

**SYNCRETISM
AND
SOCIAL PARADIGMS**

[E.M.S. Annual Publication]

SYNCRETISM AND SOCIAL PARADIGMS

Paul G. Hiebert

Our vision is to see the Kingdom of God come on earth as it is in heaven. Our mission is to manifest and make known the King and his kingdom to the world, particularly to those people who have not heard of it, and to invite them to become followers of Jesus Christ as their Lord. To carry out our mission we need to understand both the Kingdom of God and humans.

In the past we have focused our attention on the message, the Good News of the Gospel. This is essential, for without a message, we have no mission. We exegete the Bible carefully, and formulate our systematic and biblical theologies precisely. We preach sermons based on Scripture, and teach Christians to study the Bible.

Missions has made us increasingly aware of the need to study humans as well. Too often we come with a good message, but little understanding of the people. Consequently, the Gospel, as we present it, makes little sense to the people, or they see it as foreign. Early missionaries realized they had to learn new languages and translate Bible. Most assumed that people in different cultures live in the same world, but use different labels to speak of it. Consequently translations were literal. One simply found linguistic equivalents for the biblical words, adjusted the grammar, and the translations would be accurate. Similarly, worship forms, rituals such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, concepts of sin, and theology could be translated literally with little loss of meaning.

Over the years, as missionaries studied languages more deeply, they came to realize that people in different cultures do not live in the same world using different labels, they live in different worlds. Languages and cultures not only create different categories in ordering their

worlds, they organize these at deeper levels in radically different ways. Putting the Gospel in human contexts not only involves Bible translation that goes deeper than literal equivalences, it involves conceptualizing rituals, ecclesiology, beliefs and even theology in terms of different categories, logics and worldviews. Moreover, if, as evangelicals, we believe that ordinary people should learn to read and study the Scripture for themselves, we must allow Christians in other cultures to take the lead in conceptualizing the Gospel in their settings. Donald Shultz writes,

The time is also past when Western theologians had all the “definitive answers.” Asian theologians now bear the responsibility and willingly accept it. The latter have discovered that Western definitive answers do not automatically fit the Asian situation and often answer questions not asked in Asia (1989, 23).

The study of humans raises difficult questions which we cannot avoid (Kirk and Vanhoozer 1999, Ramachandra 1999). How can we put the Gospel in human contexts and avoid cultural relativism? How can we work towards the unity of the Church when people and their societies are so different? How do we take into account the fact that not only are young Christians in sociocultural contexts, so, too, are we as missionaries and sending churches. Moreover, God’s revelation to humans as recorded in Scripture was give in specific sociocultural and historical contexts. We must ask, therefore, to what extent are our Christian ways and theologies shaped by Scripture and to what extent by our cultures, and what are the social, economic, political and legal dimensions in our relationships with the people we serve. We must also ask what in Scripture is divine revelation, and what relates to the social and cultural context of its times.

The answer to these questions is not to only study Scripture and reject the study of humans for fear of losing the Gospel, nor is it to study humans and lose sight of the Gospel. It is

keep in mind that we have been entrusted with God's revelation, made known in human history and definitively manifested in Jesus Christ as recorded in the Bible, but we understand the Gospel as humans in social, cultural, personal and historical contexts. Our understanding of revelation is always partial, and shaped by our contexts. Therefore we dare not equate our theologies fully with divine revelation. On the other hand, by careful study of Scripture and our human contexts we can understand the Gospel more fully. We may see through glasses darkly, but we can see enough to become followers of Jesus Christ as our Lord and King.

Studying Humans

To study humans we need theoretical frameworks. Just as systematic theologians draw on western philosophy, and biblical theologians draws on western history for the questions they ask, the data they examine and the methods they use, so missionaries often draw on western human sciences, notably chemistry and biology (for example in modern medicine, relief and development), psychology (in counseling), sociology (in social work), and anthropology (in Bible translation and contextualization). Christian missionaries need to be aware of the insights these various disciplines can offer. The study of anthropology is of critical importance because it deals with many of the same issues that missionaries do (Hiebert 1978). It takes a global perspective, not simply a western one. It studies and compares different social and cultural systems around the world, wrestles with the questions of fundamental human differences—of Others and Otherness, and seeks to understand what it means to be humans.

Like academic studies, including biblical and systematic theologies, anthropology began as a western discipline (Barnard 2000). Over the past hundred years, anthropologists have

developed different theories to understand humans, and, in varying degrees, missionaries have drawn on their insights to translate the Bible, and to understand the people they serve. Like other western disciplines, these theories have cast light on the understanding of humans, but they are also culturally situated, and so have their limitations and biases.¹

One of the first theories to emerge was biological and cultural evolution, a secular deviation from the Biblical story. It affirmed that meaning is found in a grand meta-narrative moving from simple beginnings to the complex present day human world and ending, hopefully, in an earthly utopia. It held that ‘man’ not God, is the measure of all things. In western missions, the influence of the theory of evolution was seen in beliefs in ‘progress’ and the church’s responsibility to bring the Kingdom of God to earth—the kingdom defined in terms of human well being. But the great wars of the twentieth century, and the increase in injustice, oppression and evil undermined the vision of cultural evolution.

