Those of us who study Christian mission believe our scholarly endeavors to be vitally important. A constellation of reasons, variously prioritized, underlie the significance we attribute to mission studies. Religious passion for Christian mission itself, including active participation in it, is the driving force for many. Mission’s connections with factors other than specifically religious realities—political, economic, social, ethnic, historical, and others—motivate many of us to examine critically, and seek to disentangle, the complexities of mission initiatives. Some analysts aim toward the related goal of adding to religion’s constructive contributions to peace, justice, and security for all human beings and the rest of creation. For a sizable portion of us, the scholarly pull of what is inherently a fascinating area of academic research and analysis is compelling enough for us to devote our lives to mission studies.

I personally relate to all of these motivations. Furthermore, I place myself among those who long to see theological curricula transformed through a deeper orientation toward mission studies. Indeed, I would go still further and claim that mission studies and personal mission involvement represent a healthy framework for fruitful living.

The high value to be placed on studying Christian mission will draw little disagreement from this journal’s readership. The subject of how Christian mission should be studied, however, including what methods of research and analysis are appropriate to use, is an altogether different consideration—and a highly contested one. At a recent gathering I attended of scholars of world Christianity and mission studies, we sifted through the intricacies of the budding academic field of world Christianity,
of that field’s relationship with mission studies, of the relative meanings of “world” and “global,” and similar matters. We cultivated deeper trust among ourselves and paved the way for collaboration between members of that relatively small group of highly motivated scholars. Even so, we went away sensing that large challenges lie on the path to achieving clarity, creating shared understandings, and undertaking genuinely constructive initiatives within the vast arena of mission studies. We also felt the presence of the inevitably related question that has been oft discussed and debated, especially over the past one hundred years, namely, the very nature of Christian mission itself.

This issue of the IBMR showcases the elastic topic of research methodologies in mission studies, not by presenting an exhaustive survey of methodology but by offering samples of methodologically exemplary scholarship in practice. Dana Robert, from the vantage point of a historian, and Craig Van Gelder, as a missiological ecclesiologist, offer robust analyses of crucial developments in missiology, including constructive suggestions for moving forward. Dwight Baker draws on his rich personal experience and well-honed analytical skills to examine carefully interrelated academic disciplines. Steve Rundle places research into business as mission on a new footing, with results that challenge some common assumptions. Religious demography is at the forefront of Todd Johnson and Peter Crossing’s yearly update of mission statistics. Janet Carroll’s instructive account of her experience, with members of that relatively small group of highly motivated scholars. Even so, we went away sensing that large challenges lie on the path to achieving clarity, creating shared understandings, and undertaking genuinely constructive initiatives within the vast arena of mission studies. We also felt the presence of the inevitably related question that has been oft discussed and debated, especially over the past one hundred years, namely, the very nature of Christian mission itself.

As a cautionary word, I suggest that readers not anticipate some sort of revelatory breakthrough in grasping the essence of the missio Dei. Mission studies point toward a final reality—when “the kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Messiah” (Rev. 11:15). But they extend no promise of finality in the here and now. Fascinating and vitally important as our impassioned research into Christian mission may be, the resulting insights are relatively modest and unquestionably provisional. God’s mission in this world is vast and mysteriously enough to humble the most brilliant, hard-working, and painstakingly careful of researchers. May the essays found here fuel the flame of those of us engaged in mission studies, as well as cultivate a deeper sense of the humility requisite for peering responsibly into what cannot yet be fully grasped.

—J. Nelson Jennings
Forty Years of North American Missiology: A Brief Review

Dana L. Robert

On June 8–10, 1973, mission leaders from Roman Catholic, mainline Protestant, and evangelical traditions united to found the American Society of Missiology (ASM).1 In so doing, they hoped to secure missiology as a recognized scholarly discipline in North America.2 The launch of the society included provision for a journal, an annual meeting, and formal collaboration among teachers, practitioners, and scholars. The establishment of ASM clarified the professional identity of the missiologist. The importance of this role in an age in which mission itself was under attack was well expressed in 1968 by mission historian R. Pierce Beaver when he said, “The missiologist is called to be the pioneer and to blaze the trail. The missionary will not escape from his uncertainty until the missiologist points the way, and the church will not move ahead in mission unless the missiologist sounds a prophetic call.”3

Against the backdrop of ASM’s founding and forty-year development, this article delineates three major stages in the recent history of North American missiology: crisis (1973–88), wider influence (1989–2000), and global awareness (2001 to the present).

Missiology in Crisis, 1973–1988

ASM was formed in the context of crisis. The founders of the society fought the imminent collapse of legitimacy in missions and in mission studies with the tools of collaboration, convergence, church growth, and contextualization, four “Cs” that characterized the early years of ASM.

By 1970 the end of colonialism and the Vietnam War had created a widespread backlash against missions. Collapse of support for Western missions extended to mission studies as well. Nationalist independence movements named missionaries as complicit in the system of Western occupation, and critique of missions grew exponentially. Because students lost interest in what they considered a colonialist enterprise, mission studies began disappearing from mainline denominational seminaries. In universities the secularization of religious studies marginalized mission publishing, noted the “shrinking market” for books on mission studies and the withdrawal from the field by major publishers.5 Further evidence of the crisis of academic legitimacy was the lack of a high-quality North American periodical for missionary research. Writing on the future of evangelicals in mission, Harold Lindsell, president of the Evangelical Theological Society, saw affluence and relativism as dominant trends. Without renewal, wrote Lindsell, “the next decade may spell the difference between a resurgent evangelicalism and a declining, moribund community of orthodox but powerless believers.”6 Arthur Glasser, dean of Fuller Theological Seminary’s School of World Mission, saw more signs of hope than did Lindsell, but he expressed grave concern over negativity toward evangelism and erosion of support for world mission among Protestants.7

In an article on the teaching of missiology, James Scherer, former dean of the Lutheran School of Missions, noted the tenuous relationship of the subject with academia.8 No successor was named to missiologist R. Pierce Beaver at the University of Chicago Divinity School after he retired in 1971. A decade earlier, in 1961 the Kennedy School of Missions, the chief U.S. institute for missiological training in the social sciences, ended its independent existence. That same academic year saw the newly-formed Department of Religious Studies deny a place at the table to the venerable professorship of mission at Yale Divinity School. Yale’s separation of mission studies from religious studies ended the doctoral-training tradition associated with the name of mission historian and sinologist Kenneth Scott Latourette. These sad developments signaled the decline of missions and mission studies among older American denominations.

Collaboration and convergence. Although the crisis took different forms in each constituency, Catholic, mainline, and evangelical missiologists recognized they were sitting in the same boat.9 Arthur Glasser, for example, pointed out the common interests shared by Protestant and Catholic evangelicals. The new spirit of openness since the Second Vatican Council meant that Catholic missiologists were participating in nondenominational projects, such as Bible translation. Mainline mission professors Pierce Beaver and Richey Hogg included Roman Catholics within a “new ecumenism.”10

With the closure of the Kennedy School of Missions, its mantle and social science tradition passed to the new Fuller School of World Mission, founded in 1965.11 Fuller president David Allan Hubbard recognized that unless missiology could be put on a
firm academic basis, the School of World Mission had little chance of succeeding. Hubbard then authorized Ralph Winter to plan toward founding the ASM, alongside Gerald Anderson. Fuller provided material support to the new society.12

Ensuring the academic respectability of mission studies required the collaboration of missiologists across the ecclesial divide. The key values in the founding of ASM were thus collaboration and convergence. Not only were nonsectarian intellectual standards necessary to secure the academic field, but collaboration among scholars, practitioners, and mission executives remained necessary in order to resource mission practices and stimulate vocations. Another form of collaboration was the deliberate tripartite rotation of leadership within ASM among Catholics, mainline Protestants, and “independents,” or evangelicals. With the transfer of the journal Practical Anthropology to ASM, now reborn as the journal Missiology: An International Review, the society gained its own official publication.13

By the 1980s another form of convergence was occurring among official mission theologies produced by different ecclesial traditions. This welcome development followed years of visible division between ecumenical and evangelical movements. International mission leaders, including David Bosch from South Africa and Emilio Castro from Uruguay, crafted the 1982 World Council of Churches (WCC) document Mission and Evangelism: An Ecumenical Affirmation,14 which affirmed mission among both the unreached and the poor, who in many places were the same people. Growing acceptance of the concept of the missio Dei, the idea that mission is grounded in God’s Trinitarian nature, created a common theological framework in which holistic missiologies developed inclusive of both evangelism and social justice, salvation and liberation.15 In 1987 United Church of Christ mission executive David M. Stowe stated that “from the conciliar-ecumenical side, and the Roman Catholic and evangelical-ecumenical sides, we see theologies of mission converging toward a shared vision of the future.”16

Crossing traditional ecclesiastical boundaries for the sake of mission studies was not without its risks. By embracing evangelicals and resisting the tide of antimissiory rhetoric, mainline Protestant missiologists exposed themselves to accusations of being unrepentant colonialists. For consorting with Catholics and supposed liberals, evangelical missiologists were accused of betraying the Great Commission.17 In respecting Protestant colleagues, Roman Catholics seemed to be caving in to sectarianism. Even so, looking back over forty years of the development of American missiology and of ASM confirms that the deliberate collaboration and convergence across traditions has shaped the field of missiology and impacted the academy beyond the dreams of ASM’s founders. In his ASM presidential address of 1995, Peruvian missiologist Samuel Escobar, echoing Archbishop William Temple, forcefully stated the rationale undergirding ASM when he named missiological convergence “the new fact of our time.”18

Church growth. A third “C” that fills out the context for American missiology in this period is church growth. Prior to the 1960s, cross-cultural mission was directed toward nations largely defined as the nation-state.19 A central argument put forward in the 1960s for the elimination of Western missionaries and mission studies was that Christianity had already been introduced to most of the countries of the world, and that “nationals” should evangelize their own countries. But with the 1965 merger of Donald McGavran’s Institute of Church Growth into the Fuller School of World Mission, a new definition of the Great Commission as oriented toward ethnie, or people groups, began to take hold among evangelicals. A new strategy of world evangelization rose from the ashes of the colonial-era geographically based model.

In related fashion, missiologists of whatever stripe refused to give up on evangelization. In 1972 the Division of Overseas Ministries of the U.S. National Council of Churches organized a consultation titled “The Gospel and Frontier Peoples.” Representatives of sixty Catholic and Protestant mission agencies met to reflect on “how to effect responsible action toward unevangelized peoples by national churches and missionary agencies.”20 The meeting considered issues of culture and relationships with indigenous churches. The gathered mission agencies affirmed that “Christian concern for justice, compassion for people forced to painful change, and the constant compulsion to introduce the Lord Jesus Christ to all men makes responsible action by churches towards frontier tribal societies a genuine and urgent challenge and a ministry of high priority.”21

The 1972 conference “represented a new level of practical cooperation among post-Vatican II Catholics, ecumenical Protestants, and evangelical Protestants for a common vision of evangelization. It affirmed the value of social science methodologies alongside mission theology and history as crucial components of mission studies. It defied the one-sided negative rhetoric about missionaries common in the early 1970s, and recognized that the imperative to make disciples was still part of missions even though colonialist structures had to be rejected.”22 In other words, necessary critiques of paternalism and missionary colonialism occurred within a framework of basic support for evangelization.

From a postcolonial perspective, the church growth movement represented the construction of a new discourse that both reframed the continuation of missionary expansion and crafted a distinctively U.S. missiological ethos and vocabulary. The advent of the church growth movement gave a North American stamp to mid-twentieth-century mission studies and generated lively discussion within ASM.23

Contextualization. The fourth “C” embraced by North American missiology was contextualization. In 1971 Taiwanese ecumenist Shoki Coe coined the term “contextualization,” a concept that described the “dialectic between the Scriptures and contexts of social and cultural change. For Coe and the TEF [Theological Education Fund], ethnicity, political structures, and the rapid urbanization and modernization in Asia were all factors in the dialectic between the local, and the universal norm of God’s incarnation in Jesus Christ—the ultimate act of contextualization.”24 With the incarnation as a biblical model, mission theologians increasingly represented the goal of mission as moving beyond the traditional “three selfs” (self-support, self-government, self-propagation) to the “fourth self,” namely,
self-theologizing. Although Coe’s position as head of the World Council of Churches’ TEF meant that evangelicals were initially suspicious of the term, by the mid-1980s the concept was sweeping through missiological circles.25

In the context of North American arguments about evangelism versus social justice during the early 1970s, the currents of contextualization and church growth theory did not easily flow in the same direction. Both parallels and tensions were evident between the early North American–directed church growth agenda and the emerging “contextual” missiologies of other regions. For example, there were disagreements between evangelicals from North America and Latin America.26 Over the next forty years, the theologians of the Fraternidad Teológica Latinoamericana (FTL, Latin American Theological Fraternity) would develop their own holistic and increasingly influential missiology of “integral mission.”27 By the 1980s, however, ASM had become an important space for mediating the differences between church growth theory and contextual theologies, with the presence at annual meetings of people such as Orlando Costas,28 Sidney Rooy, and Alan Neely, who in 1981 translated into English the liberation-oriented history of Latin American Christianity by Enrique Dussel.29

As an organizational expression of the development of North American missiology, the American Society of Missiology began amid the tension between world evangelization and self-theologizing, both of which were key values for the U.S. missionary community. The significance of ASM was that it provided a safe space in which different theological and ecclesial perspectives cross-fertilized each other, as well as where local and global conversations about the nature of church growth and of contextualization could intersect.

Wider Influence, 1989–2000

In the era just discussed, North American missiologists established the respectability of missiology as an academic field. The maturation of mission studies occurred when missiological insights moved beyond missionary discourse and gained recognition within the larger scholarly community. Conversations stimulated publications, and publications carried the insights of mission studies across academic divides.

The “crisis” phase ended around 1989 to 1991. First, with the end of the Cold War in 1989, the old colonial period drew to a close. Just as the walls fell on Cold War political divisions, the walls fell between mission studies and other fields of academic inquiry. The resurgence of religion that accompanied the end of the Cold War opened a new window for mission studies, as secularizing and colonial narratives loosened their grip. Lausanne II, held in Manila in 1989, the WCC’s Commission on Mission and Evangelism in San Antonio the same year, and the promulgation of *Redemptoris missio* by Pope John Paul II at the end of 1990 marked key reaffirmations of the central importance of mission to the life of the worldwide church.

**Key bridge-building volumes.** Several books published between 1989 and 1991 set mission studies upon a new stage of confidence. Lamin Sanneh’s *Translating the Message*, as part of the vitally important ASM series, was published in 1989.30 Because Sanneh was an African, he could not be dismissed as a Western apologist. His theory of translatability, therefore, completely reframed the colonial discourse in which mission studies functioned. A second work of major importance to the credibility of missiology as a field was Lesslie Newbigin’s *Gospel in a Pluralist Society*, also published in 1989.31 This major work of apologetics analyzed the West as a mission field and deconstructed the secular Enlightenment worldview in a way that created a new set of conversation partners for missiologists. The “missional church” movement launched by Craig Van Gelder, Darrell Guder, and George Hunsberger built upon Newbigin’s foundation. The opening of programs in domestic and congregational mission studies, and of the Gospel and Our Culture Network, gave a new urgency to North American mission studies.

A third masterful work that marked the end of the crisis stage was David Bosch’s *Transforming Mission*, published as part of the ASM series in 1991.32 Immediately upon publication, Bosch’s book was the subject of a weekend retreat for the heads of North American evangelical mission agencies sponsored by the Overseas Ministries Study Center in New Haven, Connecticut. Finally, mission theology had received the systematic treatment that confirmed it as a major branch of theological reflection. The recovery of ecclesiology, in light of the now widely embraced concept of *missio Dei*, undergirded missiology as a serious area of systematic theological inquiry.

A set of books published during the “coming of age” of North American mission studies fostered the movement of contextualization into the mainstream of theology. Especially significant were Robert Schreiter’s now-classic *Constructing Local Theologies* (1985) and Steven Bevans’s 1992 follow-up *Models of Contextual Theology*. Schreiter argued for the “fourth self” of self-theologizing, and he began to draw crucial distinctions within contextualization between ethnographic and liberationist approaches. Bevans built upon Schreiter’s typology by analyzing multiple models of contextual theology.33

The publications of these authors—Sanneh, Newbigin, Bosch, Schreiter, and Bevans—together represented a turning point for North American missiology. Collectively, they signaled the maturation of mission studies through its confirmed influence upon other theological disciplines. These volumes charted the agenda for a new age of mission studies in which missional reflection was no longer confined to the specific sending activities of mission societies but had become foundational for theology, ecclesiology, and church history.34

The resurgence of religion that accompanied the end of the Cold War opened a new window for mission studies.

Expanding the scope of mission studies. Another transformational event that occurred in 1989 was the awarding of a planning grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts to the Overseas Ministries Study Center. Under Gerald Anderson, the first president of ASM (1973–75), executive director of the Overseas Ministries Study Center, and editor of OMSC’s *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* (1976–2000), a team of scholars launched the Scholars’ Initiative for Studies in Mission and International Christianity (SISMIC).35 In 1992 SISMIC submitted a proposal to Pew for an ambitious “multidimensional initiative to enhance the intellectual vitality of the world Christian movement.”36 The importance
of contact between Gerald Anderson and Joel Carpenter of the Pew religion program cannot be overestimated; the subsequent program funded by Pew was the first large-scale financial investment in mission studies research in living memory.\footnote{37}

With Pew support, from 1992 to 1999 the Research Enablement Program (REP), administered by OMSC, subsidized 110 academic research projects. Carpenter administered international collaborative grants on world Christianity called Research Advancement Grants (RAG), and another project studied the development of resources for world Christianity. One of the most significant projects sponsored under Carpenter’s leadership was the North Atlantic Missiology Project (NAMP) in 1996, which morphed into the Currents in World Christianity (CWC) program under British mission historian Brian Stanley. Although CWC officially ended in 2001, the award-winning book series edited by Stanley and Indologist Robert Frykenberg continues, with nearly twenty-five volumes published so far.\footnote{38} The cluster of Pew-funded projects—SISMIC, REP, RAG, NAMP, CWC, and others—had an unparalleled impact on moving mission history beyond its captivity to the colonialist paradigm and in launching “world Christianity” as a discrete field of historical inquiry. By the end of the 1990s, mission studies had been mainstreamed into the larger academic world of historical and area studies.\footnote{39}

Global Awareness, 2001–Present

With the turn of a new century, awareness of Christianity as a worldwide religion finally moved beyond mission studies itself. The publication in 2002 of Philip Jenkins’s blockbuster \textit{The Next Christendom} popularized what missiologists had known for decades—that Christianity was no longer captive to the colonial West and that local and global are inseparable in the making of Christianity as a world religion.\footnote{40} The 2001 publication of the first volume of Dale Irvin and Scott Sunquist’s \textit{History of the World Christian Movement}, the result of a cross-cultural collaborative process initiated by American missiologists, buttressed the missional and global basis of the history of Christianity.\footnote{41} The first decade of the twenty-first century ushered in the dual recognition that Christianity was now a worldwide religion and that mission was alive and well.

The twenty-first-century paradigm of Christianity as a multicultural religion energized missiological reflection in global contexts. Nearly a decade of planning and reflection culminated in the series of 2010 conferences to commemorate the hundredth anniversary of the World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh. Aarhus, Tokyo, Edinburgh, Cape Town, and Boston were the sites of major gatherings, and publications from the multiple processes are still forthcoming.\footnote{42} New statements of mission theology, influenced through global conversations made possible by new communications media, emerged from both the Lausanne Movement (2011) and the WCC.\footnote{43} With the shifting configuration of world Christianity, fresh patterns of ecumenical conversation became important, such as the Global Christian Forum and the 2011 document “Christian Witness in a Multi-Religious World.”\footnote{44}

The new millennium awakened significant missiological leadership in the world church, including the flourishing of mission research centers such as the Korean Research Institute for Mission and the Akrofi-Christaller Institute of Theology, Mission, and Culture in Ghana; new missionary training programs such as the International Leadership University in Burundi; and the expansion of missiological networks such as the International Fellowship of Mission as Transformation (INFEMIT).\footnote{45}

What does the new global framework of Christianity mean for North American missiology? I highlight here three significant arenas for reflection.

Changing definitions of the missionary and of missiology. The context of globalization, including advanced communication technologies, has led to a massive democratization or depersonalization of mission work. Short-term mission projects involving millions of people and millions of dollars, cross-cultural outreach from local congregations, proliferation of “global” faith-based organizations (FBOs), and migration have become so extensive that the missionary is being redefined in North America. What should be the trajectory for mission studies in an age when globe-trotting amateurs vastly outnumber career missionaries? In short, what is missiology in the twenty-first century?

Support for mission education and research. Are the educational institutions that have traditionally supported missiological research ready for the future? In North America, independent theological seminaries are suffering severe economic crises. Some mission programs would be facing a crisis of obsolescence if it were not for the enrollment of international students and the advent of modular, blended, and online courses. In an age of global mobility, is it still efficient to gather into one location personnel with mission experience from different continents, or has the graduate “school of mission” model that was new forty-some years ago now become dated? What is the role of universities in the future of mission studies, given the rise of world Christianity as a distinct field?

North American identity issues. Indeed, in a global age, what is uniquely American about organizations such as the American Society of Missiology? Much of ASM’s uniqueness has gone global.\footnote{46} Church growth theory, for example, is alive and well among Korean and Chinese missionaries. North American intellectual and financial resources have transformed the field of world Christianity and spread the framework of the “missional church” to South Africa, Australia, and Europe. Should we as North Americans be focusing on problems particular to our region, or on global problems from a North American perspective? What does it mean to be American missiologists going forward into the twenty-first century?

