecostal scholars.

Anderson and Tang’s intentions have been achieved as comprehensively as possible while allowing for many more questions to be posed and answered in future as to the way Pentecostalism finds its own cultural adaptability. Surely that is fitting since the Holy Spirit is neither Asian nor Western.

Anne E Dyer, Librarian, Mattersey Hall. adyer@matterseyhall.co.uk

The Missionary Process
Jan-Åke Alvarsson (ed.), (Studia Missionalia Svecana XCIX Uppsala, 2005)

Distributed by The Swedish Institute of Mission Research, Box 1526 SE-751 45 Uppsala, Sweden.

This edited book has nine chapters by seven authors which are planned to provide an understanding of the Missionary process. All are associated with a conference that took place in the Swedish Institute of Mission Studies, Uppsala 2003. It is not a straightforward account of a single mission or missionary but according to the editor, ‘a study within the anthropology of religion, inspired by cybernetics and system theory’. Alvarsson is an anthropologist with missionary experience in and through the Swedish Pentecostal church. He is using his experience in both fields to present a book that has a different ‘ring’ to most mission books. He deliberately avoids a chronological or geographical sequence. He does not seek to be comprehensive; just reflective. He wants a situational discussion and yet when
contexts are so different it makes for difficult comparisons elsewhere in the world. Seeking for universals in human nature is one thing but there are so many differences in contexts that when reading the book I could not help compare my own experience - and laugh at times with the accounts of Swedish Pentecostal home attitude or cry with the missionary experience. British Pentecostal attitudes are not that different.

Each chapter is complete in itself but contributes well enough to the whole despite disparate geography and eras represented. Most chapters however do focus on Bolivia. Clear bibliographies present both English and Swedish language sources.

Alvarsson’s own article on the home base in Tranås and how it sent out or welcomed home various missionaries uses many verbatim quotations which reflect cultural and world-view conflicts between the missionary (p105) and the home origins (p61). Few other books relate this phenomenon although mission societies are aware of it. It is written for the scholarly world of missions but regular missionaries and home ministers should consider the pictures of ‘figures of thought’ (p74) that appear throughout the book. Some may have to be re-depicted to relate to the 21st century instead of existing practices.

Later sections deal with a variety of topics, starting with China at the turn of the 20th Century which show up “class, gender education and ethnicity.” [p71] From the usual 19th C depiction of darkest pagandom to the later almost acceptable late 20th Century pluralistic attitudes to foreign cultures the chapters move through a series of experiences and how they are perceived by the missionary. The missionary is representative of three cultures- the original home and church, the society to which [s]he belongs, and the people of his/her destination. Each is presented. Each has scholarly critiques under the scrutiny of anthropology’s systems. It does not avoid the issues of personal encounter. It tells in narrative form how missionaries coped or did not cope with their societies and ethos represented (p106). Authenticity of experience and its interpretation is allowed in the anthropological world perhaps therefore more than in a strictly religious publication.

There are many other books on mission from a cultural perspective and even anthropological stance but most of them still seem to come from the western, still possibly triumphalist perspective that the west understands and teaches things ‘better’. This book reveals the other dimension: the west does not really understand communication any better than anywhere else. Faith in the Jesus of the Bible still has to be interpreted by receptor, who becomes communicator who has various contexts in which to be interpreted!

This is illustrated further by Alvarsson’s portrayal of the Weenhayek people who are now regarded by the Swedish churches as better spiritual

---

2 e.g. Alvarsson’s account of Tanas p17-80.
3 e.g. Ruuth’s account of the Swedish Pentecostal Mission in Bolivia.
4 e.g. Perruchon’s account of the Shuar perceptions of Christianity, pp111-128. or Erdtman’s Spiritual Fiesta based on the Quechua Pentecostals. (p147-167)
models of Pentecostalism than they are! (‘The Ethnified Gospel’ pp169-208, 202).

The north to south perspective is knowingly given in the light of the future being Missiologically south to north; Alvarsson’s point is that the cycle of learning how to do mission will help the south if they understand the cycle of learning that the north-south had to undergo.

This book should help mission societies originating from across the whole world to re-consider their history and future.