A second theory to emerge in anthropology was British Structural Functionalism which compared social systems around the world,² such families, clans, tribes, and peasant societies. This helped us see that social systems are real and powerful—societies are not simply gatherings

¹ The same is true for Systematic and Biblical theologies. To say that the ones we use were developed in western sociocultural contexts is not to say that they are totally culturally shaped, wrong or relative. They do offer us deep and true insights into the deep structure and story of the Scriptures. However, their use of digital intrinsic categories, and abstract algorithmic logic has led them to divorce Truth from Beauty and Holiness (the cognitive from the affective and evaluative dimensions of culture), and to reduce worship and divine mysteries to philosophical categories and logic. Their perspective of outside observation rather than participants in the scene, often led theology to be the knowledge of truth, but not lives that lived out the Gospel.

² Many of the studies were done by British anthropologists in British colonies, often to help British administrators institute indirect rule through local governmental structures.

of individuals. It also showed us that humans organize their societies in very different ways, and gave us ways to compare social systems. These insights have important implications for missions. For example, polygamy in the west is seen as sin, but in other societies it is regarded as honorable, while anger, which is often tolerated in the west, is seen as a greater evil for it breaks the harmony of the community. In the west we expect individuals to make personal decisions to follow Christ, but in many parts of the world important decisions are made by the significant groups to which people belong—their families, or lineages. We translate the Bible, but we rarely think of conceptualizing ecclesiologies. Anglicans ordain bishops, Presbyterians appoint presbyteries and synods, and free churches hold elections, even if these forms of leadership cause confusion in societies where these are foreign.³

While social anthropology is important in the study of people, it has its limitations and distortions. It is often reductionist and linear in causality, explaining human realities basically in terms of social systems. For example, religions are seen as important to keep groups together, but they are not ‘true’ in any ontological sense. In its early stages it focused attention on small societies, and examined them as closed systems, largely unaffected by outside factors. Consequently, it had difficulties in understanding larger, complex societies, such as cities, and global systems. Social anthropology also saw societies as harmonious organic wholes, and change as bad. There was no place for oppression, injustice and human sinfulness. Consequently,

³ For example, in rural South India, when elections were introduced in the churches, Christians learned that who ever had the most votes won, so candidates brought their relatives and friends, Christian and non-Christian, to church business meetings Church politics became village politics. When told that only Christian members of the church could vote, they argued that they didn’t want to drive non-Christians away by rejecting them.

missionaries were often castigated for changing cultures. Furthermore, in social anthropology there was no place for God and spiritual realities. Finally, early social anthropologists saw themselves as objective scientists analyzing humans using scientific categories, methods and logic. They were not in the scenes they described, nor did they see themselves as socially and culturally shaped. What the people thought, at first, was unimportant. What the scientist said was true. Shaped by the enlightenment, it placed humans at the center of reality

Over time, social anthropologists, such as Malinowski, realized the importance of understand how the people they studied looked at the world (emic perspectives), and to differentiate between insider and outsider views or reality. This insight challenged the old belief that scientists are totally objective observers unaffected their own social and cultural contexts.

In North America, anthropologists often studied the Native Americans who had been overrun by white settlers and placed on reservations. They could not understand the Native Americans without taking history, outside forces and change into account. Moreover, while the social systems of the Native Americans had been radically altered, the Native Americans maintained a sense of cultural identity, even in the most difficult and oppressive situations.

Like other scientists of the time, American anthropologists came as outsiders, confident that their scientific categories and methods produced objective truth. They focused their attention on cultures as closed harmonious cognitive systems that explained and gave meaning to their lives, but did not see change as always evil. Consequently, anthropology was increasingly used in programs for advocating the rights of Native Americans, for human development, and in missions. Moreover, they became aware of the importance of seeing the world as the people did, and of their own cultural context and its shaping of their anthropological reflections.

Cultural anthropologists helped us in mission to understand the reality and power of cultural systems, including languages and other sign systems, patterns of behavior, rituals and myths, beliefs and worldviews. This has helped us move beyond literal Bible translations to dynamic equivalence translations sensitive to cultural differences. It has also made us aware of the need to contextualize worship services and rituals, and, more recently, local theologies, and to engage worldviews.

Cultural anthropology, too, had its distortions. It had a linear causality and reduced everything to cultural explanations. Moreover, those who used Saussurian semiotics saw cultures as essentially subjective—the arbitrary creations of human societies (Barnard 2000, 120-138). Consequently, all cultures are relative. None can stand in judgment of another. In this view there is no external objective Truth, and even if there is, it can only be known subjectively.⁴ Secular cultural anthropology, moreover, had no place in its assumptions and categories for God or spiritual realities. Consequently, it did not take the ontological claims of religions seriously, and claimed a privileged stance, as a science, on the assessment of reality.