In conclusion, a brief review of the history of North American missiology shows that our forebears of forty and fifty years ago succeeded beyond their wildest dreams. Mission studies is widely recognized as an academic field. Missional thinking permeates church history, theology, and ecclesiology. Having accomplished much, where do we go from here? Still now, R. Pierce Beaver’s words point the way forward: “The missiologist is called to be the pioneer and to blaze the trail. The missionary will not escape from his uncertainty until the missiologist points the way, and the church will not move ahead in mission unless the missiologist sounds a prophetic call.”\footnote{47}
Notes

1. I thank Craig Van Gelder, Gerald Anderson, and Wilbert Shenk for helpful suggestions to the original, full version of this essay. Thanks also to Wilbert Shenk for sharing an early section of his revised institutional history of the ASM. Daryl Ireland and Eva Pascal assisted with research and formatting of the original article, and Dwight Baker edited the shortened IBMR version.


9. European missiology was in a similar identity crisis. It should be noted that the International Association of Mission Studies (IAMS) was founded in 1972, a year before ASM, to meet the need for academic respectability among missiologists transnationally. North Americans also participated in the founding of IAMS. See Gerald H. Anderson, Witness to World Christianity: The International Association for Mission Studies, 1972–2012 (New Haven, Conn.: Overseas Ministries Study Center Publications, 2012).


11. Widely known professors in Fuller Theological Seminary’s School of World Mission who had earned doctorates from the Hartford Seminary Foundation included Charles H. Kraft, Dean Gilliland, and Arthur Glasser.


13. Fuller Seminary subsidized Missiology for its first decade, both financially and by providing faculty as staff and editors (Shenk, History, 28–30). It should also be noted that in 1977 Gerald Anderson transformed the Occasional Bulletin of Missiological Research into the International Bulletin of Missiological Research, which within five years had 5,000 subscribers. The establishment of Missiology and of the IBMR gave North American missiologists two leading professional journals by the late 1970s.


17. The Evangelical Missiological Society (EMS) was formed in 1990 as an alternative to ASM. The EMS has focused exclusively on fulfilling the Great Commission. For a brief history, see www.emsweb.org/about.


19. For example, J. Christy Wilson, Jr., cofounder of the Urbana mission conferences, believed that, by going to the country of Afghanistan, one of the last nation-states without the Gospel, he was fulfilling the conditions for Jesus’ return.


21. Ibid., 5.


25. See David J. Hesselgrave and Edward Rommen, Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), a pioneer evangelical treatment of contextualization. Evangelicals were slower than mainline Protestants and Catholics to adopt the idea. Catholics initially tended to prefer the language of inculturation; see, e.g., Peter Schineller, A Handbook on Inculturation (New York: Paulist Press, 1990).


27. On the FTL, see www.ftl-al.org. Interestingly, the Dutch Mission Councils initially funded both the FTL and FAMBIDZANO (Ecu- menical Movement of Zimbabwean Independent Churches) in Rhodesia as postcolonial missionary projects. Christian Reformed U.S. missionary Sidney Rooy and Dutch Reformed Zimbabwean Marthinus Daneel were important links to Dutch funding on behalf of indigenous movements outside the normal “missionary” structures. For the ongoing influence of FTL’s holistic missiology of “integral mission,” see Lausanne Movement, Cape Town Commitment (2011), part 1, §§7A and 10B; www.lausanne.org/en/documents/ctcommitment.html.

28. Orlando Costas was involved in mass evangelism in Costa Rica, but he also criticized church growth from the inside; see his essay “A Wholistic Concept of Church Growth,” in Exploring Church Growth, ed. Shenk, 95–107.


34. In addition to the fields mentioned here, mission studies and missiology have had major roles in stimulating the academic imagination around issues of interreligious dialogue, bibliical studies, liberation theology, and women’s studies. For example, Paul Knitter’s groundbreaking study of interreligious issues, No Other Name?, was published in the ASM series in 1985. Also in 1985 the ASM series published Guillermo Cook’s important work on base ecclesial communities, The Expectation of the Poor. Broader appreciation for the missiological framework of the Bible was launched by the work of Donald Senior and Carroll Stuhlmuller, The Biblical Foundations for Mission (1983). In the late 1990s, mission studies influenced women’s
Errata: Doctoral Dissertations on Mission (Revised)

After the October 2013 issue of the IBMR had been both mailed and posted online, we learned that a group of dissertations from Biola University for the years 2002–11 had inadvertently been omitted from the database used in preparing the article “Doctoral Dissertations on Mission: Ten-Year Update, 2002–2011.” They have now been added to the list, and the statistical analysis has been completely redone.

A revised version of the article is now available online at www.internationalbulletin.org. Also, a printed copy of the revised article is included with this issue of the IBMR. Please place it in your copy of the October 2013 issue.

Adjustments to percentages and totals, mostly small, occur throughout the article. The most notable change is Biola University’s move up in rank. It is now tied with Boston University for fourth place among schools in number of doctoral degrees granted related to Christian mission. Condolences to Biola!

With this revision the list of doctoral dissertations analyzed has grown from 1,492 to 1,515. The entire list has been placed online and can be searched at www.internationalbulletin.org/files/html/diss-list-2002-2011. For all citations and comparisons, please use the figures, percentages, and rankings of schools found in this revision of the article.

In addition, a copyediting error in “My Pilgrimage in Mission,” by John C. B. Webster, IBMR (October 2013): 226, led to a misidentification of Bishop Azariah. The correct person is Bishop M. Azariah, not Bishop V. S. Azariah.

The editors of the IBMR regret these errors.
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Should our proclamation of the gospel be in words or deeds or both? New Testament scholar and missionary Dean Flemming takes a look at this disputed question. Rooted in the Old Testament and covering the Gospels, Paul, Acts, Peter and Revelation, Flemming provides a biblically sound basis for holistic ministry in the post-Christian West and beyond.
288 PAGES, PAPERBACK, 978-0-8308-4026-7, $24.00

THEOLOGY OF MISSION
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John Howard Yoder
Edited by Gayle Gerber Koontz and Andy Alexis-Baker
John Howard Yoder was one of the most important ethicists of the twentieth century. This volume—based on lectures recorded in 1973—shows he was a profound missiologist as well. Working from a free church perspective, Yoder weaves together biblical, theological, practical and interreligious reflections to think about mission beyond Christendom.
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The Future of the Discipline of Missiology: A Brief Overview of Current Realities and Future Possibilities

Craig Van Gelder

The following article is an abridgment of the author’s presidential address “The Future of the Discipline of Missiology: Framing Current Realities and Future Possibilities,” delivered at the American Society of Missiology annual meeting, Wheaton, Illinois, on June 22, 2013. The full address is available in Missiology: An International Review 42, no. 1 (January 2014), and online at http://mis.sagepub.com/content/42/1/39.full.pdf+html. (This URL was updated on December 31, 2013.) DOI: 10.1177/0091829613507027. —Editors

The church’s participation in God’s mission in the world continues to undergo dramatic changes, related both to massive demographic shifts in the distribution of Christian adherents and to new realities in missionary endeavors. As Protestant missiology developed in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it focused more on practices and pragmatics than on theology and theory. Missiology thus entered the theological academy as a type of theological stepchild. While North American missiology has matured tremendously, North American missiologists have now entered into a new space that requires us to rethink our practices of mission and to reframe our understanding of the discipline of missiology.

The changes required of us are not only technical in nature, that is, changes that are largely within our ability to manage, utilizing skills and resources we currently possess.1 Rather, they are more adaptive in character, presenting challenges for which we do not at present have answers but which we nevertheless must address if we in North America are to participate more robustly in God’s mission throughout the world.

This article explores three crucial adaptive challenges missiology faces today: (1) demographic shifts and the rise of the majority church in the Global South, (2) the reshaping and marginalization of the Euro-tribal Christian faith traditions, and (3) mission theology and the discipline of missiology.2

Changing Realities on the Ground

Publications tracking the shifts taking place within the global church and the rise of the majority church in the South are increasingly commonplace, but the composite picture they paint is critical for us to understand.3

Population growth. Missiologists need to readjust their perspective continuously in light of the massive growth in world population. It took until 1804 for the world’s population to grow to a total of one billion persons, and then only 123 more years, in 1927, to reach two billion. Since then, the span of time for adding each new billion has dramatically decreased; at present a mere twelve years is required. The world’s population is presently estimated to be seven billion, with projections of nine billion persons by 2050.

Significantly, Anglo population growth in the West is becoming basically flat: births are offset by deaths.4 Current population increases are occurring primarily within communities of color, as well as because of increased immigration from the Global South.

Changes in the location of Christian believers. The World Christian Database (www.worldchristiandatabase.org/wcd) provides information on all persons identified in any way with Christianity, regardless of the character of their faith life. It thus includes many whose allegiance is nominal, a point important to note regarding many Western Christians. In 1900 Europe and North America were home to 82 percent of the estimated 558 million Christians in the world. By 1970 this majority had declined to 57 percent. By 2010 the decisive shift to a majority church in the Global South had taken place. In one century, the proportion of the world’s Christians living in the West had declined from 82 percent to approximately 38 percent. Further decline, to only 27 percent, is projected by 2050.5

Make-up of the church in 2010. In 1910 the major Christian traditions ranked by size of membership were Roman Catholic (47 percent), Orthodox (20 percent), Protestant (18 percent), Anglican (5 percent), independent (1.5 percent). What is now referred to as “Renewalist”—Pentecostal and Charismatic combined—represented only 0.2 percent. By 2010 the rapid growth of the Renewalists was palpable. That year Renewalists, with over 614 million adherents, encompassed 27 percent of the world’s Christians.Independents had grown similarly to over 16 percent (369 million).6

Christian faith in a world of many religions. The Christian communities in the West that gave birth to the modern missions movement had significant population majorities that enabled the rise of a hegemonic worldview, an assumption of being in control of the sociocultural order. Though massive changes from majority status are under way, this history of having cultural dominance has deeply shaped Western Christianity for both Catholics and Protestants. In contrast, most Christian communities of the Global South live in contexts where Christianity is a minority religion. The rise of these Christian communities in the Global South has introduced four critical changes in how we understand and participate in the mission of God in the world.

1. Engaging others and experiencing reciprocity. As noted, many Christian communities in the South live as a minority faith within their local contexts. While most Christian communities in North America still assume public recognition of the importance of what they have to say or share, the Christian communities in the South, in order to survive, let alone prosper, have had to attend deeply to the issue of how to engage the other. Our
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North American heritage of assuming cultural dominance and exercising cultural hegemony has limited our churches’ ability to develop genuinely reciprocal relationships, whether in our mission practices or within our local and now increasingly diverse congregational contexts. Gary Simpson has helpfully identified the posture of “benefactor”: someone who has resources and who proceeds to meet the needs of the other from a position of privilege. Much Western mission practice and Western framing of missiology is still deeply embedded in the assumption of being such a benefactor. The alternative posture, Simpson notes, is that of one who bears the burden of the other, thereby freeing the other to participate fully in all of life. This alternative posture lies at the heart of kenosis, as presented in Philippians 2.

2. Worldview shift from “I” to “we.” The Western worldview is deeply shaped by the notion of the individual—the self—encapsulated by Descartes’s seventeenth-century maxim “I think, therefore I am.” The modern concept of the self gained momentum through the Protestant Reformation and came to full maturity in the Enlightenment. Though poststructural theorists have substantially deconstructed the modern concept of the self, operational individualism still dwells deep within North American culture. Our understandings of anthropology, soteriology, and ecclesiology stand in substantial contrast to the worldviews more common in the South, which would rephrase Descartes’s maxim to “We are, therefore I am.” This “we” type of understanding is well expressed in the African concept of Ubuntu, which views personal identity as understood only within the identity of the social group.

3. Every location as a mission location. The majority church in the South is teaching us that every location is a mission location. Having been the recipients of mission, they are well attuned to understanding their own contexts as mission locations, an understanding deeply reinforced through living as minorities within communities of multiple and diverse faiths. They engage their local contexts at a deep level simply because they must if they are to survive. Unfortunately, the church in North America has been slow to grasp the critical importance of one’s social location. In the 1990s—in line with Leslie Newbigin’s seminal question, Can the West be converted?—the Gospel and Our Culture Network (GOCN) took the lead in challenging churches in North America to undertake serious rethinking of the relationship between Gospel and culture. Even so, the fundamental question of the relationship of the Gospel and North American culture has yet to work its way into ongoing North American missiological conversation.

4. The Bible, the spirits, and pneumatology. In light of how a person’s reading of the Bible shapes that person’s worldview, another clear contrast between the emerging Christian communities in the Global South and the traditional Christian communities in the West is the way the Bible is read by the churches in the South. Historically, Western Protestants especially have given primacy to an intellectual understanding of the faith. Drawing on early creedal formulations seen as being normative, the magisterial Protestant traditions quickly codified their biblical understanding into formal confessions accompanied by instructional catechisms. In the midst of these developments, the influence of the Enlightenment made it increasingly difficult to read the Bible on its own cultural terms relative to a world of spirits and the reality of miracles. The active agency of God was increasingly relegated to the interior world of the human heart, and the Bible increasingly came to be used either for shaping character or for instructing the church regarding its obligations in the world. In contrast, many Christians in the South have a fundamental understanding that all of life is spiritual, with the presence and agency of spirits in the material world being self-evident. At the same time, they also understand the active agency of God in their midst through the Spirit of God.

The adaptive challenge for North American missiologists is that most of us appear to be increasingly out of step with the make-up and cultural assumptions of the global church we seek to serve. And we are not sure how to bridge these differences.

Reshaping of Euro-tribal Christian Faith

Christianity in the twenty-first century is regaining likeness to the church’s first centuries. First, the global church is rediscovering how to affirm its inherent many-ness in the midst of its essential oneness. The early church encompassed a great diversity of faith traditions, including quasi-Jewish, Hellenistic, Syrian, Alexandrian, Coptic, Ethiopian, Orthodox, Roman, and Celtic streams. In the church’s rich diversity today the vision of every tribe and tongue is becoming more prominent. Second, the majority of the church is once more positioned geographically in the Global South, terrain it occupied in its early centuries. It came into existence in the Middle East and then spread as a series of dispersed minority communities south into Africa, east into Asia, and west along the northern Mediterranean coast.

Recent Christian historiography recognizes these changing realities. The Western story of the spread of Christianity as “the history of Christian missions,” articulated masterfully by Kenneth Scott Latourette and summarized by Stephen Neill, is now being reframed as “the history of the world Christian movement.”

Rise of Euro-tribal Christian faith traditions. Most of us learned to frame the Christian story around key turning points, which typically included Constantine’s conversion (fourth century), the division between the Eastern Orthodox and Western Roman Catholic churches (eleventh century), and especially the Protestant Reformation and Catholic Counter-Reformation (sixteenth century). For most Protestants, as well as for many Catholics in Europe and in North America, these two reformations represent a critical line of demarcation. The unfolding narratives of the various Protestant faith traditions growing out of the Reformation are deeply embedded in this historical time period. They were profoundly shaped as well by several dramatic changes
taking place in Western culture at that time, including the rise of modern nation-states, the ascendency among the intelligentsia of the Enlightenment, with its commitment to rational framing of universals considered to be normative for all of life, and the accompanying modern project, bolstered by the methodology of scientific discovery and the rise of capitalistic economies.

In the sixteenth century, Christianity in the West operated from the premise of the Nicene Creed that there is only one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church. The protesters and the Catholic Church alike worked from this premise, which raised the fundamental question, Which church is true and which churches are not? The protesters responded by offering two “marks”—the pure preaching of the Word and the proper administration of the sacraments—as litmus tests. They then consolidated their fragile movements around the dominant cultural-political tribes of their day and eventually formed state churches, which soon framed their theological convictions within a variety of confessional documents.

The intellectual consolidation of the church accomplished by the Reformation confessions was paralleled by the cultural and political consolidation taking place with the rise of modern nation-states. These national political movements coalesced with the rise of confessional Christianity to form identities that were largely sociocultural and that enjoyed the political favor of the monarch or magistrate. Thus by the seventeenth century, especially following the Thirty Years War (1618–48), it is possible to speak of national churches such as the German Lutheran Church, the Dutch Reformed Church, the Anglican (English) Church, and the Danish Lutheran Church.

These Protestant state churches worked from the assumption of cultural dominance in exercising hegemony. Dissenting groups such as the Anabaptists, Quakers, Mennonites, and Puritans all paid a heavy price for their alternative views of the church. But in doing so, they made the point that the emerging Euro-tribal faith traditions of the state churches were in fact fundamentally particularistic and therefore not normative or universally applicable.

Andrew Walls was one of the first to identify the sixteenth-century reformations as representing largely the clan history of Europe. The time is long past for missiologists in the West to reconceive the place of the Euro-tribal faith traditions within the larger Christian story. But the witness of voices from the South will likely be necessary if this historiographical corner is adequately to be turned.

**Rise of the U.S./North American version.** The historical particularity of the Euro-tribal faith traditions became manifest when emigrants from them began to settle in the British colonies that were eventually to become the United States and Canada. Some, such as the Anglicans and Congregationalists, acted to establish domain in colonies where they were the majority. But the seeds of diversity sown in Europe quickly bore fruit in the colonial context. Solving this intensely commingled diversity of Christian faith traditions involved four organizational developments, whose understanding is critical for understanding mission practices and the development of the discipline of missiology in North America.

1. **Separation of church and state.** Church and state were separated following the U.S. Revolutionary War. This organizational development was codified in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution through the ratification of the Bill of Rights in 1791. No church was to be established by the state or infringed upon from the state, a “right” that enfranchised the Lockean ideal of rational, autonomous individuals entering into social contracts to form self-governing organizations. Churches in the new United States readily applied the logic of this understanding; congregations formed on a voluntary basis and were governed by democratic polities.

Interestingly, the Euro-tribal faith traditions with magisterial ecclesiologies and polities soon adjusted to this new understanding by amending their articles of church governance. The voluntary concept of the church spread rapidly throughout much of the world, carried by missionaries sent out by North American mission societies and denominational mission agencies.

2. **Denominations and mission organizations.** Between the Revolutionary War and the 1820s, over thirty denominations were created in the newly formed United States, a number that increased to over two hundred by 1900, with hundreds more added since. Most early U.S. denominations were formed out of Euro-tribal immigrant groups who shared a common faith tradition. They were soon joined, however, by denominations that were uniquely “made in America,” often with strong restoration tendencies that sought to reestablish a biblical, primarily a New Testament, Christian faith.

The modern missions movement came of age in the midst of these developments, and new structures for engaging in mission work emerged. In Europe these structures were the mission societies, pioneered by William Carey in 1792, which worked alongside the state churches. Similar independent structures, such as interdenominational mission societies, faith missions, and parachurch organizations that worked outside of or alongside the emerging denominations, were organized in North America. New internal structures known as denominational agencies also soon emerged. All of these newly created structures spread Christianity around the world throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Over the past two hundred years the rising Global Church has largely come of age within this Western framing of the issues and in the presence of Western structures for the church. But these Western exports are now increasingly being critiqued or deconstructed, or simply being ignored.

3. **The modern project and corporate culture.** During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Enlightenment gave birth to what is often labeled “the modern project,” in which advances in scientific discovery were used to exercise increasing dominion over the physical world. The creative forces these advances unleashed, together with the harnessing of water and steam power, fueled what became known as the industrial revolution. These developments required the creation of new forms of organization (e.g., bureaucracy as conceptualized by Max Weber) in order to manage the work of the large corporations that were beginning to emerge. All of these developments took place in the same period of time that the Western powers were colonizing most of the rest of the world.

Significantly, this same period of time also saw a massive expansion of missionary outreach from the West. Thousands of
missionaries were sent out by hundreds of mission societies in Europe and North America, as well as by North American para-church organizations and denominational agencies. The World Missionary Conference at Edinburgh in 1910 represented the culmination of this missional system. The system began to be dismantled after World War I and was fully dismantled following World War II, a period that coincided with the rise of the United States to world leadership politically, militarily, and economically. The same time period saw a resurgence of the evangelical movement in the United States, leading in time to the creation of the now ongoing Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization.

Mission work in general in all traditions, but especially among evangelicals, functioned within the hegemonic framework of the worldwide influence of the United States. The values, practices, and assumptions embedded in U.S. culture were largely accepted as normative. The fact of this assumption lay at the heart of the question that Newbigin first raised in England in the 1970s and on which the GOCN in North America focused in the 1980s and 1990s. The critical question for North American mission work today is: As we engage in mission, to what extent are we stewarding the power of the Gospel, and to what extent are we unreflectively relying on the power and privileges that North American culture provides?

4. The hermeneutical turn. Contributing to the shift in the missiological conversation is the West’s continued journey into a post-Enlightenment understanding of truth. A hermeneutical shift has taken place in the West in the past half century with thinkers such as Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Clifford Geertz, Jürgen Habermas, and Paul Ricoeur making it clear that all “knowing” is multiperspectival. All knowing is shaped in part by our foreknowledge, which we acquired through having been socialized into particular human communities. We recognize that we are enmeshed in the hermeneutical circle, and our focus has shifted onto the importance of the perspectival: the local, the particular, the narrative, and the story.

The Enlightenment, in splitting fact from value, separated knowing truth from being in relationship. Historically, by focusing primarily on confession, churches in the West built this split into the pattern of their corporate lives and even validated breaking relationships if truth was perceived to have been violated. Today Western churches are in the process of understanding diversity more deeply. They are being invited to learn from the other and to develop skills in stewarding deep relationships that are reciprocal in character. Unfortunately, for many the European mind-set of assuming cultural dominance and trying to maintain structures that operate out of this assumption will likely continue for some time. We can expect, however, a continued reshaping and marginalization of the European Christian faith traditions, which will require the discipline of missiology also to be fundamentally reframed.

The adaptive challenge for the North American mission enterprise is that it continues to be embedded within a historical hegemony of assuming cultural dominance and has been unable to develop sufficient critical distance to critique and reframe this understanding in regard to our own mission location.

Mission Theology and Missiology as a Discipline

The twentieth century saw dramatic changes in the way both Protestants and Roman Catholics thought theologically about mission. For 150 years the Protestant movement’s primary rationale undergirding mission centered on the church’s obedience to the Great Commission. This theology functioned well within Western colonialism; scores of organizations were created to utilize the organizational power supplied by the modern project’s corporate culture.