Anne E Dyer, Librarian, Mattersey Hall. adyer@matterseyhall.co.uk

The Suspended Middle: Henri de Lubac and the Debate concerning the Supernatural
John Milbank
(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005, x + 117 pp).

Henri de Lubac (1896-1991) was a French Jesuit theologian associated with the movement, labelled as “La nouvelle théologie” by its opponents, that included individuals like Jean Daniélou, Yves Congar, Hans Urs von Balthasar, Maurice Blondel, and others. In 1946, de Lubac published perhaps his most controversial book, Surnaturel, wherein he argued against the reigning neo-Thomistic construal of nature (including human nature) as autonomous, self-sufficient, and aimed toward purposes commensurate with its natural powers, and of grace as a supernatural addition capable of elevating nature to a supernatural level of activity and ends. Surnaturel retrieved instead resources from the first Christian millennium to rehabilitate the idea that nature (and creation as a whole, including human nature), while a divinely gifted realm of independent existence, it is nevertheless also graciously oriented toward and desirous of the supernatural which is the irresistible gift of deified existence. Grace is thereby not extrinsic to nature, but sustains it from “within,” as if at and from its heart, and this allows nature to point beyond itself toward the divine. Yet grace is not confused with nature; rather nature is now understood as both the gift and call of God, with its own integrity at one level, but yearning after the supernatural at another level.

In the book under review, John Milbank unpacks de Lubac’s understanding of the nature-grace relationship in terms of an ontology understood according to the metaphor of the “suspended middle.” For those familiar with Milbank’s work and with the new “Radical Orthodoxy” movement which he has in some sense shaped into existence, the suspended middle calls attention to nature as existing out of divine grace, but as also intimately connected to, sacramentally pointing toward, and earnestly desiring of completion, redemption, and deification by the supernatural. Milbank’s interpretation of de Lubac’s theology is set forth in nine brisk chapters: an overview of de Lubac’s life and writings; the Surnaturel; the relationship of the “nouvelle théologie” in general and de Lubac in particular to Humani Generis (1950); de Lubac’s pneumatology (relatively undeveloped, as de Lubac himself acknowledged) and cosmology; the Surnaturel in relationship to de Lubac’s wider theological
ouevre; a comparison of de Lubac and von Balthasar; Thomistic criticisms of de Lubac’s theological vision; de Lubac’s radicalization of Aquinas; and a concluding “The Limits and the Renown of Henri de Lubac.” Throughout, Milbank shows an comprehensive understanding of de Lubac’s work as a historical theologian, even while it is clear that he is at the same time marshalling de Lubac’s thinking for the purposes of clarifying and furthering the theological agenda of Radical Orthodoxy.

There are many types of responses that this book will draw forth. Neo-Thomist, Lubacian, and “nouvelle théologie” scholars will no doubt take issue with Milbank’s discussion on various points, even as advocates and critics of Radical Orthodoxy will be motivated to engage The Suspended Middle as a succinct manifesto defending the movement’s ontological underpinnings. What about readers of this journal? Why should Pentecostal (and charismatic) scholars care about either de Lubac’s Surnaturel or Milbank’s Suspended Middle?

I suggest that as Pentecostal (and charismatic) theology continues to mature its scholars and theologians will be increasingly drawn into these kinds of discussions because of their concerns about providing a coherent theological account of the supernatural. To be sure, the Pentecostal and charismatic theology assumes understandings of the “natural” and the “supernatural” that are informed less immediately by the Thomistic tradition, and more so by the Scottish Enlightenment. At the same time, in part because the charismatic renewal cuts across theological and confessional traditions and includes the Roman Catholic Church, Pentecostal-charismatic rethinking of the relationship between nature and grace cannot avoid Catholic theologians in general and Jesuit interlocutors in particular, whether that be Killian McDonnell, Ralph Del Colle, or Donald L. Gelpi, among others. In this wider theological framework, sooner or later de Lubac’s Surnaturel will need to be engaged, and in the process, Milbank’s interpretation and Radical Orthodoxy’s reappropriation of de Lubac will then be confronted. Pentecostal and charismatic theologians who are attracted to the Lubacian theology will have to make peace with its neo-Platonic ontology and its Eastern soteriology, while those drawn to Milbank’s “suspended middle” will have to come to grips similarly with its panentheistic structures and Anglo-Catholic sacramentalism. In either case, Pentecostal and charismatic theology will be at least critically engaged, if not theologically enriched, and perhaps there will also be room for our own insights that will further these wider conversations.