Marxist anthropology stressed the importance of a grand meta-narrative, the evils of oppression and exploitation in human social systems, and the need for transforming not only

⁴Ferdinand de Saussure argued that signs, such as words, do not point to external objective realities, but refer to subjective categories in people's minds. Consequently, in Bible translation, what is important is that 'meanings' are communicated in other cultures using dynamic equivalents. In contrast, Charles Peirce argued that signs are triadic. The word does refer to external objective realities and links these to images in the mind. Thus, the word "tree" refers to real trees and links these to images in the minds of the people. Therefore signs link objective realities to subjective perceptions. A Peircian approach to Bible translation would take both the subjective and the objective dimensions of signs, perceptions and meanings seriously. It would not totally reject the need for dynamic equivalence, but would limit this by keeping the objective nature of the message.

individuals but also whole social systems. It's solution was revolution, by violence if need be. But it could not guarantee that the new social order would be any less repressive than the old. It, too, had no place for God and spiritual realities, nor for personal and corporate redemption.

More recently, symbolic anthropology has made us aware of the power and importance of nondiscursive signs,⁵ myths⁶ and rituals in communicating deeper truths, feelings and judgments about reality as it is seen by the people involved (Turner 1969). These insights have great significance for missions, particularly as they seek to contextualize the Gospel in the worship and life of a community of believers, but we must go further and ask what is the Gospel that we are seeking to communicate and validate by these cultural means.

In recent years some anthropologists such as Clifford Geertz (1988) argue that anthropology is the study of humans, and that humans cannot be reduced to purely objective scientific observation. Anthropology is more like the humanities in that it seeks to understand what is going on inside humans, and that involves the methods of hermeneutics. This is a move away from objective materialism to the "communication of lived-through experiences (Harries-Jones 1985, 234). This helps us avoid reducing humans to purely objects and machines, and calls for us to enter into their lives and worlds, and the relate to them as humans to humans.

At the end of the twentieth century anthropologists, such as Peter Harries-Jones (1985:224-248), challenged the very assumptions of the mid-twentieth-century approach to the

⁵ Signs that point to realities that are beyond description using discursive signs such as words, that evoke the deepest feelings, and that embody the fundamental values—understandings of righteousness and sin, of a culture.

⁶ Defined, not as fable, but in the technical sense as the meta-narrative believed to be true, by which we understand the cosmic story of reality.

study of humans, and provided a rationale and point to the direction which anthropology should take in the twenty-first century. Jacob Loewen writes,

Harries-Jones observes that in the past anthropologists who enjoyed the hospitality of a people over a period of months or years usually wrote an ethnography as a return “gift.” They wrote it, however, in the language and intellectual categories of the researcher’s culture, not of the host culture. These researchers “piously” hoped for a “trickle-down” effect. That is, as more Westerners learned more about these exotic peoples, benefits from the academic industrialized world would trickle down to the former host society. This, says Harries-Jones, never happened! In fact, the anthropologists’ work often exposed these societies to exploitation by the Western industrialized world (1992, 42).

Harries-Jones notes that anthropological research is based on the assumption of an exchange of communication between human equals of two different cultures. In fact anthropologists saw the local people mainly as “informants,” and “objects” to be studied, “as a mine whose product was extracted for export to the Western academic community (Harries-Jones 1985, 227, Loewen 1992, 47). Rarely is there a genuine two-way exchange of information and beliefs to discover reality. Moreover, ethnographic studies carry no commitment of responsibility on the part of the anthropologist.

Harries-Jones and others (Anderson 1985, 45-48, Maybury-Lewis 1985, 136-148) point out that the day of moral neutrality is over. Knowledge is used by the participants in the social, economic and political arenas of life. In the past, anthropologists have interpreted others from the point of view of western culture. Today they must also interpret the point of local peoples to those in power. Harries-Jones argues that anthropology can no longer be taught as an objective morally neutral description of culture. “[C]ultural knowledge carries with it responsibilities to facilitate mutually beneficial interaction between different social and racial groups (Loewen 1992, 48).” Consequently anthropologists must be advocates helping minority communities cope

with the impact of majority cultures in a rapidly changing world (1985, 225).

Jacob Loewen notes (1992, 48) that on the whole missionaries have been less guilty than anthropologists of exploiting the societies they studied. They stayed, and sought to serve the people they learned to know. However, some missionaries collaborated with colonial governments—at least in the eyes of the local people, and even now many see ethnographic knowledge, not as a way of building deep mutual relationships, but as useful tools for carrying out their own agendas more efficiently. In missions we must now ask what do young churches have to teach sending churches, how can we, as missionaries, be advocates of our adopted churches to those in the West, and how can churches around the world join as fully equal partners in missions to a lost world (Loewen 1991, 49)?