By the middle of the twentieth century, two world wars, the dismantling of colonialism, an increase in secularism, and the resurgence of world religions had dramatically decentralized this ethos. Protestant mission theology underwent a “Copernican revolution.” The basic turn came in 1952 at the International Missionary Council meeting in Willingen, West Germany, which reconceptualized mission as missio Dei—the mission of the triune God in the world. The shift was fundamental: from a Christologically based understanding of the church having a mission in the world to a Trinitarian understanding that God’s mission in the world has a church.

With the remarkable declaration in 1965 in the Vatican Council’s Ad Gentes that the church is missionary “by her very nature,” Roman Catholics joined in reframing Western understandings of mission. This shift in perspective on mission was tied to Vatican II’s reframing of Roman Catholicism’s understanding of the church, moving away from institutional terms and reconceptualizing it as primarily the people of God thought of in communal terms. This shift unleashed generative work on mission theology among Catholics, especially by liberation and feminist theologians. To these developments Orthodox circles contributed an emphasis on the social reality of the Trinity and on the significance of the community gathered around the Eucharist for shaping the character of mission.

All of these developments, well summarized by David Bosch in his Transforming Mission (1991), fed into the theme of convergence present in mission theology in the last half of the twentieth century. To some extent this conversation continues,

**Mission work in general functioned within the hegemonic framework of the worldwide influence of the United States.**

but it is, I believe, increasingly a dated conversation primarily occurring in Western settings. Changes are under way today to which Western students of mission need to attend if we are to understand the future of the discipline of missiology.

**Mission theology and the global church.** For as long as there has been a church, the global church has been thinking theologically, with diverse theological perspectives emerging out of diverse local contexts. What became problematic for theologizing in context was the claim made within the Euro-tribal faith traditions that if orthodoxy was to be preserved, their particular framing of truth must be acknowledged as universally normative.

Attention to the theme of contextualization during the latter half of the twentieth century led to increased emphasis on the importance of context, fostering the development of theology in context and the rise of local theologies. An abundance of adjectival theologies—black theology, feminist theology, water buffalo theology, minjung theology, and others—was the result. Interestingly, many adjectival theologies have used traditional Western theological frameworks for shaping their alternative theological understandings.
Theologically, we may be at a point of transition. The theological hegemony exercised by the West appears to be going through a process of deconstruction as more contextual theological perspectives continue to surface within the majority church in the South. North American missiologists—as well as our colleagues in the fields of systematic, history, and biblical studies—need to engage this conversation more substantively.

**Mission theology, missiology, and ecclesiology.** Stanley Skreslet’s recent book *Comprehending Mission* (2012) challenges the premise that a focus on mission theology is adequate for framing the discipline of missiology. He rightly contends that such an approach often results in theology’s being framed too abstractly and in the concrete realities of the lived life of Christian communities not being taken seriously enough. He proposes three foci for the discipline of missiology: processes of religious change, the reality of faith, and use of an integrative multidisciplinary approach. I appreciate much in his argument, but an underlying concern leads me to take a different approach.

In our understanding of missiology, I believe that it is essential to keep the active agency of God, closely coupled to Christian communities seeking to live in faithful relationship with the triune God, at the center of the conversation. This Trinitarian perspective, tightly tied to the reality of incarnational Christian communities, keeps theology grounded in local contexts. Skreslet critiques Bosch’s mission theology as being too abstract at the same time that he criticizes Bosch for tying his understanding of missiology to ecclesiology. His criticisms have merit, but I want to argue the other side, that Bosch did not take his argument far enough, failing to attend to the way the church as Christian congregations actually lives in the world.

Western missiology has given extensive attention to planting congregations, but for the most part it has failed to develop a congregationally focused missiology that deals substantively with the challenges congregations face as they live in particular contexts. This disjunction is rooted, I believe, in the way the discipline of missiology rose within the modern mission movement. The categories used were “church” and “missions,” later “church” and “mission.” Unfortunately, once one frames discussion around those two categories, as Bosch continued to do, one has created a dichotomy that is almost impossible to overcome. Impulses in the 1960s sought to merge missiology and ecclesiology into a missiological ecclesiology, but they were soon sidetracked by the secularization debate.

With the work of the GOCN in North America in the 1990s, discussion of the relationship between missiology and ecclesiology was picked up again, eventually leading to publication of the multiauthored work *Missional Church* (1998). Drawing primarily on a Western understanding of the sending Trinity, *Missional Church* collapsed the dichotomy between church and mission by developing a missiological ecclesiology that focused on congregations as the primary location of God’s work in the world.

Numerous other volumes published over the past decade have elaborated the argument for a missiological ecclesiology, or missional church. These works make significant contributions, but Newbigin’s original challenge regarding the relationship between Gospel and culture seems too often to have faded from view. This absence is clearly seen in the way so many have used missional language primarily as an ecclesiological strategy regarding how churches need to change when facing a changing context.

What does a robust missiological critique of North American culture linked to a missiological ecclesiology that focuses on congregations in context have to offer as a framework for conceiving of the discipline of missiology? At least three things. First, it is profoundly Trinitarian, drawing on both the sending and social realities of the living and triune God. Second, it is profoundly contextual in focusing on congregations that are seeking to live as incarnational communities within the particularities of their locations. Third, it is profoundly pneumatological in understanding that congregations are not only created by the Spirit but also are to be led by the Spirit. Primary focus is placed on God’s active agency in the midst of local communities of faith that are seeking to discern the leading of God’s Spirit within their particular locations.

**The discipline of missiology and the academy.** Earlier I noted that for Protestants the discipline of missiology, born of the modern missions movement, is largely a stepchild in the theological academy. Just when many theological schools were creating mission courses and adding chairs of mission, the world changed and the colonial enterprise was dismantled. In consequence, many mainline theological schools dropped their mission courses and terminated mission professorships. Some ground has been regained in a number of these theological schools, but for the most part the discipline of missiology still struggles to find a hearing within the larger theological curriculum.

In evangelical schools developments have been quite different. Many institutions have expanded their mission curriculum and increased mission professorships since the 1970s. These developments have paralleled the growth of the evangelical mission movement, which coalesced around the Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization. But substantive changes are afoot. Though frontier missions and cross-cultural church planting are still the primary focus for many evangelical organizations, today most mission organizations find it essential to partner more directly with church bodies already in existence in many places across the Global South.

Perhaps a more telling sign of the shift taking place in North American evangelical schools is the change of name from departments of mission or missiology to departments of intercultural studies. In part this change is driven by continued postcolonial critique, but it also reflects the growing presence of the majority church in the South and the changing role of Western personnel working within those contexts.

The question now becomes, What is the future of the discipline of missiology? I believe there is a future for those of us who work in the North American context. But it is a future that will look quite different from the way we presently function. First, missiology must participate in bringing a robust Trinitarian mission theology into conversation with the whole of the theological curriculum. This dialogue within North American theological schools will require that we build collaborative partnerships with our systematic, historical, and biblical studies colleagues, something at which missiologists have not been particularly adept. With today’s decline in many schools of both funding and enrollment, much in theological education is up for grabs, providing a fresh opportunity for (1) reframing the theological curriculum around the hermeneutic of a missional reading of all of Scripture and (2) the integration across the whole of the curriculum of a Trinitarian mission theology that focuses significantly on congregations in context.

Second, engaging in this work will assist us in fundamental reframing of the Euro-tribal traditions with their presumption, inherited from Christendom, of an assumed cultural dominion. A Trinitarian mission theology that places primary focus on...
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congregations ministering within dynamically changing contexts will help us at last to break the lock that—because of the legacy of Christendom—homoletics, liturgics, Christian education, and pastoral care have had on the imagination of leadership formation. This type of missiological approach to theological education is required if we are to take seriously that (1) North America is, in fact, a mission field, (2) congregations in context are the primary location of God’s redemptive presence in the world, and (3) we need to engage the numerous immigrant Christian communities now present in our North American contexts. Finally, this type of approach is required if we are to take up the most fundamental question—one that for the most part has been left unattended in North America—of the relationship between the Gospel and North American culture.

The adaptive challenge that North American missiologists face arises from our failure to focus sufficiently on our own context (i.e., the United States and North America) and from our inadequate employment of a missiological ecclesiology designed for congregations in context. In these shortcomings we continue to marginalize our own voices, as well as selling short the contributions the discipline of missiology can make to theological education in the academy and to congregations on the ground.

Conclusion

What, then, is the future of the discipline of missiology? The future is filled with significant opportunities, as I have tried to point out. But realizing this future will require us to reframe much of the way we have thought about missiology and many of the mission practices we have utilized. Realizing this future entails addressing adaptive challenges that will take us out of our comfort zone. May the Spirit of the living God be at work in our midst in the years to come to provoke us, to disturb us, and to empower us to address the adaptive challenges we are facing, so that we can participate more fully in God’s mission in the world!

Notes

2. The phrase “Euro-tribal” is used throughout this article to refer to the various ethnic clans on the European continent during the sixteenth century whose populations were caught up in the Protestant Reformation, and who eventually were formed into Protestant state churches.
5. Jenkins, Next Christendom, 3.
7. Gary Simpson, professor of systematic theology at Luther Seminary, regularly treats these concepts in his courses.
12. These confessions include the Augsburg Confession (1530), Calvin’s Institutes (1536), the Thirty-Nine Articles (1563), the Belgic Confession (1566), and the Westminster Confession (1646).
17. Examples include the Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Episcopalians.
18. These tendencies were present, for example, among Congregationalists, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), Churches of Christ, and several strains of Baptists.
24. This Trinitarian turn continued to be nuanced over the next several decades, primarily in ecumenical circles but also to some extent among evangelicals, especially in the 1982 Lausanne Committee for World Evangelization meeting in Grand Rapids, Michigan.
27. The same has also been true for many theologians from the majority church in the South, since they received their theological training in Western schools.
28. Numerous examples of such voices are in print today, thanks largely to the publishing commitments of Orbis Books over the past few decades.
31. An especially strong contribution has been made by bringing Orthodox perspectives on the social Trinity more substantively into the conversation.
33. Examples include Fuller’s School of Intercultural Studies, Trinity’s Mission and Evangelism Department, and Asbury’s School of World Mission and Evangelism.
Missiology as an Interested Discipline—and Where Is It Happening?

Dwight P. Baker

I grew up as a third-culture kid (or third-subculture kid) years before such language was popular, but my siblings and I were quite aware of cultural nonfit as a reality. When I was four, our family moved to western Pennsylvania, where my father became pastor of a recently established, struggling Brethren church. As members of a splinter segment of the Dunkards, or German Baptist Brethren, established in 1708 by Alexander Mack, we were a minority presence in an overwhelmingly Orthodox and Roman Catholic community.

As a family, we knew that we were in Appalachia but not of it. We were always aware of the cultural differences between us and our neighbors—coal miners of Eastern European extraction, who still spoke their Slavic languages. Similarly, when my father took another pastorate deeper in Appalachia, the subcultural differences between us and the Scotch-Irish mountain folk among whom we lived and ministered were deep indeed.

I was always from somewhere else. As a youth in Appalachia I internally identified myself as being from California, the state of my birth. As a teenager working during the summers in Indiana, I identified myself as from Aleppo, Pennsylvania, something that for personal reasons I did through college and beyond. As plain folk, the Brethren, even the partially acculturated branch that for personal reasons I did through college and beyond. As I identified myself as from Aleppo, Pennsylvania, something my birth. As a teenager working during the summers in Indiana, I internally identified myself as being from California, the state of whom we lived and ministered were deep indeed.

Coming to Missiology

Mission and missions were part of my family from before my birth. Forebears on my mother’s side had been Brethren lay pastors for several generations. Her brother and a sister served on the mission field. Another sister was a pastor’s wife, and the remaining sibling was an active Christian worker. When I was a teenager, my mother told me of her regret that instead of becoming a missionary, the rigors of which she felt she was fitted to sustain, she had been merely a pastor’s wife. A hierarchy of Christian callings was strongly present in my childhood home.

The small Christian college that I attended did not offer anthropology, but I began reading the subject on my own. My point of entry was *Customs and Cultures*, by Eugene Nida, followed by *Message and Mission* and anything else of his I could locate. I read the journal *Practical Anthropology*, which led me to Jacob Loewen, William Reyburn, William Smalley, Louis Luzbetak, and many others. Along the way I encountered Charles Taber, also raised in the Brethren Church and dealing with the same types of questions as I was. Eventually, I became assistant editor of *Practical Anthropology* (whose editor then was Taber), which later was subsumed into *Missiology: An International Review*.

Anthropology (and the social sciences more broadly) supplied conceptual tools for thinking about the life experiences and heritage that had formed me. Fascinating in itself, anthropology provided conceptual maps that helped to clarify the inchoate data of life. The instruments it supplied extended my understanding of the human experience and of God’s interaction and intervention therein. The discipline held out possibilities for removing misunderstandings and improving communication, including communication of the Gospel. When, years later, the concept of third-culture kids was developed, it illuminated much of my own experience. I also noted that it was erected on foundations of an anthropological understanding of culture and emerged in the context of ethnographic fieldwork.

Missiology: What It Is

If anthropology can provide tools for clarifying life issues, what can it do for missionary practice? What role does it have in mission studies? in missionary formation?

Missiology is inherently and necessarily interdisciplinary. We may picture the field as a three-legged stool, with the seat, missiology, supported by the sturdy legs of history, theology, and anthropology. Such an image has its uses—but what if we flip the image on its head, with the three legs sticking up, and add a fourth leg, actually an axis, on the bottom? The stool thus becomes a gyroscope or a top. In this view the added leg is missionary practice, upon which all of the inverted upper legs direct their attention, with the intention of (1) understanding and (2) refining, reforming, and reshaping missionary practice.

This added element of dual intentionality distinguishes missiology from mission studies in general. The wider field of mission studies offers numerous examples of instructive investigation of missionary practice that record the results of research into cultural, religious, organizational, and other dynamics illumined by missionary practice, but without any intrinsic concern to see the ends of mission carried forward. Such studies have their own purposes and their own merit. But missiology and missiologists, as I am using the terms, have some skin in the game; they have something at stake, and they want something more. They want to see the work of mission carried forward, but they grieve when zeal is needlessly unyoked from thoughtful reflection or when mission enthusiasm, good in itself, rushes unformedly forward. Missiology does more than simply record missionary practice; it seeks, as stated, to reform or reshape missionary practice, missionary theory, even missionary strategy, and to refine missionary self-understanding in ways that will enhance missionary effectiveness. It is intrinsically an interested discipline, one in which the practitioners themselves, as well as their students and followers, are affected. Missiology merits our close attention because the outcomes of good missiology, as of missiology poorly conceived, are so consequential.

Missiology as a field draws on the techniques and data of the disciplines of history, theology, and anthropology. Missionary practice in turn supplies abundant and at times unique data to these fields. It has something to give as well as something to
gain. Feedback loops therefore appear on all sides of our upside-down stool or top.

For a top to stand up or to travel, it must spin. Dynamism is indispensable. A static top falls over. Similarly, a missiology without internal development, one that resists change and growth, ossifies and fades into irrelevance.

Finally, for a top to spin, its components must be proportionate and in balance. Lopsided or out-of-balance tops fall over. What if one leg of our imaginary inverted stool swells up and demands that it be accorded the prerogatives of the whole? And what if one facet of missiology—say, theology—lays claim to overwhelming primacy? That missiology becomes unbalanced as well and fares no better. All the facets of missiology have a part to play, and each must be satisfied to play its own part. Self-aggrandizement, pretensions to self-sufficiency, or willful claims that one part contains all wisdom are uncalled for. Just proportionally—for the task to which they have been both called and sent. In part, it grows out of a desire to see that those human resources be well organized, well utilized, and well provided for. All of this intellectual and practical effort is undertaken to the end that more peoples, that is, ethnolinguistic collectivities, and more persons, considered as individuals, might learn of Jesus Christ and join in glorifying God through him—and so that the purposes of God the Father for humankind, made known supremely in Christ Jesus, might be accomplished through the power of the life-giving Spirit.

Missiology: Wrought, Caught, or Taught?

Missiology, we might say, consists of zeal seeking the accompaniment of knowledge; always beyond, however, beckons the realm of doxology. With such a conception of missiology, a number of questions come to mind, among them the issue of missiological formation. Is missiology something that is wrought (i.e., a field that a young person might deliberately plan to enter)? Is missiology simply caught? Or can missiology be taught? Where and how is the next generation of those to whom Samuel Escobar refers as loving critics of mission practice being formed?

Something wrought? I have had the privilege of interviewing a small number of eminent mission leaders. One of the questions I have asked is, Did you set out to become a missiologist? It may not be a surprise to learn that the answer has uniformly been No, varying from mild amusement at the idea to emphatic dismissal of it. The things they had in common were (1) missional intention and engagement of some form, thereby being “in the way” and available to follow the path that led to their current activities and positions, and (2) rigorous pursuit of advanced academic training that helped to equip them for their present roles. They set out to do one thing and ended up doing not exactly it, but it and much more.

In the field of missionary anthropology, if you are of my age, Charles Taber, Jacob Loewen, and Paul Heibert come to mind as examples of persons who entered doctoral study in anthropology after some years of missionary service on the field. Their mission experience led them to advanced study rather than the other way around. They were already reflecting on missional practice and anthropology gave them tools to carry their analysis further.

Something caught? How is a vision transmitted? How are skills and outlook passed along? Through contact, exposure, demonstration, and long-term relationships, certainly, and it is no surprise that mentorships and apprenticeships are time-honored means of transmitting skills and inculcating values. Names of persons who invested heavily in fostering future missiologists and mission leaders outside a formal academic structure include Eugene Nida, Lesslie Newbigin, and Wilbert Shenk. Nida had a knack for identifying and enlisting younger scholars with strong academic outlook passed along? Through contact, exposure, demonstration, and long-term relationships, certainly, and it is no surprise that mentorships and apprenticeships are time-honored means of transmitting skills and inculcating values. Names of persons who invested heavily in fostering future missiologists and mission leaders outside a formal academic structure include Eugene Nida, Lesslie Newbigin, and Wilbert Shenk. Nida had a knack for identifying and enlisting younger scholars with strong academic credentials to engage in various aspects of Bible translation theory and practice. Together they formed a Bible translation think tank, collaborating with him in his multidisciplinary writing projects and working to develop theoretical guidance and translation aids for the worldwide Bible translation effort.3

Wilbert Shenk has written extensively on missiological topics, served as director of the Missiology of Western Culture project, and coordinated missiological publishing projects such as the Modern Mission Era, 1792–1992, a series published by Mercer University Press. But something that I have long admired is that, before joining the Fuller School of Intercultural Studies faculty...
in Pasadena, California, while still a mission administrator, he scheduled regular colloquia for field missionary personnel. They would gather to present papers on a preassigned theme and be encouraged to deepen their own missiological reflection. Some of the papers eventually bore fruit as chapters of books or grew into full-scale books in their own right. John Driver and David Shank are two who have expressed appreciation for the formative value those colloquia and Wilbert Shenk’s mentoring had for their own missional thought and publications.

One thinks as well of the missiological significance of the study group that Lesslie Newbigin formed as a missionary in India and of the immense accession to mission-historical scholarship brought about through the North Atlantic Missiology Project spearheaded by Andrew Walls among others. Though not all of the works produced would fit comfortably within the confines of interested or engaged missiology as I am defining the field, the gains for mission history from Walls’s efforts through NAMP and, with Lamin Sanneh, through the Yale-Edinburgh Group on the History of the Missionary Movement and World Christianity are incalculable.

Something taught? A missiological outlook can be caught, but can honed reflection on missional practice for the sake of facilitating, refining, and enhancing missional engagement be taught? We had better trust that the answer is yes—otherwise, a number of persons have reason, for the sake of conscience, to seek another source of employment!

The interviews that I have conducted are not sufficient in number or in randomness to constitute any type of scientific survey, but the consistency in response to some questions has both interest and possible significance. For example, despite Fuller Theological Seminary’s continuing preponderance in the number of missiological dissertations produced, no one that I have interviewed has pointed to a single school or institution as presently dominant in the field of missiology, certainly not in the way that Fuller’s School of World Mission was viewed within the United States during the 1970s and 1980s. When I have asked where cutting-edge missiological thinking and research are occurring, the response has not been to mention schools of world mission as schools but to point to individuals here and there. The interdisciplinary nature of missiology is strongly, even adamantly, stressed. Concern has been voiced, rising to the level of lament, over what is perceived as the weak and weakening presence of missionary anthropology in the faculty mix.

A theme that has emerged is that missiology is not cotermi-
nous with mission strategy, a note that I would like to underscore. One person remarked that the perception (at least in the United States) that missiology and strategy are largely the same thing is not large. What can be done to foster anthropological scholar-
ship as a Christian calling, entered into either for its own sake or for the sake of strengthening Christian missionary practice?

Faculty Formation

If, as I suggested earlier, anthropology offers tools and perspec-
tives that enable individuals and social groups to come to a better understanding of themselves and the forces that impinge upon them, and if anthropology can provide categories for discussing social relationships and dynamics, can anthropology and the social sciences do something similar for mission studies and mission practice? I believe they can. One of the strengths of liberation theology, in my view, was to refrain from speaking until having become intimately acquainted with where the people to whom it was speaking dwelt, with where they walked, sat, ate, and slept. Anthropology offers tools for deep entry into people’s lives. Where people are at home is anthropology’s native ground. It would be shortsighted for missiology or mission studies departments not to avail themselves of anthropology’s insights and expertise, and not just at second hand through readings, but at first hand by seeking anthropologically trained and experienced instructors as members of their faculties.