Amos Yong, Associate Research Professor of Theology, Regent University School of Divinity
ayong@regent.edu

Finding and Losing Faith: Studies in Conversion

This series of essays examines the concept of conversion to and from various
An interesting study on the conversion of the Apostle Paul suggested that his experience is not-normative; that there is an allowance for diversity in patterns of Christian conversion although certain core elements are essential. As one of the writers usefully reminds us, Christianity is not primarily concerned with converting to a ‘religion’ or tradition, but to a relationship with God through Jesus Christ and this faith can and should be expressed differently in every culture.

An analysis of the testimonies from applicants to an evangelical theological college revealed the surprising and thought provoking conclusion that the social theme is more dominant in evangelicalism than “Damascus Road” type events. This analysis would possibly be useful for those planning evangelistic outreach programmes since it reveals patterns that are perhaps not immediately apparent.

Overall, this was an interesting series of essays discussing the dynamics of communicating the gospel in a multi-cultural society; it raises awareness of the complex social implications of conversion and should prompt further debate. Yet, for Pentecostals, the most important fact remains that it is the Holy Spirit who is the guiding force for all our endeavours.

Rev. Graham Cartwright, Regents Theological College, Nantwich, U.K.
**A Step-by Step Introduction to New Testament Greek**  
Glenn M Balfour  
(Mattersey: Mattersey Hall Publications, 2005; pp. 532)

The author has been teaching New Testament Greek to students at Mattersey Hall since 1990, and is thus familiar with the problems and difficulties encountered by those attempting to learn a new language. The volume contains a valuable introductory section briefly tracing the history of the Greek language, the nature of New Testament Greek and how ancient texts were written, an introduction to the Greek alphabet, and guidance on how to pronounce the individual letters. Before embarking on a course of Greek grammar it is, of course, essential for the student to be familiar with the basic principles of English grammar, and students will benefit from reading the crash course on English grammar thoughtfully provided by the author in the introductory section. Moreover, whenever new grammatical forms are introduced in the body of the work, the author is careful to explain the English equivalent. Thus, even students who are not overly familiar with the niceties of classical English grammar can embark on the daunting task of learning New Testament Greek with some measure of confidence.

One of the distinctive features of the book is that the lessons are grouped together into grammatical themes (verbs, nouns, pronouns etc.) thus enabling the student to focus on one particular area of New Testament Greek before moving on to a different area. The main points of Greek grammar are introduced to the student in an orderly and systematic way. The volume also has the merit of explaining points of grammar with reference to specific New Testament texts, and thus the student is introduced to New Testament passages at a relatively early stage. Little attention is devoted to Greek accents although there is an introduction to them in the Appendix at the end of the volume.

The vocabularies appended to each lesson include every word that occurs twenty times or more in the New Testament; consequently, there are more words to memorize here than in many comparable Greek grammars. But while this may court the risk of information overload, it does enable students to embark on a reading of New Testament texts confident that they will not encounter too many unfamiliar words.

The principles and methods used in this volume ensure that students will make rapid progress with their studies. Indeed, one of the great merits of this book is the emphasis placed on clear presentation and ease of access to basic grammatical information. The volume is user-friendly and the I/you form of address is deployed regularly. The author even manages to cover difficult topics in a readable and simplified way. The exercises require translation from Greek into English and vice versa. At the end of the book, the answers to the exercises are provided; thus while the grammar is primarily intended for classroom use, it can easily be followed (and the exercises corrected) without the aid of a teacher. After working through the forty lessons contained in this book, the student should be able to read...
much of the New Testament without constant reference to a dictionary, and should have a good grasp of the basic structure of the Greek language and its grammar. The volume is clearly printed and will provide a most welcome addition to the resources available for teaching New Testament Greek to the beginner.

Eryl W Davies, Dept, Theology & Religious Studies, University of Wales, Bangor
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