There are many other anthropological, sociological, psychological, biological and historical theories that can help us understand different aspects of human beings. These which have been discussed are given only as illustrations of how human studies can help us understand our mission task better, and bear witness to the Gospel more effectively among peoples who have not heard it. Many of these theories can help us understand certain aspects of human life, but all of them need to be critiqued anthropologically. No one of these is fully adequate in helping us understand humans. Like in medicine, physics and other disciplines, further research may help us develop better models. But, as Christians we must also evaluate them from the perspective of a biblical worldview as best we understand it through a careful study of Scripture.⁷

⁷ The same is true in our use of philosophical and historical models and methods. Western systematic theology contributes much to our understanding of the structure of a biblical worldview, but also distorts the gospel in other ways. For example, in its search for objectivity, it has divorced cognition from affectivity and evaluation—truth from beauty and holiness. And its use of digital intrinsic categories has reduced salvation to a personal state, not a relationship, and

Understanding the Gospel in Human Contexts

How can we understand the Gospel when we live in particular human contexts? We need to study Scripture to understand and bear witness to the Gospel, but studying Scripture alone does not help us see our sociocultural biases, and often leads to a failure in missions to communicate that Gospel so that the people understand and believe. We need to study humans to understand ourselves and others, and to communicate accurately, but studying humans alone leaves us with no Gospel to share. We need both—to study divine revelation and human contexts, and we need to communicate that revelation in ways that remain true to it, and are understood by people. Failure to do so leads to syncretisms in which the truth of the Gospel is lost and the people go astray.

How can we communicate the Gospel in human contexts? First, it is important to note that our understandings of the Scriptures are limited by our humanness. We must not equate our theological reflections on revelation with a full and final understanding of revelation itself. Moreover, to understand complex realities we must use different theories or maps which complement one another on the essentials, but focus on different aspects of reality.⁸ For example, to understand humans we can look at them as physical, biological, psychological, social, cultural and spiritual systems. While each of these adds insights to our understandings, none is the whole. On the other hand, taken together in a ‘system of systems’ view we begin to

divorced justification from sanctification.

⁸ Complementarity is an essential part of a critical realist epistemology (Hiebert 1999). For a discussion of the theory of complementarity see D. M. MacKay, Complementarity in scientific and theological thinking. *Zygon* 9 (September 1974): 225-44.

understand them more fully. This means that we need to work together as a hermeneutical community to gain a more comprehensive knowledge of the truth.

Second, we must keep in mind that our interpretations are shaped by our social, cultural, psychological and historical contexts. This is not to say that they are totally subjective or necessarily wrong. But, like glasses, they color how we see things. By studying these carefully, we can begin to see our particular perspectives, and grow in our knowledge of and obedience to the Gospel.

Third, God starts with us where we are, but our knowledge of him and the Gospel should keep growing. Conversion is to turn to follow Christ, but throughout life we must keep following more closely. We must not split justification from sanctification.

Fourth, it is important to remember that God revealed himself in Scripture in particular human contexts. That does not reduce the Gospel to particularities, or relativize it. Rather, we must seek to understand what God's revelation in those contexts has to say to us today in our contexts, and, indeed, for all humans everywhere and in all times.

Finally, we must seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit in our studies. Reason, in its many forms, is important, but it is the Holy Spirit that reveals to us through Scripture mysteries that transcend human knowledge.

In seeking to understand Scripture and to guard against the limitations and falsehoods of our cultures and societies, we need a meta-theology,⁹ a transcultural framework that guides us in doing theology in different human contexts (Hiebert 1994). This has four steps. First, we need

⁹ The preface *meta* is used as Douglas Hofstadter uses it, as a position above two or more systems of the same level (*Godel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Braid* [New York: Random House, 1980]. For further discussion see Hiebert 1994, 87).

to study Scripture as the accurate, divinely inspired history of God's revelation to humans and let it shape our thinking (Pannenberg 1968 , Morrison 2004). In doing so, we need to allow for different methods of analysis, in part because each throws light on certain aspects of Scripture but overlooks others, and in part because young churches around the world use their own philosophical methods in studying the Bible.¹⁰ For example, modern Systematic Theology uses the western philosophical methods which use digital intrinsic categories, and abstract linear algorithmic logic to understand the underlying structure of Reality. Eastern Orthodox theologians use tropological logic and nondiscursive signs such as icons to speak about truths that cannot be reduced to words (Halebian 2005). Indian theologians may use extrinsic, analogical categories and theologians in other cultures may use concrete functional logic (Luria 1976) in seeking to understand the Scriptures. Biblical theologians use the methods of history to understand the unfolding story of God's cosmic mission. Like different maps, these may be complementary if they are based on the texts, and do not contradict one another in fundamental ways.

It is important to use not only philosophical and historical methods in the study of scripture. To do so is to focus on truth (cognitive dimension of knowledge), and to divorce it from beauty (affective dimension) and holiness (evaluative dimension). We need truth, but unless it moves and transforms us, it remains lifeless. The Gospel must be understood as a whole, as truth, beauty, and holiness, and it must be lived out in daily life. We need also to do theological reflection liturgically—as leading to and as an essential part of our worship of God.

¹⁰ For a discussion of categories and rational systems see Luria 1976, Wilson 1970, and Hiebert 1994..

The second step is to study humans in their contexts. Local church leaders and missionaries lead the church in *uncritically* study the local culture—gathering and analyzing the traditional beliefs and customs associated with the critical questions the church is facing using their local emic perspectives and worldview. If at this point, the missionaries show criticism of the customary beliefs and practices, the people will not talk to them freely for fear of being condemned, and we only drive the old ways underground.