That stated, I would raise a few questions about faculty formation and the formation of missionary anthropologists in particular. Who is encouraging younger scholars with potential, not just to think of the immediate short term, but to undertake extended preparation that will equip them for larger roles and wider service down the road? Who is mentoring them beyond the confines of degree-program requirements? Or is it all a matter of “seeing what or who happens to emerge from the stew”? Also, what is the obligation of older faculty to step aside gracefully so that there is room for younger faculty to take up the load and bring new insights?

Another question: in the case of missionary anthropologists, not just are there too few in an absolute sense, but are too many instructors being drawn from the schools of world mission’s own graduates in intercultural studies (every blessing upon them)? Have insufficient numbers gone through the rigors of a full university anthropological program (may their tribe increase)? Is the missionary anthropology that is offered by schools of world mission today being watered down by becoming an in-grown, in-house product? Where are the Christians with mission experi-

No one I have interviewed has pointed to a single school or institution as presently dominant in the field of missiology.

Missiology after Mission?

A few comments and questions about the future. Specifically, what steps are mission departments and schools of world mission taking to position themselves to be helpful to persons engaged in mission in the years ahead? We have lived through the end of the Carey era, that is, the era in which mission societies were or thought of themselves as being the central players in the mis-
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ence who are presently pursuing Ph.D. degrees through major research university departments of anthropology? The number is not large. What can be done to foster anthropological scholar-
ship as a Christian calling, entered into either for its own sake or for the sake of strengthening Christian missionary practice?
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tives that enable individuals and social groups to come to a better understanding of themselves and the forces that impinge upon them, and if anthropology can provide categories for discussing social relationships and dynamics, can anthropology and the social sciences do something similar for mission studies and mission practice? I believe they can. One of the strengths of liberation theology, in my view, was to refrain from speaking until having become intimately acquainted with where the people to whom it was speaking dwelt, with where they walked, sat, ate, and slept. Anthropology offers tools for deep entry into people’s lives. Where people are at home is anthropology’s native ground. It would be shortsighted for missiology or mission studies departments not to avail themselves of anthropology’s insights and expertise, and not just at second hand through readings, but at first hand by seeking anthropologically trained and experienced instructors as members of their faculties.

That stated, I would raise a few questions about faculty formation and the formation of missionary anthropologists in particular. Who is encouraging younger scholars with potential, not just to think of the immediate short term, but to undertake extended preparation that will equip them for larger roles and wider service down the road? Who is mentoring them beyond the confines of degree-program requirements? Or is it all a matter of “seeing what or who happens to emerge from the stew”? Also, what is the obligation of older faculty to step aside gracefully so that there is room for younger faculty to take up the load and bring new insights?
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Instead of continuity across decades and even centuries, we see effective functioning of a lifespan or less. Instead of lifelong or career missionary commitments, we observe short-termism of progressively shorter duration. In light of these trends, how do missiological thinking and instruction need to change? Are our inherited models of missiological analysis and reflection adapted for working with organizations and their agents (i.e., with societies, agencies, and denominational boards of world mission and their field personnel), but ill-adapted for analysis of today’s adventitious missional enterprises? Is our missiology able to cope with mission as fleeting encounter, mission as adjunct to tourism, and various transitory forms that claim the label of mission today? Is mission as a recognizable and to some degree shapeable movement in fact now a thing of the past?

What is missiology after mission, and what does missiology have to study after the “disappearance” of the missionary? And what about those nonmissionaries “chiefly responsible” for the spread of the Gospel across Africa, namely, “African catechists and evangelists”? A similar question applies as well to many others in numerous other regions of the world. Is missiology even equipped to recognize their existence, let alone able to document and analyze their contribution?

Conclusion

Finally, I should acknowledge an apparent conflict between what I have written here and the view of missiology developed by Stanley Skreslet in his outstanding overview of missiology, Comprehending Mission, and his earlier article “Configuring Missiology: Reading Classified Bibliographies as Disciplinary Maps.” I have great admiration for the breadth, depth, and thoroughness of Skreslet’s scholarship. I agree with him that scholarly interest in mission studies has burgeoned far beyond the fold of the missions, but illadapted for analysis of high-caliber, in-depth, scholarly analyses and reports on what doing mission are less likely to be carrying out and publishing. Instead of continuity across decades and even centuries, we see journals in the field of mission studies have shifted from a focus on refining or extending missional practice considered as crossing boundaries of all sorts with the announcement that salvation is to be found in Jesus Christ, to other interests such as ecumenics, interreligious dialogue, and intercultural theology, subjects valuable in themselves, certainly, but embarked on a different trajectory. The number of those persons, however, who desire to proclaim God’s glory among the nations and to invite people of all nations and tongues and tribes to become followers of Jesus is hardly inconsiderable.

Interest in mission studies is strong and growing, as evidenced by the number of journal titles, a good portion recently launched, that appear in “Missiological Journals: A Checklist,” by Jonathan Bonk. The persons and organizations that publish many of these journals have an avid interest in refining and extending missional practice and in urging others to join in doing so. I find it useful to reserve the term “missiology” for such interests and advocacy and to use the term “mission studies” for the broader, more diffuse, and at times less existentially committed field of scholarship. But it is to this distinction itself that I wish to call attention, one that I believe runs deeper than simply a distinction between emic and etic perspectives. I have no great stake in one word or term versus another. It does seem, however, that there should be something better to offer than “missiology” versus “missiology to the second power,” or “mission” versus “missiology by those who are actually invested in it” (not Skreslet’s terms) for facilitating discussion.

Finally, if, as it seems, those who are deeply invested in doing mission are less likely to be carrying out and publishing high-caliber, in-depth, scholarly analyses and reports on what they are doing (vs. focusing more on producing enlistment brochures, brief guides for volunteers, and appeals for prayer and funds), then this deficiency offers a challenge to be addressed by missiologists and engaged professors of mission alike. Taking up that challenge is a significant task that lies ever before us.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this article was presented to the Association of Professors of Mission, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, June 21, 2013.
4. One couple active in mission leadership write, “We believe that it is important for kingdom-minded Christians to come to terms with the fact that the title of ‘missionary’ is becoming less and less useful, in both mission-sending and mission-receiving contexts.” See Frank Decker and Victoria Decker, “Response to ‘Korean Missionary Families and Retirement,’” in Family Accountability in Missions: Korean and Western Case Studies, ed. Jonathan J. Bonk et al. (New Haven, Conn.: OMSC Publications, 2013), p. 207.
8. Whatever differences we may have in emphasis, Skreslet and I are fully at one when he writes that “the real-world conditions of human culture are just as important to understand as theological points of view” (“Configuring Missiology,” 198), a position that is ably developed in his volume Comprehending Mission.
Much attention has been given in recent years to the role of business in missions. Often called “business as mission” (BAM), the integration of business and missions presents new opportunities and raises new questions for mission scholars. It represents an opportunity in that BAM is the only ministry or mission strategy that has the potential to create wealth and support itself. All other ministries in various ways must transfer wealth from one group (individual donors, governments, and so forth) to another to stay afloat. Yet this self-supporting aspect also raises some important theological, legal, and economic questions. Theologically, it requires Christians to develop an understanding of how business relates to missio Dei. Legally, those conducting BAM within the context of a government-approved charity must exercise great care to avoid violating the law. Economically, since BAM is essentially a for-profit ministry, it raises many questions about how to structure and manage such a ministry for maximum impact.

This article focuses on the economic question, specifically the role—good or bad—of economic incentives within a BAM context. A concern held by many mission leaders is that economic incentives, if left unchecked, can cause practitioners to lose sight of their ministry goals. Indeed, this fear underlies the advice often given to missionary-practitioners that they should keep their businesses small and continue to draw donor support rather than become dependent on the business for their salaries.

The findings of this study do not support this concern. Based on a survey of 119 BAM practitioners, it finds that donor-supported practitioners are no more effective in producing spiritual fruit than their business-supported peers. Furthermore, in terms of other kinds of “fruit,” business-supported practitioners report significantly better results. This difference may partially be a function of firm size—donor-supported BAM practitioners tend to have smaller businesses than business-supported practitioners and are therefore likely to have regular contact with fewer people. Conversely, a thriving, highly visible business has greater transformative potential than a struggling, low-profile business. The evidence presented in this article suggests that, for a BAM business to have a meaningful impact in a community, it should be structured and incentivized much like a “regular” business, which includes (1) an independent board of directors and (2) salaries that are based, at least in part, on the company’s performance.

We consider first the definition and goals of a BAM business followed by a review of previous empirical work in this area.

Building on that foundation, two hypotheses are generated, and the results of the study are presented.

### Definition and Goals of a BAM Business

Today we have a bewildering range of definitions of BAM. It might be helpful to think of the alternatives on a continuum, as shown in the four contrasts below. On one end are those who see BAM mainly as a vehicle for evangelism and church planting. These practitioners are usually affiliated with a missionary-sending agency or denomination and are often donor supported. They may engage in business somewhat reluctantly, for they would rather be doing “regular missionary work,” but the country in which they serve does not issue visas for such work. For them, business is primarily a means to an end, and time spent doing business is by definition time not spent doing ministry. Small businesses are often preferred, and donor support is seen as essential for (1) insulating practitioners from the pressures that accompany running a business and (2) keeping practitioners focused on their ministry goals.

At the other end of the continuum are those who see BAM as a long-overdue acknowledgment that business is itself a divine calling and a ministry, one that is every bit as important as the work of pastors and missionaries. Practitioners who hold this view are often in a “regular business” context in the sense that they are typically not affiliated with a missionary-sending agency. They are sincere Christians who find themselves, for various economic reasons, located in a part of the world that has great social and spiritual need. Their definition of ministry is often broader than that of the average missionary, but the impact they have when led by the Holy Spirit can be no less impressive.

As with any continuum, most entries fall somewhere in between the two end points. In fact, there is widespread agreement on at least one point—the ultimate goal is to glorify God and to help facilitate the “holistic transformation” of a community, introducing true shalom. The differences come down to one’s theological starting points and areas of emphasis. Advocates of BAM have begun referring to the areas of emphasis as the “bottom lines” of a BAM business, which, in addition to financial profitability, include explicit social, environmental, and spiritual goals.

### Previous Empirical Work on BAM

Thus far, most evidence on the impact of BAM has been anecdotal and based on limited case studies. The idiosyncratic nature of such evidence makes it difficult to draw any generalizable con-
conclusions. Unfortunately, we presently have only a few rigorous studies that attempt to identify consistent strengths or weaknesses among a large sample of BAM businesses. Of those, none look explicitly at the role of economic incentives, although to the extent that they shed light on other kinds of incentives, they are relevant and interesting.

The first and perhaps most ambitious study was conducted by Patrick Lai as part of his doctoral work at the Asia Graduate School of Theology. This study was a follow-up to Donald Hamilton’s groundbreaking research published in 1987 on tentmaker effectiveness. Like Hamilton’s study, Lai’s definition of “effective” centered on spiritual outcomes, specifically: (1) the number of people the tentmakers led to Christ, (2) the number of people they discipled in the Word, and (3) the number of churches they planted. In addition to being focused exclusively on the single “bottom line” of spiritual impact, it looked only at individual effectiveness, not at the effectiveness of a team or business.

Most of Lai’s subjects were donor-supported tentmakers affiliated with missionary-sending agencies who themselves emphasized evangelistic outcomes over other measures of kingdom impact. Somewhat predictably, those who stood out as most effective were spiritually mature and evangelistically zealous, as well as socially well adjusted, focused, and well organized. Lai also discovered something counterintuitive: those who believed that the ultimate objective of mission was simply to win people to Christ were actually less effective in accomplishing these goals. The most consistently effective tentmakers were those who defined their objective as “transforming society” more generally. These findings provide our first hint that a holistic, multiple-bottom-line approach to ministry may ultimately be more fruitful, even in terms of spiritual outcomes.

Another study that considered the effectiveness of BAM—but at the business level rather than the individual level—reached a similar conclusion. Like the previous study, this one was part of a doctoral program. Mark Russell carried out the study at Asbury Theological Seminary and published it in 2011 under the title The Use of Business in Missions in Chiang Mai, Thailand. In an effort to reduce the number of cultural and geopolitical variables, Russell focused on the single city of Chiang Mai, where he conducted an in-depth study of twelve self-identified missionary-run businesses. The results were similar to Lai’s, although much more pronounced—those who had a single-minded focus on spiritual fruit were surprisingly less effective at producing spiritual fruit than those who had broader goals.

Two other studies looked at the motivations of BAM practitioners, not their impact. David Bronkema and Christopher Brown found evidence that, despite all the references in the BAM literature to societal transformation, practitioners themselves seem to care only about the economic and spiritual impact. In their survey of thirty-nine “practitioners and theorists,” not one identified societal or developmental transformation as one of the expected outcomes or best practices. In another study, Linda Christiansen administered a survey to nineteen seminar participants and two coaches. Contrary to Bronkema and Brown, she concluded that BAM practitioners are more interested in societal and spiritual outcomes than in the economic viability of their businesses.

These studies suggest that much more empirical work is needed before we can say with any confidence how, and under what circumstances, BAM has a kingdom impact. The present study is an attempt to begin filling that gap.

**Hypotheses**

Previous studies looked at the priorities of BAM practitioners and, in the case of Lai and Russell, compared these priorities with actual outcomes. Given the important role economic incentives play in shaping one’s priorities, there is a need for more studies that look at how such incentives help or hinder a BAM initiative.

Therefore, this study looks at the correlation, if any, between how BAM practitioners are paid and their reported outcomes. In line with the concept of “holistic transformation,” the study employs the “quadruple bottom line” language that is common in the BAM literature, namely, that of improving the conditions of a community’s economic, social, spiritual, and environmental circumstances.

Taking the “business-as-mission continuum” above as an accurate depiction of the BAM movement, we can propose two hypotheses. The first flows from the prediction that BAM practitioners who are completely dependent on the business for their personal salaries will devote more time and energy to the business and are therefore more likely to have a greater economic impact. Simply stated:

**Hypothesis 1:** Business-supported BAM practitioners will have a greater (more beneficial) economic impact on the local community than their donor-supported peers.

The second hypothesis assumes that donor-supported BAM practitioners, because they are freed from the pressures of growing a successful business, will be more accountable for producing explicit spiritual fruit, more focused on that goal, and more effective in that area.

**Hypothesis 2:** Donor-supported BAM practitioners will be more effective in producing spiritual fruit than their business-supported peers.

**Data and Methodology**

In an attempt to assess the link between compensation and impact, a fifty-nine-question survey was constructed and made available to BAM practitioners around the world via SurveyMonkey. Leaders of mission agencies and BAM networks were asked to assist in getting the word out. Rather than impose a “correct” definition of BAM and risk excluding some well-intentioned Christians, the survey was made available to anyone who self-identified as a BAM practitioner. This included donor-supported missionary-practitioners and self-supported “regular” business people who were not affiliated with a missionary-sending organization. The
One striking difference between donor-supported BAM and business-supported BAM is in the area of accountability and governance.

because the company itself does not have an expressly Christian purpose. In addition to asking for demographic information (e.g., age, gender, and educational background), the survey asked questions relating to the company’s location, structure, industry, and impact in the areas of economic (8 questions), social (5 questions), spiritual (7 questions), and environmental (5 questions) transformation. Some questions were repeated across all four bottom lines and provided opportunity for qualitative self-assessments in each of the four areas. For example, a question asked for each bottom line was “How would you rate the impact of your business over the past three years?” The possible answers were “Exceptionally strong,” “Generally pretty good,” “OK, but could be better,” “Not very good,” and “We’re not making a serious effort in this area.” Other questions were attempts to quantify the impact by identifying specific activities consistent with that bottom line, resources devoted to those activities, or specific outcomes.

Responses to the question “How would you rate the [economic, social, spiritual, or environmental] impact of your business over the past three years?” were then converted to a four-point Likert scale. Responses of “We’re not making a serious effort in this area” were assigned a zero score, and the responses “Exceptionally strong” and “Generally pretty good” were grouped together and assigned the top score of three. Once converted to a numerical score, it became possible to rank surveys either by total impact (the sum of the scores) or by specific bottom lines. Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were then performed to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in the performance of fully donor-supported and fully business-supported BAM practitioners.

Results and Assessment

Demographic and geographic breakdown. Of the 190 surveys collected over two years, 71 were discarded either because they were woefully incomplete or early-stage start-ups or because they failed the test described above of being a BAM practitioner. Also excluded were those operating in North America. Of the 119 surveys remaining, 38 respondents drew their salaries entirely from donors, 35 were living entirely on income from the business, and 46 were drawing salaries from a combination of the two sources. See table 1 for the demographic breakdown.

Table 1. Demographic information for the 119 survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average age: 41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (bachelor’s degree or higher)</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This largely white, male, and American sample is probably not an accurate reflection of the BAM movement as a whole, but rather of the North American and Western European components of that movement. Thus, the responses given and the conclusions drawn may apply only to North Americans and Europeans.

As we can see in table 2, nearly all the businesses represented in the sample are for-profit enterprises, which holds true as well for the donor-supported practitioners. One striking difference between the two groups is in the area of accountability and governance. Nearly 80 percent of the practitioners who are fully business-supported work for companies that have a board of directors, whereas boards of directors are much less common for the donor-supported practitioners. The reverse is true for affiliation with a missionary-sending agency or denomination: fully 97 percent of the donor-supported practitioners are affiliated with an agency, compared with 35.3 percent of the business-supported practitioners.

Table 2. Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donor supported</th>
<th>Business supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founded as a for-profit enterprise</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have board of directors</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation with a mission agency</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To test the possibility that boards and agencies are equally effective forms of accountability for BAM businesses, Wilcoxon tests were run to ascertain the overall impact of companies with a board only and those with agency affiliation only. The impact of a board on total effectiveness is quite strong and statistically significant, with a p-value of 0.0001919. The impact of agency affiliation, however, is negligible. Simply stated, an independent board of directors makes a big difference on total impact, but agency affiliation does not. Tests were also performed on individual bottom lines to see whether perhaps a board or agency affiliation was positively correlated with high scores in specific areas. Surprisingly, no correlation was found with respect to individual bottom lines. For example, agency affiliation did not lead to higher scores in the spiritual bottom line, and having an independent board was not correlated with lower scores in the spiritual bottom line.

Table 3 shows the geographic distribution of the businesses. Most of them (those in lines 1 and 3–5) are operating in the so-called 10/40 Window. Specifically, 81.5 percent of the donor-supported practitioners, and 77.1 percent of the business-
supported practitioners are operating in this region. Given the sample sizes, the differences between the two subgroups are statistically insignificant.

Table 3. Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Donor supported</th>
<th>Business supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Africa</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East and Southeast Asia</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia/former USSR</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central and South America</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessing the impact of BAM companies. One observation that became immediately obvious from the surveys was that, in practice, the first three bottom lines—economic, social, and spiritual—are prominent concerns among BAM practitioners, but there is far from any consensus about the importance of having explicitly environmental goals. Most respondents claimed either to be “not making any effort” or “not doing very well” in this area. Indeed, only 2.9 percent of the donor-supported practitioners and only 17.1 percent of the business-supported practitioners reported having any explicit goals in this area. For simplicity’s sake, therefore, the environmental bottom line was dropped from the analysis that follows.

Of the remaining three bottom lines, the first tests were performed on total impact, meaning the sum of the Likert scores for the three bottom lines. This was seen as a crude approximation for impact that is holistic in nature. Given that each bottom line had a high score of three, this gives a possible total score of nine. The Wilcoxon signed-rank test is a test of medians—specifically, whether the medians are significantly different between the two subgroups. The null hypothesis is that there is no differ-

Companies and practitioners that are fully supported by income from the business have a greater social impact than those that are donor supported.

Table 4. Gross revenue over the previous three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue in U.S. dollars</th>
<th>Donor supported</th>
<th>Business supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$50,001–$150,000</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,001–$300,000</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,001–$600,000</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$600,001–$1,200,000</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,200,001–$3,000,000</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,001–$6,000,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ $6,000,001</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although no hypothesis was articulated for the social bottom line (physical, noneconomic impact), it is worth noting that the differences between the two subgroups were also striking and statistically significant, although not as large as the economic impact. Many are engaged in philanthropy, community development, and education, but once again we see that, whether one looks at resources devoted to these activities or at self-reported descriptions of local impact and awareness, the companies and practitioners that are fully supported by income from the business have a greater social impact than those that are donor supported.

Perhaps the most interesting and in some ways surprising findings were in the area of the spiritual “bottom line.” Here the null hypothesis of no difference between the two subgroups could not be rejected. In other words, this study did not find evidence to support Hypothesis 2, which says that donor-supported practitioners will be more effective in producing spiritual fruit than their business-supported peers. This finding is worth looking at in some detail.

As with the other bottom lines, multiple questions were used to assess spiritual impact, including the number of people who have heard the Gospel “because of the business’s presence in the community,” number of converts, number of new believers being discipled, as well as qualitative self-assessment questions like those used in the other categories. Regrettfully, the attempt to quantify the number of converts (and other categories) largely failed. Many respondents either did not know, do not count, or provided unhelpful answers like “dozens” or “hundreds.” To the extent that some people provided numbers, which provide a general sense of the actual figures, it is not obvious that
donor-supported practitioners outperform those who are fully business-supported. This result is consistent with the qualitative self-assessments, which also show no statistical difference between the two groups. For example, in table 5 we see that 30.6 percent of the donor-supported respondents reported either “pretty good” or “exceptionally strong” results, compared with 37.1 percent of the business-supported practitioners. Given the sample sizes, the differences are a statistical tie, and we cannot reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the subgroups.

Table 5. Responses to the question “How would you rate the spiritual impact of your business over the past three years?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donor supported</th>
<th>Business supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptionally strong</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally pretty good</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK, but could be better</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very good</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’re not making a serious effort in this area</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“pretty good” or “exceptionally strong” results, compared with 37.1 percent of the business-supported practitioners. Given the sample sizes, the differences are a statistical tie, and we cannot reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the subgroups.