In studying humans in the contexts, it is also important to study the context of the missionary or outsider participating in the study, seeing to understand their emic perspectives and worldviews to help separate the Gospel from their particular cultural viewpoints. This includes examining the worldviews behind modern theology and modern science.

Having studied both inside and outside views of the issues at hand, it is important to develop a metacultural framework to compare and evaluate these various perspectives. This framework is not itself a full culture, but a translating grid that enables participants in one culture to begin to understand other cultural perspectives. The formation of this framework is critical in building bridges of understanding, and all parties to the conversation must be heard. Each must agree that their views have been truly understood by outsiders as best as can be done in outside etic terms. It is here that anthropology can be of help, because it has sought to develop ways of translating and comparing social and cultural systems. Its frameworks are imperfect, and an ongoing dialogue between spokespersons for different cultures must continue in the construction of a metacultural framework.

The third step is for the people corporately to critically evaluate their own beliefs and practices in the light of their new biblical understandings, and to make decisions regarding their

responses to their new-found truths. The gospel is not simply information to be communicated. It is a message to which the people must respond. Moreover, it is not enough that the leaders be convinced that changes are needed. They may share their convictions and point out the consequences of various decisions, but they and their people must together make and enforce decisions arrived at corporately. Only then will there be little likelihood of old beliefs and practices going underground and subverting the Gospel.

To involve people in evaluating their own culture in the light of new truth draws on their strength. ‘They know their old culture better than does the missionary, and are in a better position to critique it and live transformed lives, once they have biblical instruction. Moreover, their involvement to grow spiritually through learning discernment and applying scriptural teachings to their own lives. The priesthood of believers works in practice in a hermeneutical community.

Checks against Syncretism

What checks help us in this process of doing missional theology (Ti  nou and Hiebert 2005) to guard against? It is important to remember that all our Christian understandings and life are in human contexts, and therefore partial. This does not mean they are necessarily wrong, but we need to be humble in our stance and to seek unity in the church “so that through the church the wisdom of God in its rich variety might be made known . . .”(Eph. 3:10, 4:1-3). But there is always the danger when we put the Gospel in human contexts that the essence of the Gospel be so distorted that it loses its message. God also starts with us where we are and reveals himself to us more fully as we grow in the knowledge of our Lord. In one sense syncretism is a message

that has lost the heart of the Gospel. In another sense, it is moving in the wrong direction, away from a fuller knowledge of the Gospel.

The checks against both types of syncretisms lie in the metatheology we use in doing our theological reflections in life. We need to take the Bible seriously as the rule of faith and life. This may seem obvious, but we must constantly remind ourselves that biblical revelation is the standard against which our beliefs and practices must be measured. We need to recognize the work of the Holy Spirit in the lives of all believers open to God's leading. The church must act as a hermeneutical community seeking to understand God's word to it in its particular contexts. The priesthood of believers is not a license for theological "Lone-Rangerism." We need Christians from other cultures for they often see how our cultural biases have limited or distorted our interpretations of the "Scriptures. This corporate nature of the church as a community of interpretation extends not only to the church in every culture, but also to the church in all ages. Through this community hermeneutics we seek a growing understanding, if not agreement, on key theological issues that can help us test our theologies and our practices. This will be an ongoing process in which the church constantly engages itself seeking to understand what the lordship of Christ and the Kingdom of God on earth are about.

References Cited

Bernard, Alan. 2000. *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press

Haleblian, Krikor G. 2004. "Art, theology and contextualization: the Armenian Orthodox experience." *Missiology: An International Review*. 3 (July):309-335.

Harries-Jones, Peter. 1985. "From cultural translator to advocate: changing circles of interpretation." In *Advocacy and Anthropology: First Encounters*. ed. Robert Paine. St. Johns: Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Hiebert, Paul G. 1978. "Missions and anthropology: a love/hate relationship." *Missiology*. 6 (April):165-189.

_____. 1994. *Anthropological Reflections on Missiological Issues*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

_____. 1999. *Missiological Implications of Epistemological Shifts: Affirming Truth in a Modern/Postmodern World*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Kirk, J.; Andrew and Kevin J. Vanhoozer, eds. 1999. *To Stake a Claim: Mission and the Western Crisis of Knowledge*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Laudin, Larry. 1996. *Beyond Positivism and Relativism: Theory, Method and Evidence*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Loewen, Jacob. 1992. "What is happening in anthropology? An example for missionaries and mission boards." *Mission Focus*. 20m (September): 47 - 50.

Luria, Aleksandr R. 1976. *Cognitive Development: Its Cultural and Social Foundations*. Trans. M. Lopez-Morillas and I. Solotaroff. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Mayberry-Lewis, David. 1985. "Brazilian Indianist policy: some lessons from the Shavarite Project." In *Native Peoples and Economic Development: Six Case Studies from Latin America*. ed. Theodore Macdonald. Cambridge: Cultural Survival Occasional Paper No. 16.

Morrison, John. 2004 "Barth, Barthians and Evangelicals: Reassessing the question of the relations of Holy Scripture and the Word of God." *Trinity Journal*. 25 (Fall): 187-213.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart, ed. 1968. *Revelation as History: A Proposal for a More Open Less Authoritarian View of an Important Theological Concept*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Ramachandra, Vinoth. 1999. *Faiths in Conflict? Christian Integrity in a Multicultural World*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Schultz, Donald L. 1989. *Developing an Asian Evangelical Theology*. Metro Manila: Mandalyjyong

Turner, Harold. 1969. *The Ritual Process*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Wilson, Bryan R. ed. 1970. *Rationality*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

From: Gailyn Van Rheenen <rheenen@bible.acu.edu>
To: Gailyn Van Rheenen <gailyn@missionaliving.org>, Dudley Woodbury <dudley@pactec.net>, Paul Hiebert <phiebert@juno.com>, phiebert@tiu.edu, Strauss Steve <steve.strauss@sim.org>, Bob Priest <rpriest@tiu.edu>, David J Hesselgrave <djhesselgrave@juno.com>, A Scott Moreau <a.s.moreau@wheaton.edu>, Larry Poston <Larry.Poston@nyack.edu>, Eric Moeller <moellerej@mail.ctsfw.edu>, Edwin Zehner <zehner1234@aol.com>, How Chuang Chua <ChuaHowChuang@omf.net>, William Larkin <WLarkin@ciu.edu>, "J. Nelson Jennings" <njennings@covenantseminary.edu>, Cristian Barbosu <caeline1997@yahoo.com>, "Drs. David & Cynthia Strong" <dstrong@simpsonca.edu>, cstrong@simpsonca.edu, Ron Stansell <rstansell@georgefox.edu>, Gareth Lee Cockerill <gcockerill@wbs.edu>, Douglas Wilson <drdoug@free.umobile.edu>
Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 18:22:22 -0500
Subject: Guidelines for EMS Papers

Colleagues,

Warm greetings in the name of Jesus. I anticipate hearing your presentations at the upcoming Triennial Meeting of EMS/IFMA/EFMA. Because this is a Triennial meeting, you have a great opportunity to influence many mission leaders and practitioners. I also anticipate including many of your presentations in the 2005 EMS volume on syncretism.

In this email I would like to suggest some format guidelines to facilitate editing and publication. I am indebted to Scott Moreau and Norm Allison for many of these guidelines, which I believe, will heighten readability and provide impact and significance to future missionaries and current mission leaders who read the book.

1) Please send me a copy of your manuscript in MicroSoft Word, if at all possible, shortly after the Triennial meeting at <vanrheeng@acu.edu> and copy it to <gailyn@missionaliving.org>. Please meet with me personally about your paper while we are still in St. Louis, if you have the time. I would like to help you fine-tune content and formatting.

2) Photocopy your paper for the participants in your class. Photocopying at the hotel is very expensive. I would suggest 75-100 copies per presentation. If you cannot afford to photocopy this number of papers, please email me at <vanrheeng@acu.edu> with a copy to Norm Allison at <nallison@tfc.edu>.

3) Use parenthetical notes which are used in most, but not all, of the EMS series. Make entries consistent with the following: (Hesselgrave 1991, 85).

4) Please include your "Works Cited" at the end of your chapter. I will then work to integrate these references into a comprehensive bibliography for the book.

5) Include 4-6 study questions at the end of your chapter.

6) Supply sidebars and vignettes to your manuscript. Scott writes that there are three types of such items. The first two listed below are best placed in a text box so that they are easy to locate. The last one is titled as "Case Study" and placed at the end of the chapter.

a) Mini-sidebars: These are short quotes that are not part of the text but that illustrate the text. You will see them throughout the *Introducing World Mission* text, and you'll see how they are formatted there. In your draft, indicate them as "mini-sidebars". Use 2-5 of these per chapter.

b) Sidebars: These are more substantive items and are numbered sequentially in the chapter (you can refer to each in an appropriate spot in the chapter text). They can be summaries of positions in controversies (e.g., the Rites Controversy, the debates over Carey's "means"), introduction to or synopsis of or outline of the thinking of a particular person or group on mission (deNobili, Lull, Taylor, Praying Hyde, a WCC or Lausanne statement or segment of such a statement, etc), presentations of significant issues (e.g., the Reformers view of the Great Commission), and so on. Each of these should have 1 to 3 questions for reflection and/or discussion. Again, look to *Introducing World Missions* for examples. You may also use 2-5 of these per chapter.

c) Case studies: these can be dilemmas from history, or primary documents (translated to English where necessary) WCC, Catholic, Lausanne, WEA type of statement or position) from missions history if the latter, please add 1-3 questions for reflection and so on.

- b. Avoid reading the paper word for word. Highlight salient points of the paper.
 - c. Leave approximately 15 minutes for questions or small groups.
 - d. Certain papers will have respondents.
 - e. Provide copies for participants or at least an email address where copies may be obtained (number of copies needed should be provided by Regional VPs).
3. Submitting the paper for publication in the annual volume:
- a. You will have a brief time to make changes before returning the paper electronically to the Program Chair.
 - b. Send an electronic version of the paper to the Program Chair, who will forward it to the editor(s).

I hope these guidelines are beneficial. I anticipate working with you closely in facilitating the program with Norm Allison and in editing the 2005 text on syncretism.