Table 6. Responses to the question “Which of the following statements best describes your views about the social impact of your business?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Donor supported</th>
<th>Business supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are well known in the community for our faith and as a place where people can inquire about Christianity.</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are actively seeking ways to make our faith known and have experimented with some ideas.</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When opportunities to share our faith come up, we seize them, but we’re not very intentional about it.</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have talked about becoming more open about our faith and what that looks like, but not much has come of it yet.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this point, we have made little effort to make our faith known.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approaching it from a different direction, table 6 reports the responses to a question about how well known the business is in the community for its faith and its desire to tell others about Christ. Here again we see that business-supported practitioners have a slight edge in that the companies they work for are better known in the community for their faith. This is consistent with the findings of Russell that companies that are more open and transparent about their faith have greater impact both economically and spiritually.13

Conclusions

This study found that, compared with fully donor-supported BAM practitioners, those who are fully supported by their business report significantly better results in the economic and social arenas, and are no less effective in producing spiritual results. It also found a strong, positive correlation between impact and accountability to an independent board of directors, but no such correlation for those who are affiliated only with a missionary-sending agency.

It would be premature, however, to conclude that donor support or agency affiliation is a hindrance to BAM. As the old adage warns, “Correlation does not prove causation.” Further study is needed to determine whether economic incentives alone explain the differences, or whether there are other factors that explain why donor-supported practitioners tend to underperform their business-supported peers.

Potentially fruitful avenues for further research include looking more closely at the locations of the businesses. While most participants in this survey worked in the 10/40 Window, a country-by-country analysis could reveal important differences. Another avenue would be to look at the theological presuppositions of the practitioners. Do those who seek and receive donor support think differently about missio Dei than other BAM practitioners? And what might be learned from those who draw salaries from both sources—donors and the business? As a group, this subsample reported stronger results than their fully donor-supported peers, but not as strong as the results of the fully business-supported practitioners. Do people adopt this hybrid model by design or by accident? What might be learned about the role of economic incentives by looking more closely at this group?

One thing we can say with certainty is that the questions raised by the integration of business and missions will keep mission scholars busy for a long time!

Notes


2. Patrick Lai, “Problems and Solutions for Enhancing the Effectiveness of Tentmakers Doing Church Planting in the 10/40 Window” (Ph.D. diss., Asia Graduate School of Theology, Quezon City, Philippines, 2003); Don Hamilton, Tentmakers Speak: Practical Advice from over 400 Missionary Tentmakers (Ventura, Calif.: Regal Books, [1989], 1987).

3. More on what he found to be the characteristics of an effective tentmaker can be found in chapter 4 of Lai’s book Tentmaking: Business as Mission (Colorado Springs, Colo.: Authentic Media, 2005).


8. In their open-ended comments at the end of the survey, some respondents favorably to the quadruple-bottom-line approach and its implied endorsement of holistic mission. Others excoriated the study for its apparent compartmentalization of life.

9. Statistically, grouping the top two categories reduced the variation in the samples and made it more difficult to reject the null hypothesis of there being no difference between the two subgroups.

10. The North American companies were many orders of magnitude larger than the typical BAM business in the developing world, and I felt they were not representative of the BAM movement as a whole.

11. The 10/40 Window, a term coined by Luis Bush in 1990, encompasses countries (other than in North America) lying roughly between 10 and 40 degrees north of the equator; they typically are facing high levels of poverty and have relatively little access to Christian resources.

12. In plain English, the probability that the differences in medians is a fluke and the two subgroups are in fact equally effective is 0.01 percent.


Noteworthy

Announcing

Missions and world Christianity will be among the topics addressed at the 2014 winter meeting of the American Society of Church History, to be held in Washington, D.C., January 2–5. Panel presentations will include a discussion of the recently published autobiography by IBMR contributing editor Lamin Sanneh, Summoned from the Margin: Homecoming of an African (2012). For information about the conference, see www.churchhistory.org.

The School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) at the University of London is marking the bicentenary of the birth of David Livingstone, missionary, explorer, and humanitarian, with an exhibition of historic material including rarely seen archives, photographs, maps, and artifacts. The exhibition at the Brunei Gallery at SOAS will run until March 22, 2014. See www.soas.ac.uk/gallery/livingstone.


“The Mission and Money: Mission in the Context of Global Inequalities” is the theme of a conference to be held by the Nordic Institute for Missiology and Ecumenism (NIME), April 3–6, 2014, at the Cultural Center Sofia, in Helsinki, Finland. Plenary speakers will include IBMR senior contributing editor Jonathan Bonk (Winnipeg, Canada), Ulrich Duchrow (Heidelberg, Germany), Isabel A. Phiri (KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa), Magne Supphellen (Bergen, Norway), Gerrie ter Haar (The Hague, Netherlands), and Felix Wilfred (Dublin, Ireland, and Madras, India). On the first day of the conference doctoral students will be able to present research not necessarily related to the specific theme but addressing world Christianity and mission studies more generally. For further information, see www.teol.lu.se/forskning/konferenser-och-symposier/2014-mission-and-money.

The annual meeting of the Association of Professors of Mission (APM), to be held June 19–20, 2014, at the University of Northwestern–St. Paul, St. Paul, Minnesota, will explore how the teaching of missiology engages with educational theorists and teaching methods that include but also extend beyond the fields of history, biblical studies, anthropology, and theology. For details, visit www.asmweb.org/content/apm. Proposals for papers are due by February 15, 2014.

“Contextualization in the Contemporary World” is the primary theme and “Third Era Mission” (understood as lay involvement, short-term missions, and sister-church partnerships) the secondary theme for the annual meeting of the American Society of Missiology (ASM), to be held June 20–22, 2014, at the University of Northwestern–St. Paul, St. Paul, Minnesota. Keynote speakers will include Virgilio Elizondo (Notre Dame), Marla Frederick (Harvard), and IBMR contributing editor Tite Tiénon (Trinity Evangelical Divinity School). Proposals for individual papers, as well as session proposals congruent with the theme of contextualization broadly understood or of third-era mission, are welcome and are due by February 15, 2014. Information can be found at www.asmweb.org/content/annual-meeting, or e-mail ASM president Robert J. Priest, rpriest@tiu.edu.

The 2014 conference of the Yale-Edinburgh Group on the History of the Missionary Movement and World Christianity will be held at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, June 26–28, with the theme “Gender and Family in the History of Missions and World Christianity.” For details, go to www.library.yale.edu/div/yale_edinburgh/2014theme.htm. The Yale-Edinburgh conference is cosponsored by the Centre for the Study of World Christianity at the University of Edinburgh and by Yale Divinity School and the Overseas Ministries Study Center, both in New Haven, Connecticut.

A new international peer-reviewed journal, Review of Religion and Chinese Society, will be published semiannually by Brill; its principal editor is Fenggang Yang, director of the Center on Religion and Chinese Society, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana. (The Center on Religion and Chinese Society organized the interdisciplinary conference “Global ReOrient: Chinese Pentecostal/Charismatic Movements in the Global East,” held at Purdue University, November 1–2, 2013.) “Religion” is to be understood in the broadest sense, and “Chinese society” concerns mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macau, and Chinese diaspora communities in Asia, North America, Europe, and elsewhere. Submission of articles and of proposals for special issues is encouraged. For further information, go to www.brill.com/products/journal/review-religion-and-chinese-society.
Evangelicalism is a broad family of the Christian faith...
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Christianity 2014: Independent Christianity and Slum Dwellers

This two-page report is the thirtieth in an annual series in the IBMR. The series began three years after the publication of the first edition of David Barrett’s World Christian Encyclopedia (WCE, Oxford Univ. Press, 1982). The purpose of the series is to present, in summary form on a single page, an annual update of the most significant global and regional statistics presented in the WCE. The WCE itself was expanded into a second edition in 2001 and accompanied by an analytic volume, World Christian Trends (WCT, William Carey Library, 2001). In 2003 an online database, the World Christian Database (WCD, later published by Brill), was launched, updating most of the statistics in the WCE and WCT. The Atlas of Global Christianity (Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2009), based on these data, was featured throughout 2010, most notably at the centennial celebrations of the 1910 Edinburgh World Missionary Conference. The World’s Religions in Figures: An Introduction to International Religious Demography, by Todd M. Johnson and Brian J. Grim (Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), covers the rationale, techniques, and specific problems associated with counting religionists around the world. And in mid-2013 the Center for the Study of Global Christianity also released a ninety-two-page report, Christianity in Its Global Context, 1970–2020 (available for free PDF download at www.globalchristianity.org/globalcontext).

Independent Christianity

In the 1982 World Christian Encyclopedia David Barrett introduced the first comprehensive classification of Christians into major traditions. This included well-known categories such as Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox, but it also included the category “non-White indigenous” to take into account the burgeoning movement of churches (especially in Africa) that were intentionally independent of the European and American historic churches. In 2001 Barrett and his colleagues found that there were too many white-led independent movements to justify the phrase “non-White” and renamed the category “Independents.” The designation of “Independent” has appeared to be the best overall label for these churches, but this year we are introducing a more detailed breakdown based on continent of origin and current geographic location. In table A below we present Independents by where they began and where they have subsequently spread. For example, under this schema an African Independent church in the United Kingdom is counted in the Africa row in the Europe column. These numbers are preliminary; much work is needed to verify the true extent of Independent churches around the world.

Retiring the Category “Marginal Christians”

For some time, we have perceived problems in using the term “Marginal” in categorizing Christian churches. The term was originally created to distinguish self-identified Christian groups that had markedly different practices and doctrines from “orthodox” or “mainstream” Christianity. Doing so, however, has never yielded satisfactory results. Many groups not listed in the Marginal category also had “unorthodox” doctrines and practices. In addition, “Marginal” groups, now global, were mainly North American in origin, with roots in the nineteenth century. Consequently, to be more consistent and to simplify the second level of our Christian classification (making it more comparable to Jewish, Muslim, and other religious classifications), we are moving all Marginals into the Independent category. Thus, while formerly the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints was categorized as Marginal (coded m-LdS), it is now categorized as a Northern American Independent church (Ni-LdS). Each of these denominations can be tracked as before, but now they appear as a subset of Independents.

Slum Dwellers

For nearly thirty years we have reported on the urban poor (line 8) and urban slum dwellers (line 9). The latter has grown from 260 million in 1970 to over 1 billion today. This current figure is approximately one in six people in the world. Unfortunately, Christian involvement in slums is disappointingly small. In his book Slum Life Rising (UNOH Publishing, 2012), Ash Barker states that even the largest Christian mission organization is devoting only around 7 percent of its budget to urban programs and less than 2 percent to slum ministry. In addition, we estimate that fewer than 1 in 500 Christian foreign missionaries (line 50) works in slums. A tiny fraction (perhaps 1 in 10,000) of national workers (line 47: pastors, evangelists, and similar persons) work in slums in their own countries. The vast majority of Christians who do work in the slums live outside the slums. While many of these have effective ministry, the most promising work appears to be that of incarnational teams living in the slums.

Table A. Independents by Continent of Origin, mid-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continent of origin</th>
<th>Global total</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Latin America</th>
<th>Northern America</th>
<th>Oceania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>95,773,000</td>
<td>95,569,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>151,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>128,749,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>127,796,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>670,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>21,523,000</td>
<td>8,752,000</td>
<td>2,229,000</td>
<td>9,833,000</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>79,000</td>
<td>112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>39,982,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>671,000</td>
<td>38,416,000</td>
<td>790,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern America</td>
<td>89,669,000</td>
<td>3,921,000</td>
<td>2,309,000</td>
<td>3,713,000</td>
<td>11,168,000</td>
<td>67,911,000</td>
<td>647,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>1,137,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,137,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total by location</td>
<td>376,833,000</td>
<td>108,325,000</td>
<td>132,381,000</td>
<td>14,522,000</td>
<td>50,213,000</td>
<td>69,486,000</td>
<td>1,906,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


GLOBAL POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>mid-2000</th>
<th>Trend % p.a.</th>
<th>24-hour change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>800,000,000</td>
<td>1,619,626,000</td>
<td>3,696,380,000</td>
<td>6,322,770,000</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>231,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,364,626,000</td>
<td>15,391,360,000</td>
<td>28,858,267,000</td>
<td>209,000,000</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,364,626,000</td>
<td>93,575,000</td>
<td>3,364,540,000</td>
<td>26,540,000</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>12,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,364,626,000</td>
<td>1,073,646,000</td>
<td>2,512,040,000</td>
<td>4,272,601,000</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>227,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,238,000,000</td>
<td>296,133,000</td>
<td>1,476,150,000</td>
<td>2,275,110,000</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>248,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945,200,000</td>
<td>777,495,000</td>
<td>835,890,000</td>
<td>997,491,000</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-21,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORLDRANGE EXPANSION OF CITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Megacities (over 1 million population)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLOBAL POPULATION BY RELIGION

| Christian (all) (World C) | 204,990,000 | 558,131,000 | 1,192,616,000 | 2.94 | 3,364,540,000 |
| Church members | 195,680,000 | 558,131,000 | 1,192,616,000 | 2.94 | 3,364,540,000 |
| Church attenders | 195,680,000 | 558,131,000 | 1,192,616,000 | 2.94 | 3,364,540,000 |
| Denominations | 22,7 | 34.5 | 33.2 | 32.4 | 0.12 | 33.0 |
| Western denominations | 30,000,000 | 72,000,000 | 179,000,000 | 4.31 | 567,000,000 |
| Eastern denominations | 60,000,000 | 150,000,000 | 359,000,000 | 8.63 | 2,270,000,000 |
| Unaffiliated Christians | 10,000,000 | 22,000,000 | 48,000,000 | 1.0 | 1,000,000 |
| Muslims (all) (World C) | 90,500,000 | 199,818,000 | 577,225,000 | 1.81 | 83,000,000 |
| Church members | 180,000,000 | 469,300,000 | 1,390,420,000 | 3.04 | 45,300,000 |
| Church attenders | 180,000,000 | 469,300,000 | 1,390,420,000 | 3.04 | 45,300,000 |
| Jewish population (World C) | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Unaffiliated Jews | 7,000,000 | 14,000,000 | 28,000,000 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Atheists | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Non-believers (all) (World C) | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 | 4,000,000 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Unaffiliated non-believers | 7,000,000 | 14,000,000 | 28,000,000 | 1.0 | 0.0 |
| Unaffiliated non-believers | 7,000,000 | 14,000,000 | 28,000,000 | 1.0 | 0.0 |

CHRISTIAN ORGANIZATIONS

| Denominations | 500 | 1,000 | 18,800 | 34,200 | 1.98 | 24,000 |
| Congregations (worship centers) | 150,000 | 400,000 | 1,416,000 | 3,400,000 | 2.40 | 310,000 |
| Service agencies | 600 | 1,500 | 14,100 | 25,100 | 1.92 | 1.6 |
| Foreign-mission sending agencies | 200 | 600 | 2,200 | 4,000 | 1.61 | 0.2 |

CONCIARISM: ONGOING COUNCILS OF CHURCHES

| National councils of churches | 0 | 19 | 283 | 598 | 1.50 | 740 |

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE (titles, not copies)

| Books about Christianity | 75,000 | 300,000 | 1,800,000 | 4,800,000 | 3.62 | 800 |
| Christian periodicals | 800 | 3,500 | 23,000 | 35,000 | 4.29 | 7 |

SCRIPTURE DISTRIBUTION (all sources, per year)

| Bibles | 500,000 | 3,500,426 | 25,000,000 | 53,700,000 | 2.91 | 220,000,000 |
| Scriptures including gospels, selections | 1,500,000 | 20,000 | 281,000 | 4,600,000 | 1.07 | 14,000,000 |
| Bible density (copies in place) | 20,000 | 108,000 | 443,000 | 1,400,000 | 1.97 | 99,000,000 |

CHRISTIAN BROADCASTING

| Total monthly listeners/viewers | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1,830,000 | 1.12 | 660,000 |
| Church monthly audience | 0 | 0 | 50 | 1,830,000 | 1.12 | 660,000 |

GLOBAL MISSION PLANS since AD 30

| 160 | 250 | 510 | 1,500 | 2.77 | 0.2 | 2,200 |
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My Pilgrimage in Mission

Janet C. Carroll

A new sense of global consciousness was stimulated in the United States by its engagement in the Second World War. In the postwar era Americans, especially younger women and men who had served in the military, first turned their eyes to wider horizons beyond the “sea to shining sea” boundaries of their homeland. For me, this new consciousness became a call to mission, which, as for most Catholic women then, meant entering a congregation of religious women.

Early Influences

I was born into a second-generation Irish Catholic family on July 22, 1933, at the beginning of the Great Depression. My father was a New York City policeman, with a steady civil servant’s income, and perhaps we were financially a bit better off than our neighbors. My mother was a wonderful homemaker. Together, as traditional Catholic parents, they raised my two brothers and me in the faith as typically practiced in an urban parochial environment, giving us a strong sense of identity. Asked where they came from, bona fide New York Catholics always responded with the name of their home parish.

Our neighborhood Roman Catholic Church was a cathedral-like edifice where I often attended daily Mass during primary school years. St. John’s Elementary School was conducted by the Religious of Jesus and Mary, a French-Canadian-founded congregation that also did extensive missionary work abroad. As students, we heard exciting and compelling stories of missionary life in far-off lands, engaged in projects to raise money for the missions, and were ever eager to welcome visiting missionaries returned from the mission fields. This influence was reinforced by the Sisters of Charity of New York, who were my teachers at St. Barnabas High School. To foster awareness of their own missionary work in the Caribbean, they sponsored a mission club, one of several social and athletic activities in which I avidly participated. While from my youth I often imagined myself following in my father’s footsteps in police work and also dreamed about a relatively new career for young women in the 1940s (that of a glamorous airline stewardess!), clearly, my Catholic education served to nurture and help crystallize my missionary call. These exposures to missionary life were the earliest influence on my interest in the missions. In retrospect, it does seem the Holy Spirit was curiously at work in my formative years, kindling a keen interest in a much larger world beyond the parochial limits of a midcentury suburban New York City neighborhood.

With this influence by the religious who were my educators, it seemed natural that my own missionary call would be lived out in the context of a religious community. In the 1950s there were few other options for Catholic women interested in mission work.

Janet Carroll, M.M., did pastoral ministry as a missionary in Taiwan (1956–72) and served with the Holy See Permanent Observer Mission to the United Nations (1979–87). In 1989 she co-founded the U.S. Catholic China Bureau, serving as its executive director until 2009. She now is liaison for Maryknoll’s programs of supportive outreach to the church in China.

Initial Maryknoll Ministry in Taiwan

As the first and only American Catholic apostolic society devoted exclusively to the foreign missions, Maryknoll was a natural choice. At that time, the Maryknoll Sisters Congregation, founded in 1912 by Mary Josephine Rogers, was just forty years old. She was a graduate of Smith College, a solidly Protestant institution known for its missionary fervor and the many graduates who joined the Student Volunteer Movement in the early 1900s. It was at Smith that Rogers, under the influence of a faculty member who urged her to provide leadership to foster the missionary interests of the Catholic students, became attracted to missionary service. In 1952, when I entered the Maryknoll Sisters Congregation, there were over one thousand women serving in mission fields in more than twenty countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Pacific Isles and among minority peoples in the United States. Quite typical of the times, the 1952 entrance group at Maryknoll numbered eighty-three candidates, ranging in age from eighteen to mid-thirties. Like myself, many were recent high school graduates, while others were young adult career women or professionals in the fields of education, medicine, and social service.

At Maryknoll our formation and training were almost entirely focused on preparation for profession of vows in a Catholic religious congregation of women. The education and orientation to missionary life and service that we received were transmitted by the very air we breathed at Maryknoll—the dynamic and exciting atmosphere and community created by a constant inflow and outflow of our Sisters from and to the missions. Reading during daily meals drew from great literature, church history, classical theology, the lives of the saints, and, most eagerly appreciated of all, accounts from the diaries sent to the motherhouse from our missionaries all around the world.

The annual Mission Departure Ceremony took place at Maryknoll, usually at the Marian Grotto on the grounds or in the Chapel of the Annunciation. In a solemn and exciting ceremony, surrounded by family and friends, an average of sixty or more young women received their mission assignments. In 1956 it was my turn, and I was assigned to Formosa, a land I had never heard of before. I discovered in cursory inquiries that Formosa was located just off the South China Coast, leaving me with the impression that it was probably like Staten Island: a suburb of New York City! While visiting with my family before departure overseas, I was interviewed by the New York Herald Tribune. I was asked what I expected to accomplish in the field. I blithely responded from the very parochial notions I carried in my head that I would likely work in a parish, “just like the one I grew up in.” I added that this work would consist of instructing children in catechism, teaching them how to pray, and preparing people to receive the sacraments of the church. Furthermore, I opined, I might teach the youth how to play basketball and softball, as well as even ping pong and other American sports, at which I had excelled in my youth. In other words, being Catholic, or preparing others to become Catholic, was exactly the same the world over! I still have this news clipping and never fail to cringe at the thought of my naïve approach to mission theology.

Fortunately, Maryknoll’s vision and praxis of mission saved
a blundering twenty-three-year-old neophyte from disaster. Upon arrival in Taiwan (the name imposed on Formosa Island after its occupation by the Nationalist forces from Mainland China), I immediately began a mandated five-year study regime in the Taiwanese language, a Chinese dialect similar to that spoken in Fujian Province and the Amoy area in southeastern China. For five hours a day, five days a week, we were tutored individually and in groups by a native speaker—a patient Presbyterian woman who drilled us in the oral language. This regimen was complemented by a secondary-school teacher’s twice-weekly instruction in reading and writing classical Chinese characters, euphonically adapted to the sounds of spoken Taiwanese. In those days formal language schools did not exist, except the one organized for the men of Maryknoll, to which, as women, we were not welcome.

In addition to individual and group tutorials and listening to tape recordings, we rushed off after classes to practice our bumbling and outrageous attempts at Taiwanese on the cook or the laundress. These simple, mostly unlettered women were our best teachers, equipping us with the vernacular peculiar to the local town and village folk. Within a few months, we also began practicing our skills by visiting the homes of the people in the surrounding countryside, in company with an experienced Sister missioner or a local catechist.