May God richly bless you in preparation for the EMS/IFMA/EFMA Triennial.

Because of His mercies,

Gailyn

Dr. Gailyn Van Rheenen
Director, Mission Alive
Adjunct Professor, Abilene Christian University

Email: <vanrheeneng@acu.edu>

Web Sites: <www.missiology.org>; <www.missionalive.org>

Telephone: (972) 939-4337 (home); (972) 754-9693 (cell)

4207 Meadow Ridge Drive
Carrollton, TX 75010
USA

Mission Alive
P.O. Box 117575
Carrollton, TX 75011

7) Note the following format for bibliographic entries:

Book:

Barna, George. 1991. *What Americans Believe: An Annual Survey of Values and Religious Views in the United States*. Ventura, Calif.: Regal.

Journal article:

Befus, David. 2002. "Kingdom Business: A New Frontier in Missions." *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 38 (April): 204-09.

Chapter in book:

Barna, LaRay M. 1982. "Stumbling Blocks in Intercultural Communication." In *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, 3rd ed., ed. Richard E. Porter and Larry A. Samovar, 322-30. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.

Web page/article:

Barber, Benjamin R. 1992. "Jihad Vs. McWorld." *The Atlantic Monthly Digital Edition*. Online: <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/foreign/barberf.htm>. [cited 1 July, 2002].

EDWM or other dictionary/encyclopedia article:

Athyal, Sakhi. 2000. *Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions*, ed. A. Scott Moreau, s.v. "Third World Women." Grand Rapids: Baker.

Note: states are abbreviated, publishers' names omit "publishing company" and similar entries. Pay special attention to the online references; the "cited" date is the date you browse the page to ensure it is actually online it can be the most recent date rather than when you actually wrote your citation. Once again, I am thankful to Scott Moreau for these illustrations.

The following "official" EMS Guidelines will amplify what I have said.

EMS Guidelines for Papers

The goal of the EMS is for members and friends to write, present, and have published quality papers that will increase our collective understanding of, and passion for God and missions. The best of the papers will be published in the annual volume, as there is room (current limitation is 250 pages).

While some papers may be included in the volume that were not delivered at Regional Conferences, most will work their way through the Regionals to the National level (though some papers at this level may not have been presented at Regionals). Below are some brief guidelines for writers of these papers.

1. Writing the paper:

- a. Missiology integrates history, theology, the social sciences, and strategies. As far as possible, papers should weave these four threads throughout the paper, supported by a strong bibliography.
- b. Write out the paper in its entirety. No outlines will be accepted.
- c. APA citation style is preferred (parenthetical footnotes with endnotes)
- d. Submit by required dates so respondents have time for reflection.

2. Delivering the paper:

- a. Use visuals: overheads, PowerPoint, etc.

From: Gailyn Van Rheenen <vanrheeneng@acu.edu>
To: Paul Hiebert <phiebert@juno.com>, Paul Hiebert <phiebert@tiu.edu>
Date: Sun, 23 Jan 2005 18:38:20 -0600
Subject: Chapter for the Syncretism Text

Dear Paul,

Warm greetings in the name of Jesus. I hope all is well with you. I enjoyed being with you both in Abilene during the "Focus on Missions" seminar in which you collaborated with Monte and again at the national meeting of the EMS. I am editing the chapters for the syncretism text and wonder if you have been able to work on the chapter on "Syncretism and Social Paradigms." I think this will be one of the most significant chapters of the text, once completed. Do you think you could get that chapter to me within the near future.

For the sake of His kingdom,

Gailyn

Dr. Gailyn Van Rheenen
Director, Mission Alive
Adjunct Professor, Abilene Christian University

Email: <vanrheeneng@acu.edu>
Web Sites: <www.missiology.org>; <www.missionalive.org>

Telephone: (972) 939-4337 (home); (972) 754-9693 (cell)

4207 Meadow Ridge Drive
Carrollton, TX 75010
USA

Mission Alive
P.O. Box 117575
Carrollton, TX 75011

Sent Thu 7, 2005

From: Gailyn Van Rheenen <rheenen@bible.acu.edu>
To: Gailyn Van Rheenen <gailyn@missionaliving.org>, Dudley Woodbury <dudley@pactec.net>, Paul Hiebert <phiebert@juno.com>, phiebert@tiu.edu, Strauss Steve <steve.strauss@sim.org>, Bob Priest <rpriest@tiu.edu>, David J Hesselgrave <djhesselgrave@juno.com>, A Scott Moreau <a.s.moreau@wheaton.edu>, Larry Poston <Larry.Poston@nyack.edu>, Eric Moeller <moellerej@mail.ctsfw.edu>, Edwin Zehner <zehner1234@aol.com>, How Chuang Chua <ChuaHowChuang@omf.net>, William Larkin <WLarkin@ciu.edu>, "J. Nelson Jennings" <njennings@covenantseminary.edu>, Cristian Barbosu <caeline1997@yahoo.com>, "Drs. David & Cynthia Strong" <dstrong@simpsonca.edu>, cstrong@simpsonca.edu, Ron Stansell <rstanell@georgefox.edu>, Gareth Lee Cockerill <gcockerill@wbs.edu>, Douglas Wilson <drdoug@free.umobile.edu>
Date: Fri, 13 Aug 2004 18:22:22 -0500
Subject: Guidelines for EMS Papers

Colleagues,

Warm greetings in the name of Jesus. I anticipate hearing your presentations at the upcoming Triennial Meeting of EMS/IFMA/EFMA. Because this is a Triennial meeting, you have a great opportunity to influence many mission leaders and practitioners. I also anticipate including many of your presentations in the 2005 EMS volume on syncretism.