In the middle of my first five years of language study, I was assigned with another inexperienced Sister to a mission station in the central Taiwan mountains, close by Sun Moon Lake—a famous tourist site. A final year of study back at the central mission station in Changhua City included time devoted to personal and spiritual reflection in preparation for making final vows as a Maryknoll Sister. In terms more commonly used today, the orientation, education, and skills training for missionary work we received as Maryknoll Sisters in the era before Vatican II was in-service training. In the field, our actual mentors were not only seasoned missionaries but also the very people to whom we had been sent to proclaim the Gospel message.

Return from Taiwan and More Schooling
From the beginning, Maryknollers, like most Catholic missionaries, went to the missions for life. After World War II, it became Maryknoll mission policy to return to the center for a six-month Decennial Program. My initial ten years in Taiwan were spent in pastoral ministry in several urban and rural parishes. In the
mid-1960s, already responding to the influence of changes flowing from the first sessions of the Second Vatican Council, we began to integrate programs of social service among the poor and disadvantaged into traditional parochial ministry. A personal vignette illustrates the fact that, as missionaries on the ground, we were responding more rapidly to the council than were authorities in the official church. It was customary for annual diocesan reports to be sent to the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples in Rome. These reports recorded numbers of converts, adult and child baptisms, and numbers prepared to receive the sacraments of first confession, Holy Communion, and confirmation, as well as numbers of home visitations and other pastoral activities. In the spring of 1964, when asked for this data by my local Maryknoll superior, I responded that our little pastoral team at Houlung—a disadvantaged coastal town along the Taiwan Straits—was no longer giving priority to making converts. Rather, our immediate priority was on human and community development, to enhance the quality of life for the people, in the context of which we might later foster their spiritual life and growth in faith and holiness. Much to my chagrin, I was shortly reassigned away from parish ministry and sent to be the cook and oversee the domestic needs of a community of five Sisters who had recently arrived from the United States for language study.

Early in the winter of 1966, I was on board an American cargo ship bound for San Francisco, returning to Maryknoll, New York, for the Decennial Program. Ironically, it was during those weeks recrossing the Pacific Ocean that I first read Church and Cultures, the seminal work of the renowned SVD missiologist Louis Luzbetak. My companion on that journey was reading Christian Corridors to Japan, by Joseph Spae, CICM. It seemed that at the end of every chapter one or the other of us exclaimed, “Why didn’t they tell us all this before now?” Luzbetak’s work not only deeply influenced my approach to mission in the years to come but also led me to an active involvement in both Catholic and ecumenical networks devoted to missionary praxis, research, and study, including becoming an avid reader of missiological literature such as the International Bulletin of Missionary Research.

Following Vatican II, the Sister Formation Program was initiated in many congregations to comply with the mandate from Rome that women religious be afforded opportunities for both secular and religious studies commensurate with their vocational calling. I was immediately assigned to complete an undergraduate degree, which in my mind simply prepared one for professional work in social service and community development such as was offered at Coady Institute in Nova Scotia; or a program of apostolic and religious education as was offered at the East Asian Pastoral Institute in the Philippines. Alas, I was informed such programs could later be “icing on the cake” of a standard bachelor’s degree! Therefore, that spring I began studies at Mary Rogers College at Maryknoll, New York. I subsequently matriculated to New York University, where I completed a B.S. in social service in December 1968. I was delighted to be back in Taiwan in time for the Chinese New Year festival and to work in youth ministry sponsored by the Jesuit Society in the northeastern Hsin Chu Diocese.

The role of R&P director afforded me the privileged opportunity to visit all of our mission sites in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Islands.

Social Service Ministry in Taiwan

I now entered a new phase of my pilgrimage in mission, wherein my own experience was a microcosm of the radical changes in the missionary outreach of the Catholic Church as envisioned and inspired by the spirit and teachings of Vatican II. Responding to the call of beloved Pope John XXIII to be “the church in the world,” we sought to be more authentically in dialogue with the cultural, social, and religious contexts in which mission took place. In those years I was privileged to work with a wonderful Jesuit colleague, Louis Dowd, S.J., who almost single-handedly spearheaded the Young Christian Worker (YCW) movement in Taiwan (known in Europe as the Jocists). YCW proved a strategic response to the industrial revolution then exploding all over Taiwan, as tens of thousands of young men and women from the agrarian countryside flooded into small and large factories, which were rife with dangerous and oppressive conditions.

The YCW program and its related activities were housed in the Catholic Social Service Center, built by the Jesuits on the outskirts of the city. As the vast majority of the youth were non-Christian, the focus was on human development, character formation, moral and ethical training, and such spiritual nurture as might lift them above the drudgery of their daily labor. This was further enhanced with organized social and recreational activities. In addition to the regional YCW program, Dowd and I also served as chaplains respectively of the men and women’s national YCW offices, coordinating the YCW programs in other dioceses.

The Institute for Social Action in China (ISAC), which I served as executive secretary, was another Jesuit initiative in which we organized courses and seminars to train grassroots leadership for socioeconomic projects, especially for the co-op movement in the rural and mountainous areas populated by Taiwan’s many aboriginal peoples. ISAC was networked with similar institutes sponsored by the Jesuits in other Asian countries. From time to time, Asia-wide conferences were convened to address specific social and educational issues, affording these indigenous leaders from different countries the opportunity for mutual learning and for building networks of solidarity and common purpose. This also strengthened their capacity to coordinate responses to the multifaceted social problems faced in their own countries and increasingly spreading all across East and Southeast Asia.

Director of Maryknoll Research and Planning

The era after Vatican II also saw many changes in the internal organization of Catholic religious and missionary congregations. Following the Extraordinary Chapter of Affairs of the Maryknoll Sisters Congregation in 1968, the design of governance required greater participation of all the members. In response to a management study and evaluation of the congregation, new administrative offices and services were established, including the Department of Research and Planning (R&P). It
began policy for Maryknoll Sisters to rotate back from overseas assignments to staff these new structures required to support our rapidly expanding global mission presence. In my case, I was recalled from Taiwan in 1972 to assume the role of R&P director. This became a seven-year assignment, which afforded me the privileged opportunity to visit all of our mission sites in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Pacific Islands. At that juncture such mission sites formed a wide spectrum of both institutional and grassroots ministries in some twenty-five countries, including the United States.

The R&P department’s main responsibility was to offer planning workshops in the mission field to enable the Sisters and their co-missioners to evaluate local ministries and programs of service in terms of their outcomes. The immediate purpose was to improve the effectiveness of programs of service in educational, medical, social, and pastoral fields, assuring efficient use of both material and human resources. Part of a longer-range goal was to free up personnel and funds to enable the congregation to take on new mission commitments in places where the local church was not as yet securely established. The R&P department also fostered study and research of emerging developments in mission, assembling and closely monitoring documentation and resources necessary to provide guidance for informed decision making by the leadership at all levels. It also promoted Maryknoll’s collaboration and participation with ecumenical missionary networks.

Responding to another sign of the times, R&P took the initiative to seek membership for the Maryknoll Sisters as a nongovernmental organization at the United Nations in 1974. As NGOs, groups like Maryknoll, along with ecumenical missionary and secular organizations, served to amplify the voice of the non-Western world in that assembly of nations, as well as to channel back to the field educational and information resources to strengthen grassroots services and programs. In these and many other ways, the churches were assuming an ever-expanding role in the world as local Christians and missionaries together sought to enhance their proclamation of the Gospel message not only in word but also in action and by the witness of their daily lives.

U.N. Work and Study at Yale

After two terms of administrative ministry, I eagerly expected to return to the field in Taiwan. However, the road again diverged, and in 1979 I was asked instead to respond to a request from the Vatican ambassador to the United Nations for a Maryknoll Sister to serve on the delegation of the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to that body. There I served as adviser on the People’s Republic of China in 1949, the American church virtually shut down almost all conduits of contact with China. Most
missionary agencies, including Maryknoll, turned their eyes to other places such as Africa and Latin America. The deepest impact of this decision to divert attention from China was the failure to continue preparing missionaries with Chinese culture and language studies. Hence, in the 1980s, when the doors to China once again opened, even if ever so slightly, few missionary congregations were prepared to respond in any sustainable way.

In the context of this Openness and Reform Era in China, representatives of various U.S.-based Catholic missionary organizations began to meet annually at Maryknoll, New York. They shared information and insights gleaned from various sources on what was as yet a very murky reality for religious believers of all persuasions in China. Slowly and prudently, ways and means were conceived to respond to requests coming from both Roman Catholic and Protestant Christian leaders in China to collaborate in their quest for the recovery, restoration, and renewal of Christianity and of their churches. The unique characteristic of these efforts, which many now term the “fifth insertion of Christianity into Chinese civilization,” was that they would be under the leadership of Chinese Christians themselves. The traditional missionary paradigm, whereby the so-called missionary orders (especially Roman Catholic societies of priests) tended to exercise virtual autonomy in their mission activity was no longer viable. Moreover, it was unacceptable in the religiopolitical climate now prevailing in the People’s Republic of China. Even more important, however, traditional methods of missionary activity, previously employed in all so-called mission territories, would no longer meet the test of the new theologies of mission and of the local church that flowed from the teachings of Vatican II.

I am filled with deepest gratitude for God’s loving providence and presence in my life, as mediated by all those who have walked with me on this pilgrimage in mission.

Catholic and Protestant Christian leaders in China to collaborate in their quest for the recovery, restoration, and renewal of Christianity and of their churches. The unique characteristic of these efforts, which many now term the “fifth insertion of Christianity into Chinese civilization,” was that they would be under the leadership of Chinese Christians themselves. The traditional missionary paradigm, whereby the so-called missionary orders (especially Roman Catholic societies of priests) tended to exercise virtual autonomy in their mission activity was no longer viable. Moreover, it was unacceptable in the religiopolitical climate now prevailing in the People’s Republic of China. Even more important, however, traditional methods of missionary activity, previously employed in all so-called mission territories, would no longer meet the test of the new theologies of mission and of the local church that flowed from the teachings of Vatican II.

**Director of the China Bureau**

Building on the annual China consultations held at Maryknoll, the U.S. Catholic China Bureau (USCCB) was established in 1989. This initiative, sponsored jointly by the Jesuit Society and the Maryknoll Society and Sisters’ Congregation, enjoyed the affirmation of the U.S. Catholic Bishops Conference, in the persons of Archbishops Theodore McCarrick and Roger Mahony. With a newly minted degree in international affairs, I was invited by the USCCB Board of Trustees to become the executive director. As envisioned by its founding members, the purpose of the China Bureau was threefold: to foster collaboration among the interested missionary orders, to animate the missionary outreach of the American Catholic Church to its Chinese sister-church, and to provide a coordinated response to requests for assistance from their sisters and brothers in the faith in China.

In August 1989, from an office provided on the campus of Seton Hall University (South Orange, N.J.), the bureau developed programs of education and awareness-raising directed to the U.S. Catholic Church and ecumenical and academic networks with specific China-related interests. An eight-page newsletter, *China Church Quarterly*, began publication in the fall, with the goal of augmenting and balancing the scant and often negative news and information on developments in China’s Catholic and other Christian churches, including contextually related sociopolitical developments impacting the exercise of religious belief and praxis in the new China. The annual China consultations became the National Catholic China Conference, organized to examine and reflect upon the major issues relevant to the growth and development of Christianity in China in this new era. From time to time, religious study tours took small groups of American Christians on three-week visits to China, focused on experiencing the rich culture, long history, and contemporary reality of Chinese civilization, as background to understanding the situation of Chinese Catholics and their church. In this way, we sought to learn how to partner anew in mission for the upbuilding of the China church, in support and affirmation of its responsibility as the primary agent of evangelization of the Chinese people.

During two decades as executive director of the China Bureau (1989–2009), I witnessed phenomenal changes in China’s church and society. Today the Chinese Roman Catholic and Protestant churches, perhaps much to the surprise of everyone, having survived the absence of foreign missionaries in their midst and three decades of persecution and suppression, are nonetheless growing rapidly, both in numbers and in the quality and effectiveness of their pastoral and ministerial outreach.

Beginning in the mid-1980s, Maryknoll once more resumed its missionary outreach to China. Both the society of priests and brothers and the Sisters’ congregation began sending members to teach English in China’s universities. In 1993, with the approbation of the Holy See, the Maryknoll Society initiated the China Education and Formation Project. Through this program a new generation of church leadership—clergy, women religious, and a few lay Catholics—come to the United States from dioceses all over China to obtain master’s or doctoral degrees at Catholic colleges and universities. Their studies cover a broad range of church-related disciplines, as well as short-term certified training courses in pastoral and administrative specialties. Well over one hundred of these future leaders have already returned to serve their church. With papal approval, five of the priests have been named diocesan bishops, and three Sisters are currently superiors general of congregations of women religious. Serving as adviser to the China Project since its inception, accompanying these young men and women who embody the future of the church in China, has been among the greatest joys of my entire missionary pilgrimage.

In many ways, as I live out the final stages of my life’s journey, the circle comes to completion, taking me back to the beginning. The grace of accompaniment—shown to me by my parents, teachers, and all who mentored and guided me in my formative years, and above all my community of Maryknoll Sisters—will hopefully continue to bless and inspire the lives of new generations of religious and missionaries, called in their own time to spread the Good News of God’s love. Looking back on these eight decades of life, I am filled with deepest gratitude for God’s loving providence and presence in my life, as mediated by all those who have walked with me on this pilgrimage in mission.
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A Precious Gift: The Punjabi Psalms and the Legacy of Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz

Yousaf Sadiq

The Punjabi Zabur is the metrical translation of the Book of Psalms into the Punjabi language. One cannot envisage worship among Pakistani churches without the singing of psalms. Without question, the Punjabi Psalms—read, sung, recited, and memorized by the body of Christ—are the most familiar part of Scripture in Pakistan. Yet, little is widely known about the history of the Punjabi Psalter. In this article I explore (1) the historical context of the translation of psalms into Punjabi, (2) the contributions of the Rev. Dr. Imam-ud-din Shahbaz, the leading figure in compiling these psalms, and (3) some of the ways in which Punjabi Psalms are currently used.

Before 1882–83, when the United Presbyterian Mission formed various committees for the purpose of fostering the overall work and training of local Christian workers, churches in North India mostly used hymns and psalms set to meter and sung or chanted to Western melodies. Robert Stewart reports that the volume Zabur aur Git (Psalms and Hymns) was used largely for this purpose, with metrical versions prepared by various Christian missions. The language used was Urdu. None of these versions, however, closely followed the Hebrew text of the Psalter.

The United Presbyterian Mission committees charged with preparing metrical psalms, however, “oscillated between the adoption of Eastern and Western meters.” In January 1882 a committee was formed for the translation of the Psalms into Urdu. Their task was to prepare a metrical translation of the Psalms that could be sung to Western melodies, and the translation was to correspond to the original text. The committee included Andrew Gordon, Samuel Martin, and Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz, who served as a poet and put the Psalms into verse. The committee finished the task of translating all 150 psalms into Western meters in October 1891; the work was first published in Persian script, and later in the Roman script.

The Punjabi Metrical Psalms

In January 1890, over a year before the final publication of the Urdu metrical Psalms, initiatives were started for a separate committee to prepare a similar volume in Punjabi. According to Stewart, “Less cultured of our people like native meters and native airs better than those of occidental origin, and it was found necessary to prepare versions of the bhajan form [that is, traditional hymns of worship and devotional songs], and that too in the Punjabi tongue—the language which they love most and know best.”

William Galbraith Young notes that by 1890, Christian hymns and psalms were already in use in the Punjabi language and were sung to local tunes, although they were few in number. It is not known who prepared these Punjabi Christian songs, but it seems that they were beginning to have an influence on ordinary people. Did the increasing popularity of these songs in Punjabi create a need for the translation of the whole Psalter into Punjabi? Was it due to the unpopularity of the Urdu metrical Psalms? or both? Such questions suggest the need for further investigation.

The committee for the metrical translation of the Psalter into Punjabi consisted of Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz, Mary Jane Campbell, Thomas Fulton Cummings, Mary Rachel Martin, Josephine Martin, Henrietta Cowden, Mrs. William McKelvey, and David Smith Lytle, the head of the committee. The first work of the committee for the Punjabi Psalter was published in 1892. It was a collection of fifty-five psalms, each with musical notation. The title given to the first publication was Zabur Punjabi nazm men tarjuma kiya gaya (Psalms translated in Punjabi verse). The psalms were published in the Roman script and were arranged by the tune to which they had been set, not by their biblical order.

The Punjabi Psalms received an immediate and warm welcome by ordinary people. Stewart notes that “their use at present is even more extensive. Scarcely anything else is now sung in our village congregations, at melas [fairs offering a variety of food and local music for enjoyment], or in bazaar work.”

The initial publication was done on a trial basis. Given its great success, the committee was reactivated in 1895 and given the task of translating the entire Psalter into Punjabi, using local tunes for the melodies. The process took until 1908, with all 150 psalms ultimately published in Punjabi verse, with an initial print run of 2,000 copies. It was printed in Roman script with Western notations at the Medical Hall Press in Benares, under the title Punjabi Zabur. Desi ragan vich (Punjabi Psalms: In local melodies).

Methodology

Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz first translated each psalm into Punjabi in versified form. The next step was to evaluate the translation
of the Psalms against the Hebrew text of the Psalter as well as available translations of the Psalms in English, Persian, and Urdu. The final stage was to select the tune to be used with each psalm. On this point, Frederick Stock mentions that in order to collect data and listen to the various commonly used tunes, the committee members with musical skills spent a considerable amount of time at ordinary shopping and eating places. William Young noted that the committee also spent time listening to traveling minstrels. Mary Rachel Martin, a member of the committee gifted in music, with the help of Henrietta Cowden, Josephine Martin, and Mrs. William McKelvey, wrote down the musical tunes in Western notation so that the Western missionaries could also sing and play them. At that time, and even today, Indian music is learned and passed on solely by repetition and memory. Henrietta Cowden recounts the method the committee followed:

An Indian, Radha Kishan, a professional Hindu singer, was found who agreed to give time and come to our aid. He went to Dr. Shahbaz, who had already prepared some of the poems. The two would read the poem together until the singer caught the rhythm, then he would fit a tune to that rhythm and metre, and come back to Dr. Shahbaz and sing it to him. If he accepted it, the singer brought the copy to me and sang it until I got it into my ear. Sometimes ten times were required, sometimes fewer, sometimes with many repetitions for one phrase. I then wrote it, as I had heard it, on music paper and sang it to him. If he approved, that particular Psalm was ready to go to the printers. If not satisfactory, then it had to be corrected.

In most cases, it seems that the psalms were translated first and the tunes chosen later. In some cases, however, the meter was selected first, with the poetry adjusted to fit. The Punjabi Psalms were regarded as bhajans, and their melodies were composed in a bhajan style, which was (and is) the type of devotional and meditational singing commonly used in India for religious worship.

The story of the Punjabi Psalter is incomplete without mentioning in more detail the life and ministry of poet, teacher, theologian, pastor, and translator Imam-ud-Din. As a poet, he followed the general practice in the Indian Subcontinent of giving himself a pen name, which eventually becomes the poet’s identity. He chose Shahbaz, meaning “eagle.”

Imam-ud-Din was born around 1844 in Zafarwal, a small town located in the eastern part of the district of Sialkot. His first encounter with the Christian message was at the age of ten, when he listened attentively to the preaching of Church Missionary Society (CMS) missionaries. Then in 1866, about twelve years later, he was baptized in Amritsar by Robert Clark, a graduate of Trinity College Cambridge whom Andrew Gordon called “the venerable missionary of Amritsar.” Generally, inquirers were invited to Amritsar to be baptized, but perhaps Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz himself decided to go there to receive baptism.

After his baptism, Shahbaz became involved in evangelistic work with CMS. Clark mentions Imam-ud-Din as one of eight notable converts who were trained at the Amritsar Mission School to carry on the proclamation and teaching of the Christian faith. He also was a gifted teacher, serving at CMS schools in Amritsar and being active in evangelistic activities from 1866 to 1880.

Besides teaching and preaching, Imam-ud-Din had a special interest and definite gift in poetry, which led to his involvement with the translation of the Psalms into Urdu and, later, Punjabi. In 1880 the United Presbyterian Mission announced a poetry competition, with the winner to be selected to translate the Psalms into Urdu. Shahbaz was declared the winner and began his new responsibilities in July. He moved to Gurdaspur, where, during the early stages of the Urdu translation, he worked with Andrew Gordon, as well as taking part in evangelistic activities.

Shahbaz spent the longest period of his life in Sialkot. In addition to working on translating the Psalms, he was ordained by the United Presbyterian Church in Sialkot. Between 1886 and 1906 he served as pastor there of the First United Presbyterian Church. Emma Dean Anderson reports that he had “great influence over many of the students. He was pastor of the congregation which was attended by many students in the early days.” In 1906, toward the end of the translation work, he was freed from church work so that he could fully concentrate on the translation of the Punjabi Psalms.

During the later stages of the translation work on the Punjabi Psalms, Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz lost his sight. Yet he continued working, with the help of an assistant. “Often he would lie in his bed with his head completely covered while Babu Sadiq read to him. When once the stanza was formulated in the mind, he would dictate it back to Babu Sadiq.” Anna Augusta Milligan commented on his last days and on the significance of his work: “There is Padri I. D. Shahbaz, the poet, grown old and blind, who put the Psalms into Punjabi verse and thus made them the most popular songs of the whole church of Christ in the Punjab.” In 1921, in acknowledgment of his work on the Punjabi Psalter, Imam-ud-Din was awarded a doctor of divinity degree in absentia from Tarkio College, in Tarkio, Missouri. He died in 1921 in the town of Bhalwal, near Sargodha, a city now in Punjab Province in Pakistan.

Andrew Gordon described Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz as “industrious, earnest and efficient.” Emma Anderson captured well
the impact of Shahbaz’s lifework, writing, “I wonder sometimes if the songs of David ever sounded sweeter in Hebrew tongue sung in the hills of Judea and in the great temple in Jerusalem than they do in the plains and hills and the humble mud churches in the villages of the Punjab on the day of worship.”

Of all the languages of the Indian Subcontinent, only Punjabi possesses— and widely uses—the entire Psalter in versified form. It is therefore fitting to consider the remarkable work of Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz as a precious gift to the Punjabi Christian community in the Indian Subcontinent. The Psalms in Punjabi are equally cherished today on both sides of the India-Pakistan border. In 1930 the Punjabi Psalms were first published in the Gurmukhi script; the selection published in 1933 is used to this day in India. In 2001 Vidya Dogar commented on the popularity of Shahbaz’s Psalms in India, noting that they are “still in use in most of the northern parts in India as far as Delhi and Uttar Pradesh. In some parts of Northwest India, the worship service does not start unless the Zaboors (Psalms) are sung. Since they are composed in the popular forms of classic ragas [widely known melodic modes that are part of India’s musical heritage], they can be used in the whole of the northern region.”

It is regrettable that Shahbaz’s work in creating enduring Punjabi poetry and his contribution toward the spiritual development of the Punjabi Christian community in the Indian Subcontinent have not yet been more widely recognized. John O’Brien observes that academia has ignored the Punjabi Psalter: “One can only wonder if an unacknowledged prejudice is at work in the failure to include any excerpts from it in anthologies of Punjabi poetry.” Finally, John Webster addresses the overall impact of Imam-ud-Din’s work on the local expression of Christianity of his day, noting that “the greatest and the most lasting change was made in the area of music when the Rev. Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz translated the Psalms into metrical Punjabi and set them to Punjabi tunes.”

The Use of the Punjabi Psalter

Today the Punjabi Psalms are used widely among Punjabi-speaking churches in Pakistan. It would not be wrong to say that, within a Pakistani context, corporate worship within churches is considered incomplete if it does not include the Punjabi Psalms. They can rightly be viewed as the heart of Christian worship in Pakistan. The Punjabi Psalms have made an immeasurable impact on the body of Christ in Pakistan and have given it “an unrivalled familiarity” with the Book of Psalms.

These Psalms are used in a number of different ways. First of all, believers use them for their spiritual growth and the building up of their faith in both personal and communal expressions of devotion. These versified Psalms have played a central role in the theological development of the church in Pakistan. Virtually all Punjabi Christians, especially the older generation, know a number of the Punjabi Psalms by heart. The majority of the older generation has had no schooling, so their memorizing God’s Word as translated in the Punjabi Psalms contributes greatly to their learning truths about God. Bishop Michael Nazir-Ali regards these Psalms as “the basis of the spirituality of the Pakistani church.”

The Punjabi Psalms also play a vital role in church liturgy. Psalm 24 (part 2), which is the opening song at both Protestant and Catholic church services, is certainly the most familiar Punjabi Psalm in Pakistani churches. Besides being sung every Sunday, the translation of this psalm has a great number of repetitions, which makes it relatively easy to memorize. Also, the Sialkot Convention Hymnbook recommends using Psalm 24 at the taking of Holy Communion, which, however, is seldom actually done. Psalm 72 (part 4) is normally sung at the end of a Punjabi church service, even though the hymnbook does not list it as a closing psalm. Another interesting feature that has been linked with Psalm 72 is the church offering. As a general practice in Pakistani churches, the offering is taken at the end of the service, which means that Psalm 72 sometimes becomes the offering psalm. Sometimes Psalm 23 is also used as the closing hymn.

Psalm 20 (part 1) is usually sung at funerals. According to the thematic ordering of the Sialkot Convention Hymnbook, however, Psalm 20 is a reminder of a God who answers prayers. Churches use the second part of Psalm 45 at wedding ceremonies. In the Subcontinent on a wedding day, the bridegroom, accompanied by friends, relatives, and family members, arrives at the bride’s house with drums and big horns that play well-known Bollywood or folk melodies. It is a way of celebration. Christians who do not approve of using worldly melodies at such an occasion, however, replace them with melodies of the Punjabi Psalms. And at a service for the birth of a child, Psalm 127 is usually read and is used as the sermon text. Furthermore, the singing of the Punjabi Psalms has been successful in creating unity among churches in Pakistan, for the metrical version of the Punjabi Psalms can be heard and sung among all Pakistani Christian denominations.

Conclusion

Quite a few of the Punjabi Psalms have been omitted from the Sialkot Convention Hymnbook, and it would be wise to introduce them to the people so that they can learn them and use them for their spiritual growth and maturity. (This is not to say, however, that new Christian songs should not be welcomed and used in Punjabi churches.) Also, we could ask several important questions regarding the Punjabi metrical Psalms, such as, What are the reasons for their widespread use? How well do ordinary Punjabi people actually understand the content of the Psalms? And To what extent is the translation of the Psalms faithful to the original text?

Overall, the Punjabi metrical Psalms are the “fullest expression of indigenous Punjabi Christianity.” The work of Imam-ud-Din Shahbaz and his contributions to the Punjabi Christian community in the Indian Subcontinent need to be recognized and appreciated. Punjabi Christians have every right to thank God for these Psalms as a precious, even unique, heritage.
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The Oxford Encyclopaedia of South Asian Christianity: A Review Essay

Arun W. Jones

At least in theory, the process of writing a book review is rather straightforward: one reads the book and writes a review of it. However, how does one read an encyclopaedia in order to review it? Perusing it from cover to cover is too arduous a process, not only because there is so much material to cover, but also because there is no narrative or argument to move the readers through the book. Moreover, the plethora of information means that readers often find themselves dealing with material in which they have little or no expertise. In approaching the encyclopaedia under review, I first read the preface and introduction carefully, for they tell much about the process of putting together this work. I then read some major articles, such as those about countries and religious traditions, looked up other topics with which I am familiar, read the entries juxtaposed to these, scanned the index, and then randomly selected various articles for exploration. This procedure has yielded fascinating information and proved to be deeply satisfying.

The chief editor of the Oxford Encyclopaedia of South Asian Christianity (OESAC) is Roger Hedlund, who arrived in India as a missionary in 1974 and since then has been teaching and doing research in various Indian institutions in the field of missiology. Currently he is professor at the Mylapore Institute for Indigenous Studies in Chennai (formerly Madras), an institution that he founded. Other editors listed are Jesudas Athyal, Joshua Kalapati, and Jessica Richard. The encyclopaedia covers Christianity in India and the neighboring countries of Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and the Maldives. While India is very strongly represented in the encyclopaedia, the other countries are certainly not neglected. The overall aim of the OESAC project was “to produce a concise reference tool, available and affordable in South Asia” (xii). Topics include key people, events, institutions, places, theological issues and concepts, churches, denominations, texts and treaties, historical developments, contemporary themes, distinctive South Asian expressions of Christianity, and various models of ecclesiology. Because it covers almost two millennia of Christianity, the OESAC has a strong historical focus; it is, however, not a book of history but a repository of information about South Asian Christianity since its beginnings. Brief bibliographies follow most of the entries.

The encyclopaedia is a work possessing many virtues. One of the most remarkable features of the OESAC project is its inclusion of articles from more than 700 writers, the great majority of them South Asian, from Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant, Pentecostal, and indigenous independent traditions. The editorial team accomplished this by first of all getting the heads of various churches in India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and Bangladesh to support the project. Over time, the team then created a list of topics to be covered and assigned them with guidelines to writers, many of them lesser known scholars and even new writers. Participants in Nepal and the Himalayan region, however, requested assistance to train writers, and so the project ran a writers’ workshop. The success of this endeavor led to further writers’ workshops in Shillong, Kolkata, Mumbai, Delhi, Kottayam, Colombo, Hyderabad, and various other locations. As a result, many more articles were produced, some at the workshops themselves. In this way the encyclopaedia project has trained numerous South Asian Christians to conceptualize, research, and write about their own religious tradition(s), a highly worthy and valuable by-product of the whole project. In creating a reference work produced by South Asians themselves, the OESAC followed the example set by the Dictionary of Asian Christianity (Eerdmans, 2001), whose articles were written mostly by Asian Christian scholars living and working in Asia.

Because the entries were written by hundreds of authors with a variety of backgrounds and training, the editors worked to balance the need for some standardization with the desire to preserve the voices of the individual writers. Overall, they have succeeded admirably in what at times must have been a difficult task. The difference in approach to the same topic in different entries can be quite stark at times. For example, the article on Alexis de Menezes (445), an early seventeenth-century archbishop of Goa, is highly laudatory and perhaps for that reason neglects to mention the profoundly controversial nature of the Synod of Diamper, over which he presided in 1599. Information on the controversy, along with a sympathetic view of the archbishop’s opponents, can be found in the entry on the synod itself (225–26). While some readers may want more balanced points of view in an encyclopaedia, the authorial passion and freshness of perspective in the OESAC have much to commend them. The entry on so-called Rice-Christians (594–95) provides just such engaging passion and perspective. In contrast, the enthusiasm of a writer for his or her topic occasionally results in an article that mixes in a dose of hagiography along with history, as I would judge the entry on Anthony de Mello (444).

What any reader of an encyclopaedia expects is accuracy of information, good summaries, and presentation of material by experts for a nonexpert audience. On these counts, the OESAC on the whole is an excellent reference work. Even though the chief editor apologizes in the introduction for “gaps in coverage” and “errors of omission and in print” (xx), I found just two minor errors as I performed my admittedly cursory examination of the encyclopaedia. As far as omissions are concerned, I was surprised that the Methodist bishop James Thoburn did not merit an entry, although his equally famous sister Isabella Thoburn did. The question of what knowledge one can assume
on the part of the reader is a very difficult one to answer. The editors have tried to present the information in “straightforward English” for “both non-technical readers in South Asia as well as for the general public worldwide” (xv). Generally speaking, the work succeeds very well in reaching just such an audience. At the same time, some technical knowledge of the subject matter is necessary when treating complex materials, and individual authors are justified in their expectation that a true novice who is interested in a particular topic will take the time and trouble to look up words that he or she may not recognize. Thus the fine articles on Buddhism (110–12), conversion (201–4), and South Asian Islam (344–45) use terms that are familiar to scholars who study those topics but may require some extra work for those having little knowledge of the subject matter.

Roman Catholic Statistical Updates

### Workforce for the Apostolate as of December 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Worldwide</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>U.S. % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>5,132</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>413,418</td>
<td>42,261</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent deacons</td>
<td>40,914</td>
<td>16,919</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious brothers</td>
<td>55,085</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious sisters</td>
<td>713,206</td>
<td>55,129</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catechists</td>
<td>3,125,235</td>
<td>415,179</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CATHOLICS</td>
<td>1,213,591,000</td>
<td>70,536,000</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Twenty-Three Countries with Catholic Populations over 10 Million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>% Catholic</th>
<th>Priests</th>
<th>Parishes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>164,780,000</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>20,701</td>
<td>10,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>100,446,000</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>16,416</td>
<td>6,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>78,900,000</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>9,089</td>
<td>3,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>70,536,000</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>42,261</td>
<td>17,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>57,834,000</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>48,333</td>
<td>25,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>47,512,000</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>18,804</td>
<td>16,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>42,830,000</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>24,353</td>
<td>22,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>42,524,000</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>8,976</td>
<td>3,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>38,528,000</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>5,415</td>
<td>1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>38,016,000</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>2,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>36,799,000</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>29,961</td>
<td>10,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>26,511,000</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>1,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>25,709,000</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>2,720</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>25,150,000</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>17,007</td>
<td>11,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>24,934,000</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>3,143</td>
<td>3,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>19,431,000</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>27,228</td>
<td>9,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14,983,000</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>7,731</td>
<td>4,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>14,934,000</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>13,626,000</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>2,643</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>13,203,000</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>1,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>12,768,000</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>11,770,000</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>11,757,000</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### The Roman Catholic Church Worldwide (Changes from 2006 to 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Change %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>158,313,000</td>
<td>193,667,000</td>
<td>+22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>33,478</td>
<td>39,057</td>
<td>+16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>4,729</td>
<td>4,959</td>
<td>+5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>11,118</td>
<td>12,186</td>
<td>+9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding Mexico)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>81,783,000</td>
<td>85,535,000</td>
<td>+4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>53,260</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>+11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>3,214</td>
<td>3,477</td>
<td>+8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including Mexico and Caribbean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>156,996,000</td>
<td>164,123,000</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>22,537</td>
<td>24,175</td>
<td>+7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>6,966</td>
<td>6,789</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>4,428</td>
<td>4,266</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>South America</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>324,256,000</td>
<td>342,652,000</td>
<td>+5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>45,322</td>
<td>48,839</td>
<td>+7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>7,155</td>
<td>7,016</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>10,362</td>
<td>9,384</td>
<td>-9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>118,466,000</td>
<td>132,238,000</td>
<td>+11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>51,281</td>
<td>58,678</td>
<td>+14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>15,130</td>
<td>15,589</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>282,108,000</td>
<td>285,746,000</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>196,653</td>
<td>187,864</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>+6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>13,925</td>
<td>12,461</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oceania</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>8,828,000</td>
<td>9,630,000</td>
<td>+9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>4,731</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>+7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>+19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORLDWIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic population</td>
<td>1,130,750,000</td>
<td>1,213,591,000</td>
<td>+7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests (diocesan and religious)</td>
<td>407,262</td>
<td>413,418</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholics per priest</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>2,936</td>
<td>+6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate-level seminarians</td>
<td>58,690</td>
<td>57,979</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Jon and Jean Bonk International Fellowship Fund

Dr. Jonathan J. Bonk retired July 1, 2013, as executive director of the Overseas Ministries Study Center and editor of the International Bulletin of Missionary Research. Anticipating that leadership transition, the OMSC Board of Trustees in 2012 launched a substantial scholarship initiative—the Jon and Jean Bonk International Fellowship Fund.

Dr. J. Nelson Jennings, OMSC executive director as of July 1, 2013, says the initiative “will enable beleaguered Christian leaders to come to OMSC from challenging situations. Currently we have to turn away many worthy candidates due to lack of funding.” The fund will provide friends of the Bonks, OMSC alumni from around the world, and others who have admired their ministries from afar a “concrete way of honoring Jon and Jean on the occasion of their retirement,” adds Jennings. Jon and Jean have wanted to find a way after they retire and return to Canada to perpetuate their longtime commitment to serving marginalized church leaders and missionaries who live and minister in places where it is extraordinarily difficult and sometimes dangerous to be a follower of Christ.

Working alongside Jon and Jean Bonk has been such an honor and inspiration. Their leadership, vision, compassion, strength, and patience, a rare combination of traits, have served the Bonks and OMSC very well. The Jon and Jean Bonk International Fellowship Fund—www.omsc.org/bonk fellowship—is a crowning glory to their ministry. In keeping with their humble spirit, this fellowship is a benefit to others. It will enable those who serve the risen Christ in difficult, oppressive, and challenging circumstances to enjoy the unique opportunities for renewal offered by OMSC. I invite you to join many good people who are truly grateful for the Bonks by making this dream come true.

Read the latest Jon and Jean Bonk International Fellowship Fund newsletter and view the video online. For details, go to www.omsc.org/bonkfellowship or contact Dr. J. Nelson Jennings, the OMSC executive director.
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Book Reviews

Come and See: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective on Contextualization.


Edward Rommen has had a distinguished career as a missionary to Germany and subsequently a professor at a number of noted evangelical theological schools. Some years ago he entered the Orthodox Church of America and was ordained priest. Currently he is a pastor and adjunct professor at Duke Divinity School, in Durham, North Carolina. In 1989 Rommen collaborated with David J. Hesselgrave in writing Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models. This present book represents his reflections, not only from the distance of the years since, but also from his newly discovered and very obviously cherished Orthodox faith.

In his previous work with Hesselgrave, Rommen says, he understood the nature of the Christian Gospel in terms of a message that had to be made clear to those who had not accepted it. Now, in the light of Orthodox theology, he conceives the Gospel more as a person, Jesus Christ. Contextualization is the process of developing an “invitational core context” (196) in which a person might experience a personal introduction to Christ. This understanding of context is rather a “reversal” (193) of the usual understanding of context. Instead of emphasizing culture or social location, Rommen’s Orthodox perspective emphasizes the context provided by the church, which includes the Bible, apostolic succession, liturgy, councils, lives of the saints, and iconography. When persons enter this context, they engage the four conditions of the “axis of personhood” (58, also the chart on 59). Then, as they begin to know Christian women and men who are spiritually and humanly mature, they come face to face with the Gospel: Christ himself.

This book is a fine introduction to Orthodox theology, and it stands as a kind of “countercultural model” of contextualization—the church contextualizes by simply being the church, with little or no compromise. Still, as Hesselgrave suggests in his foreword (ix), and as Rommen would not totally deny (e.g., 65–66), new ways of conceiving of the Gospel proper to culture and social location are still important in the evangelization process.

To my mind, the Bible needs to be translated, doctrines need to be explained in ways people can understand, liturgy needs intelligent participation, and saints and their images need to speak to peoples’ lives. To contextualize thus is not to water down the Gospel but to clarify its challenge. Nevertheless, Rommen is right in that a lively, faithful, and faith-filled church community is still the best witness to the Gospel. No amount of contextualization can substitute for authenticity, fidelity, or holiness.

Stephen B. Bevans

Putting Names with Faces: Women’s Impact in Mission History.


This “global theological resource book” resulted from a consultation on women and mission held in 2008 at the WCC’s Ecumenical Institute in Bossey, Switzerland. It contains scholarly case studies and missiological reflections by sixteen women scholars from Asia, Oceania, Africa, Europe, and the Americas. Representing one of the “transversal” themes of the Edinburgh 2010 process, the volume promotes “an inclusive understanding of mission across gender barriers, race relations, and cultural differences” (17). After an introductory overview, the volume breaks into sections on “foundational perspectives,” case studies, and concluding theological reflections on women’s “contextual missiology.” Each of the major essays includes valuable suggestions for further reading, extensive footnotes, and in many cases questions for discussion.

The title Putting Names with Faces symbolizes the hidden histories and the ignored contributions of women to Christian mission. The merits of the book include its geographic and ethnic diversity of case studies and its fine introductory and concluding overviews of the biblical, historical, and missiological aspects of women’s contributions to mission through the ages. One striking feature of the book is its postcolonial approach—a consistently appreciative and yet appropriately critical reading of women’s missionary history.

Essays of note include Christine Lienemann-Perrin’s fresh reading of biblical perspectives, Amélé Adamavi-Aho Ekué’s study of missionary influence on women’s church roles in West Africa, Gulnar Francis-Dehqani’s nuanced treatment of missionary/Muslim relationships in Iran a century ago, Kwok Pui-lan’s valuable survey of feminist Christian perspectives in China, Marilú Rojas Salazar’s feminist analysis of shocking violence against women in Mexico, Karla Ann Koll’s fine overview of Presbyterian women’s work in Guatemala, and Cathy Ross’s constructive missiological reflection. Despite some uneven sections and typos, this readable, diverse, and thoughtful scholarly volume will be useful as a text both in theological seminars and in church-based educational programs.

—Dana L. Robert

Dana L. Robert, a contributing editor, is the Truman Collins Professor of World Christianity and History of Mission at the Boston University School of Theology. She directs the Center for Global Christianity and Mission (www.bu.edu/cgcm/).
Conflict, Conquest, and Conversion: Two Thousand Years of Christian Missions in the Middle East.


Conflict, Conquest, and Conversion makes an important contribution to the study of missions in and to the Middle East. Eleanor Tejirian, associate research scholar at the Middle East Institute, Columbia University, and Reeva Spector Simon, professor of history at Yeshiva University, both in New York City, have narrated the story of Christian missions in the Middle East in the context of political events—a much-needed and most helpful approach to the topic.

In about 200 pages the authors tell the whole story of Christian missions in the Middle East, from the beginnings of Christianity in the first century until the present day. Nine chapters cover two millennia of the most important political developments and missionary enterprises: the Christianization of the Roman Empire; pilgrimages, crusades and missions; the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks; the reconquest of Spain; Catholic and Protestant missionary movements and their connection with European diplomatic interventions in the Ottoman Empire; and World War I and its aftermath.

The authors assert in more than one place that World War I ended the whole missionary enterprise (xiv, 167). Thus, they devote chapter 7 to assessing the intended and unintended achievements and consequences of missionary endeavor. It is perhaps debatable whether it was World War I or World War II that really “destroyed” the missionary enterprise. In some places in the Middle East—for example, among the Nestorians or the Armenians in Turkey—World War I was crucial, but in Syria, Lebanon, Palestine, and Egypt, World War II was perhaps more decisive. In the aftermath of the establishment of the State of Israel and the gradual but sure political alienation of the nations of the region from the West, everything Western became suspect, and Western missionaries as well as missionary organizations and institutions were adversely affected. In this regard, it is perhaps a weakness of the book that the Syria Mission of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), later carried on by the Presbyterians, hardly figures in the book as a whole. Whereas ABCFM work in Asia Minor is well-documented and discussed at length, there is very little on the work of American missionaries in Syria and Lebanon.

Although based on secondary literature, the book not only provides a wealth of information about the various missionary activities in the Middle East but also incorporates and presents the most recent literature on the topic. By discussing missions in their interrelations with politics, the book indeed fills a gap in mission studies.

—George F. Sabra

George F. Sabra is Professor of Systematic Theology and President of the Near East School of Theology, Beirut, Lebanon.


Derek Peterson’s Ethnic Patriotism and the East African Revival is an important and highly original contribution to the growing scholarship on the East African Revival. While avoiding the reductionism that sees religious movements as thinly veiled political protests, Peterson argues that it was precisely the religious commitments, theological vision, and spiritual passions of the revival that had the most profound social and political impact.

For Peterson, Christian conversion in Africa is a political act. It is a pledge of ultimate allegiance and the launch of a new kind of journey. For many revivalists this allegiance and journey were defined in vernacular versions of Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress, pervasive throughout eastern Africa in the early part of the twentieth century. This kind of literature (along with post offices, bicycles, conventions, and the introduction of bookkeeping) created a new “cosmopolitanism” that transcended the tribalist politics of the region, what Peterson (following John Lonsdale) calls “ethnic patriotism.” The ethnic politician, whose respectability depended on silence about one’s private life, saw the revival’s insistence on public confession as treasonous. In contrast, “converts thought of themselves as pilgrims on the road toward another home” (4). As new pilgrims, “converts offered a contentious reading of their political world . . . . On this political field converts acted as subversives, willfully upsetting the order of tradition” (5).

Peterson weaves his theme of revival cosmopolitanism versus ethnic patriotism through twelve well-crafted chapters. Chapter 3 looks at how southern Ugandan royalist cults established a pattern of political subversion that the revivalists inherited. Chapter 5 explores Tanzanian revivalists who bureaucratized revivalism by applying the new tools of bookkeeping to their souls, thereby charismatizing bureaucracy (contra Weber). Chapter 6 focuses on ethnic patriotism among the Luo, while chapter 10 explores the same among the Mau Mau of Kenya. Chapter 12 provides a final recap of this dialectical tale of pilgrim dissent and ethnic worldliness.

Those looking for specifics about the East Africa Revival’s heroes, spirituality, and theology may want to consult the works of Joe Church, Kevin Ward, and Emma Wildwood. But for those seeking to understand the cultural, eschatological, and political power of revivalism, Peterson’s book is the place to look and will be for a long time to come.

—Mark Shaw

Network Church: A Pentecostal Ecclesiology Shaped by Mission.


The growing importance of Pentecostalism as a global movement is evident in the significant amount of literature that it has generated, particularly within the last decade. A number of the early studies were historical and anthropological. Andy Lord’s Network Church: A Pentecostal Ecclesiology Shaped by Mission stands in continuity with the writings on the movement that are paying attention to core theological issues. This book considers the interface between Pentecostal ecclesiology and missions and very ably dialogues with several leading authors in the area: Amos Yong, Steven Land, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, and Frank Macchia. Their Pentecostal concept of the church serves as a takeoff point for the present work.

Andy Lord’s thesis is that “networks contribute a new structure to Pentecostal ecclesiology enabling a fresh approach to contextualization” (4). Allan Anderson, arguably the leading Pentecostal historian of our time, has pointed out that given the diversities within the movement, it is better to speak of Pentecostalisms. This argument would suggest that there probably cannot be a single Pentecostal ecclesiology. Lord’s book does recognize the diversities but at the same time serves us well by using the shared theological features of the movement as a whole to construct a network ecclesiology with which most mainstream Pentecostal movements can identify (9). Major strengths of this work


Chiefs, Priests, and Praise-Singers is an important contribution to the discussion of volatile issues related to land ownership, chieftaincy, and politics in northern Ghana. MacGaffey’s thought-provoking reassessment focuses on the particular history of the Dagomba people, presenting a regional rather than a dynastic perspective. He admits that his early history is “speculative” (178), but it does provide an analysis of the shortcomings of both colonial anthropology and some received histories that tend to define many northern Ghanaian groups in oppositional terms such as aborigine/immigrant and chief/tindana (earth priest). He uses neglected data especially related to the tindanas to contest the claim that the tindanas were eliminated by conquest in Dagbon. Rather, their role has been increasingly restricted through political processes. He thus shows the dynamic progression of a history “that has always been one of constant movement, a play of ambition, opportunity, exogenous influence, and intrusion” (181).

Drum chants are the carriers of Dagbon tradition, but as history they can be critiqued. They may be presented as “unchanging truth” (68), yet political interests hold to competing traditions.

MacGaffey devotes an entire chapter to discussion of the history of present-day Tamale, painting a picture of a chaotic system of land acquisition and ownership strained by the historical relationships between the tindanas and the chiefs. This account is presented against a backdrop of corruption and violence stirred up by the lack of clearly established processes of land acquisition.

Although this book focuses on a specific regional context, land acquisition and ownership are issues of great concern throughout the African continent. Moreover, the author’s research methodology provides a useful paradigm for researchers of African history.

—Allison M. Howell

Allison M. Howell is Associate Professor and Dean of Accredited Studies at the Akrofi-Christaller Institute of Theology, Culture, and Mission, Akropong-Akuapem, Ghana.
are its recognition of the inseparable relationship between ecclesiology and mission and its Trinitarian approach to the subject from biblical, historical, theological, and mission perspectives.

Mission, Lord notes, “can be seen in terms of the movements of the Spirit that find their origin in the Father and their character shaped by Christ” (29). The Spirit-Word-Community methodology deployed for the study is itself a reflection of the book’s Trinitarian focus. In drawing on the importance of biblical material to demonstrate the significance of networks for contemporary Pentecostal ecclesiology, Lord has given us a new paradigm that will serve the interest of scholars and students of revivalist Christianity. The book’s case could have been strengthened with more attention to how the developing network between Pentecostals of the Global North and those of the Global South also reflects the new ecclesiology discussed in the volume. Despite this lacuna, this is a work well done that deserves attention.

—J. Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu

J. Kwabena Asamoah-Gyadu is the Baëta-Grau Professor of African Christianity and Pentecostal Theology, Trinity Theological Seminary, Legon, Accra, Ghana.

A New History of Christianity in China.


In this comprehensive, concise, and compelling volume, Daniel Bays presents the results of the significant research of the past three decades. He provides both the broad sweep of the history of Chinese Christianity and sufficient detail to make the story interesting. We find a balance, too, between (1) admirably objective discussions of controversial topics and people and (2) the author’s candid comments, all of which must be taken seriously, regardless of one’s point of view.

The narrative traces two major realities: “the basic tension between ‘foreign’ mission and (Chinese) church” and “the always-present instinct of the Chinese state . . . to monitor and control religious movements.” As a result, “Christianity was usually not seen only, indeed not even primarily, as a ‘religion’ or belief system, but as a behavioral phenomenon which could cause endless trouble.” Two major themes arise from this story. One is “the notion that Christianity, when it is separated from its bonding with Western culture in a package we may call ‘Christendom,’ is perfectly capable of adapting to function in different cultural settings.” The other is “the remarkable flexibility and creativity in the Chinese relationship with Christianity (or perhaps ‘Christianities’)” (2).

In every chapter, the development (or demise) of institutional Christianity is woven into the fabric of China’s political and social history, with special attention to the ways in which the foreign flavor of the religion helped or hurt its reception among the people and their leaders. Both Protestants and Roman Catholics receive attention, though Bays mirrors Jean-Pierre Charbonnier’s Christians in China: A.D. 600 to 2000 (Ignatius Press, 2007) in focusing more on the Protestant story after the arrival of Robert Morrison in 1807. An appendix on the Russian Orthodox mission in China concludes the book.

The description of Christianity in China today in the final chapter should be required reading for all who want to understand both wings of Chinese Roman Catholicism, as well as the complex...
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The Poor in Liberation Theology: Pathway to God or Ideological Construct?


Tim Noble studied in Brazil from 1991 to 1994, and today he teaches liberation theology in Prague. The Poor in Liberation Theology is an abridgment of a thesis arising from “a practical frustration which has led to a theoretical questioning” (p. 1):

frustration he experienced with pastoral agents who idolized the poor, leading him to question how the poor might be allowed to be iconic without their being idolized. He examines definitions of the poor in the Bible and in liberation theology as the downtrodden, the victims of unjust structures, and those treated as nonpersons. God’s preferential, not exclusive, love for them is his free choice.

Liberation theologians use the concept of idolatry to describe capitalism. Here Noble draws on the work of Pablo Richard, who finds two understandings of idolatry in the Old Testament: reducing God to the material so as to control his power, and worshiping of false gods (43). The latter appears when we absolutize money, the market, or progress, each of which promises false utopias. Liberation, a utopia, is necessary as the driving force for change, but it must be linked with eschatological hope to avoid becoming an ideology (54).

Noble introduces Emmanuel Levinas’s emphasis on the other, as well as Jean-Luc Marion’s analysis of how concepts can be idolatrour. Levinas critiques ontology where “the other person . . . is not allowed to retain his alterity but is reduced to a version of the ‘I’” (75). Marion warns that we cannot think of God in the sense of comprehending him (89). Finally, Noble argues that Clodovis Boff offers a method that allows the poor to remain other and iconic (150). In each of the three moments of the method—the socioanalytic, the hermeneutical, and the dialectical—he finds safeguards to avoid idolizing the poor. The book is challenging, difficult, and rewarding.

—Neil Collins

Neil Collins is a Columban Missionary. After many years with Basic Christian Communities in Mindanao, Philippines, he is writing the history of the Columbans.

Came Men on Horses: The Conquistador Expeditions of Francisco Vázquez de Coronado and Don Juan de Oñate.


Stan Hoig (1924–2009), a practicing journalist who earned a Ph.D. and taught for many years at the University of Colo-
rado, published more than twenty books on the American West. In *Came Men on Horses* Hoig writes with a journalist’s flair about two of the earliest and most prominent Spanish explorations and attempted settlements of the American Southwest. Hoig establishes a strong narrative as he explores the illusory and often ridiculous dreams that fueled the expeditions; the incredible hardships endured by the soldiers, settlers, and priests; and the almost incomprehensible cruelties inflicted on native populations by all involved. The book is especially valuable in its chronicle of the less well known Oñate attempt to colonize New Mexico. The book, or at least selected chapters, might be used to interest students in all manner of issues surrounding early Spanish explorations and interactions with native peoples.

Scholars of the period and readers of the *IBMR* will probably find the book less useful. The story is familiar to students of the period, and Hoig appears to pitch his argument, insofar as there is a historical argument, at those who might be tempted to see his principals in a “purified, heroic sense,” hardly a temptation for most academics today. Readers of the *IBMR* will be disappointed to find only a very few pages devoted to the work of the priests who accompanied both expeditions and to the religious traditions of the natives. This is, of course, not a criticism of the author, as such was not his intention—just a note to professional readers, who otherwise will enjoy a very well-told story.

—William Svelmoe

William Svelmoe is Associate Professor of American History at Saint Mary’s College, Notre Dame, Indiana.

Conflict in Colonial Sonora: Indians, Priests, and Settlers.


The two works under review continue the valuable borderlands scholarship begun in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by Herbert Eugene Bolton. In *Conflict in Colonial Sonora*, David Yetman describes the “conflicts among three distinct social groups—Indians, religious orders of priests . . . and settlers” (1) in northwestern colonial Mexico, ca. 1640–1770. He offers seven distinct perspectives derived from seven different instances of the ongoing three-sided conflicts, thus moving beyond the usual simple narrative and generalizations or romanticizations that portray settlers as always against Indians, priests consistently for indigenous peoples, and natives perpetually on the side of natives. Instead, he presents a well-argued account of the complex dynamics of Sonoran history in which, for example, some settlers supported Indian rights in opposition to some clerical activities, and missionaries experienced conflicts within and between their orders (Jesuit and Franciscan), as well as difficulties with secular clergy. His argument is based on a large and focused body of primary documents, including letters between priests, legal documents (such as the Tuape Indian suit, which is in the book’s appendix), and written accounts sent back to Spain of town hall meetings.
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The seven themes of the seven chapters, which for the most part are chronologically organized, provide an informative trajectory of the processes that ended with victory for the settlers, expulsion of the Jesuits, and consignment of the indigenous peoples to the hinterlands.

In *Twilight of the Mission Frontier*, Torre Curiel reassesses the long trajectory of general mission decline faced by the northern Franciscan missions in colonial New Spain and later in fledgling Mexico, namely, Sonora, and particularly in the districts of Pimeria Alta and Pimeria Baja. His well-documented study contradicts the general opinion that the increasingly limited resources of the missions prevented the missionaries from continuing to actively engage in the market economy. He contends that the crisis for the missions occurred in the 1820s, when political and local elites struggled over the economic resources after the expulsion of Spanish missionaries. He argues that this decline was exacerbated by the establishment of companies and institutions run by laypeople, as well as by the consolidation of haciendas and villages, which “modified the social function of the missions” (xxviii) and further challenged the central role the missions had played in social and economic organization. Yet, in his reassessment, he discovers that the crisis was “neither pervasive nor irreversible,” nor was it uniform and monolithic during this period of general decline. Indeed, evidence shows, for example, that “the Franciscan missions . . . experienced a conspicuous, though brief, material rebirth and new flourishing” (xviii), and that some missions even became independent, self-sustaining agricultural communities. He demonstrates that the frontier region and localized areas acted differently, as also did the missionaries and local laypeople, to meet the local needs and problems of the time, thus furthering scholarship about the region’s diversity in economic and missionary activities, as well as in demographic, cultural, and institutional factors. This densely footnoted study is supported by a solid bibliography, significant employment of primary and secondary works, and copious presentation of tables and figures of hard data in the closing chapters.

These two studies are well-written, sequential social histories of the northern mission territories of late colonial New Spain and early post-Independence Mexico. In their discussions of the relationships among indigenous peoples, missionaries, and settlers, *Conflict* is narrative and juridical in its approach, while *Twilight* is quantitative and economic—although the data occasionally break the narrative. These publications are appropriate for graduate-level seminars and beneficial for specialists and others interested in the period and subject. Together, they offer a nuanced and thoughtful temporal sweep of the Sonoran region from 1640 to 1855.

—David Orique

David Orique, O.P., is Assistant Professor of Latin American, Early Modern Iberian, and Atlantic World History at Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island.

---

*The White Fathers in Colonial Africa (1919–1939).*


In this work Francis Nolan, a member of the Society of the Missionaries of Africa, or the White Fathers, narrates the story of the missionary order founded in 1868 by Charles Cardinal Lavigerie. The focus of the book is the period between the
twentieth century’s two world wars, but Nolan does a commendable job of providing background on the order’s history before this era and then foreshadowing the fate of the order at the end of the colonial period.

The White Fathers in Colonial Africa is at once a historical and a biographical study. The White Fathers attracted a good many men with a desire to lead and to evangelize. There were too many for Nolan to characterize in any comprehensive fashion, so he organizes his account first by geographic region and then through brief biographies of the men chosen to lead the order’s evangelical initiatives. Initially, the White Fathers’ mission stations were heavily concentrated among Muslim peoples conquered by the French in Mediterranean Africa and along Africa’s West Coast. In those areas the White Fathers tried various strategies aimed at growing Christian communities, but without much success. Perhaps the greatest importance of the mission’s presence in these regions was its emergence as a buffer between indigenous peoples and the representatives of the French colonial state.

The order eventually turned to missionizing in the Congo River basin in Central Africa and in the lake regions of East Africa. In these areas their fortunes prospered. Their first mission stations were established only in the 1890s, yet by the 1920s the missionaries were ordaining African priests to serve African Catholic communities. As Nolan discusses in his last chapters, the rapid conversion of Africans to Christianity in Central and East Africa pushed education, especially education of the clergy, to the forefront of mission concerns. It was the success of the White Fathers in solving the problems associated with clerical formation that underlay the success of the order in these regions of Africa.

—Andrew E. Barnes

Andrew E. Barnes is an associate professor of history at Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, where he teaches the history of Christianity and writes on the history of Christian missions in colonial Africa.

Together in One Mission: Pentecostal Cooperation in World Evangelization.


This book grabs the reader by the heartstrings, extuding unbridled enthusiasm for mission and unapologetic commitment to winning the world for Jesus Christ. It not only exhibits the passion of the writers for mission as the heart of Christianity but also reveals their experiences and thoughtful reflections on the planning and execution, prospects and provenance, and partnerships and pioneering endeavors of Pentecostal worldwide mission.

The book offers a collection of essays by twenty-seven missionaries, pastors, and scholars dedicated to world evangelization. Each of them offers missiological and theological insights on the involvement of the Pentecostal and Charismatic movements in global mission. Coming from various continents and backgrounds, they reveal the commitment of Pentecostals to mission as exemplified in their deeds, sacrifices, struggles, and words. Not only are Pentecostals committed to mission, but also they are committed in collaboration and partnerships with one another.

A sense of urgency and compassion permeates most of the chapters. Yes, today Pentecostals are involved in development projects in mission fields; they are not as...
otherworldly as in the past, but they are still passionately committed to winning souls before the second coming of Christ. This commitment is behind their sense of urgency and fuels their compassion to take as many people to heaven as possible. For them, time is running out. At least, this much one gets from reading this compilation of honest reflections of persons engaged in mission and mission studies. The reflections are crafted in ways that will inspire others and that can serve as blueprints for those interested in going into mission fields.

All these good qualities notwithstanding, this book is not the right place to look for intellectually rigorous discussion of mission. It is a book of testimonies—therein lies both its strength and its weakness.

—Nimi Wariboko

Nimi Wariboko is the Katherine B. Stuart Professor of Christian Ethics, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

---

**Building God’s Kingdom: Norwegian Missionaries in Highland Madagascar, 1866–1903.**


The role of the Norwegian Mission Society (NMS) in Protestant history in Madagascar cannot be overstated, but scholarly English-language resources to study this history remain scarce. Therefore, Karina Hestad Skeie’s *Building God’s Kingdom* makes an important contribution. Skeie includes historic perspectives, both Malagasy and Norwegian, and careful analysis of a key moment in this history: the failed attempt toward self-governance of Malagasy Lutherans at the turn of the twentieth century. She illuminates very well the relationship of missionaries and Malagasy and how power has operated in mission work.

Skeie grew up in Madagascar, the child of missionary parents. Her native fluency in Norwegian and her knowledge of Merina Malagasy prove invaluable. Her analysis of what it meant to be in mission work in Madagascar in the nineteenth century and of how this work was approached from Norway and particularly by the NMS is essential.

Skeie’s examination of indigenous efforts to form a synod and the diverse responses from Norwegian missionaries and NMS headquarters staff is helpful.

The question of whether to praise God for signs of the Gospel taking hold or to punish Malagasy church leaders for taking agency becomes evident in the book’s study of diaries, letters, meeting reports, and published accounts. Important back stories are outlined. The NMS need to maintain interest and support at home through starting new mission work in China, which produced a need for existing missions to become financially self-sufficient; the pressure from French colonial authorities on Malagasy and missionary alike; and an emerging Malagasy sense of call to start something truly indigenous and Christian are all surveyed. This volume provides a window on many of the key issues confronting nineteenth-century missionaries as they endeavored to build God’s realm in Madagascar and elsewhere.

—Cynthia Holder Rich


---

**Peacebuilding, Power, and Politics in Africa.**


*Peacebuilding, Power, and Politics in Africa* is the result of collaboration between the Centre of African Studies (Univ. of Cambridge) and the Centre for Conflict Resolution (Cape Town). It contains fifteen chapters that offer critical reflection on the peacebuilding process in Africa. Because of the variety of origins of the contributors, we receive diverse perspectives on the subject.
In the introduction, Devon Curtis, one of the editors, stresses the idea that the understanding of peacebuilding in Africa goes beyond Western capitals and U.N. corridors (3) as he focuses on the important role of a multitude of actors. Noticing the interaction among these actors is crucial for understanding issues like mediation, governance, security, and disarmament. Local and regional agencies are thus essential in this multifaceted and complex process. Nevertheless, as Curtis points out, “It is impossible to separate ‘local’ from ‘international’ in Africa” (16), for they are part of the same interconnected network. The other editor, Gwinyayi A. Dzinesa, studies the case of Southern Africa, centered in Namibia, Angola, and Mozambique, three of the last territories to be under colonial rule and which were places of long-lasting civil wars.

The volume is divided in three parts. The first, “Peacebuilding: Themes and Debates,” explores issues such as statebuilding and governance. Part 2, “Institutions and Ideologies,” focuses on the role of international and regional institutions acting as peacebuilding actors: the United Nations, the World Bank, the African Union, and the International Criminal Court. The final part shows the importance of analyzing specific historical processes in understanding the complexity of peacebuilding strategies and accomplishments in Africa.

—Hugo Gonçalves Dores

Hugo Gonçalves Dores is a Portuguese Ph.D. candidate (University of Lisbon and Catholic University of Portugal) preparing a thesis entitled “The Missionary Question in the Portuguese Empire in Africa (1885–1926).”

The Mission of the Portuguese Augustinians to Persia and Beyond (1602–1747).


Studies abound of various Catholic orders involved in mission, but this volume addresses an important and under-researched area. The Mission of the Portuguese Augustinians to Persia and Beyond opens space for reflection on a little-known group and its mission ventures in Asia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The book’s ten chapters are packed with information on the Augustinian order and its mission to Persia. The only criticism may be that the studies sometimes suffer from too much detail individually and too little cohesion with one another. The first five chapters explore the Augustinian presence in the Persian capital of Isfahan, a topic worthy of a book in itself. John Flannery locates this mission within the larger history of the Portuguese Padroado, which placed “ecclesiastical patronage in the hands of the Portuguese monarchs” (9), lasting in one form or another until 1999, when Macao shifted from Portuguese to Chinese rule.

Chapters 6–10 include a focus on Augustinian contacts with Armenian Christianity, Catholic missions to the Mandaeans of Iraq, Augustinian jurisdiction issues in Basra, the Augustinian mission to Georgia, and a valuable final chapter of reflections on the mission’s relationship with political power and methods. Each of chapters 6–9 could be expanded to become a monograph on its own.

In the final chapter, the author mentions that a key purpose of the book is to show “the complex interaction of religion and politics” (241). This complexity deeply affected the mission results achieved by the Augustinians, which among Muslims were few and far between. Their frustration may have lent an “added impetus to their founding of missions in Georgia, and among the Mandaeans of Basra” (245).

Flannery offers important reflections on a little-known mission. His work, spanning almost 150 years, creates an appetite for more volumes expanding on the themes he treats.

—Steve Cochrane

Steve Cochrane has served with YWAM for the past thirty-four years, with twenty-six years based in India. He is presently finishing a Ph.D. in Christian-Muslim relations through the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies.
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