In this email I would like to suggest some format guidelines to facilitate editing and publication. I am indebted to Scott Moreau and Norm Allison for many of these guidelines, which I believe, will heighten readability and provide impact and significance to future missionaries and current mission leaders who read the book.

- 1) Please send me a copy of your manuscript in MicroSoft Word, if at all possible, shortly after the Triennial meeting at <vanrheeng@acu.edu> and copy it to <gailyn@missionaliving.org>. Please meet with me personally about your paper while we are still in St. Louis, if you have the time. I would like to help you fine-tune content and formatting.
- 2) Photocopy your paper for the participants in your class. Photocopying at the hotel is very expensive. I would suggest 75-100 copies per presentation. If you cannot afford to photocopy this number of papers, please email me at <vanrheeng@acu.edu> with a copy to Norm Allison at <nallison@tfc.edu>.
- 3) Use parenthetical notes which are used in most, but not all, of the EMS series. Make entries consistent with the following: (Hesselgrave 1991, 85).
- 4) Please include your "Works Cited" at the end of your chapter. I will then work to integrate these references into a comprehensive bibliography for the book.
- 5) Include 4-6 study questions at the end of your chapter.
- 6) Supply sidebars and vignettes to your manuscript. Scott writes that there are three types of such items. The first two listed below are best placed in a text box so that they are easy to locate. The last one is titled as "Case Study" and placed at the end of the chapter.
 - a) Mini-sidebars: These are short quotes that are not part of the text but that illustrate the text. You will see them throughout the Introducing World Mission text, and you'll see how they are formatted there. In your draft, indicate them as "mini-sidebars". Use 2-5 of these per chapter.
 - b) Sidebars: These are more substantive items and are numbered sequentially in the chapter (you can refer to each in an appropriate spot in the chapter text). They can be summaries of positions in controversies (e.g., the Rites Controversy, the debates over Carey's "means"), introduction to or synopsis of or outline of the thinking of a particular person or group on mission (deNobili, Lull, Taylor, Praying Hyde, a WCC or Lausanne statement or segment of such a statement, etc), presentations of significant issues (e.g., the Reformers view of the Great Commission), and so on. Each of these should have 1 to 3 questions for reflection and/or discussion. Again, look to Introducing World Missions for examples. You may also use 2-5 of these per chapter.
 - c) Case studies: these can be dilemmas from history, or primary documents (translated to English where necessary) WCC, Catholic, Lausanne, WEA type of statement or position) from missions history if the latter, please add 1-3 questions for reflection and so on.

- b. Avoid reading the paper word for word. Highlight salient points of the paper.
 - c. Leave approximately 15 minutes for questions or small groups.
 - d. Certain papers will have respondents.
 - e. Provide copies for participants or at least an email address where copies may be obtained (number of copies needed should be provided by Regional VPs).
3. Submitting the paper for publication in the annual volume:
- a. You will have a brief time to make changes before returning the paper electronically to the Program Chair.
 - b. Send an electronic version of the paper to the Program Chair, who will forward it to the editor(s).

I hope these guidelines are beneficial. I anticipate working with you closely in facilitating the program with Norm Allison and in editing the 2005 text on syncretism.

May God richly bless you in preparation for the EMS/IFMA/EFMA Triennial.

Because of His mercies,

Gailyn

Dr. Gailyn Van Rheenen
Director, Mission Alive
Adjunct Professor, Abilene Christian University

Email: <vanrheeneng@acu.edu>
Web Sites: <www.missiology.org>; <www.missionalive.org>

Telephone: (972) 939-4337 (home); (972) 754-9693 (cell)

4207 Meadow Ridge Drive
Carrollton, TX 75010
USA

Mission Alive
P.O. Box 117575
Carrollton, TX 75011

7) Note the following format for bibliographic entries:

Book:

Barna, George. 1991. *What Americans Believe: An Annual Survey of Values and Religious Views in the United States*. Ventura, Calif.: Regal.

Journal article:

Befus, David. 2002. "Kingdom Business: A New Frontier in Missions." *Evangelical Missions Quarterly* 38 (April): 204-09.

Chapter in book:

Barna, LaRay M. 1982. "Stumbling Blocks in Intercultural Communication." In *Intercultural Communication: A Reader*, 3rd ed., ed. Richard E. Porter and Larry A. Samovar, 322-30. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.

Web page/article:

Barber, Benjamin R. 1992. "Jihad Vs. McWorld." *The Atlantic Monthly Digital Edition*. Online: <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/foreign/barberf.htm>. [cited 1 July, 2002].

EDWM or other dictionary/encyclopedia article:

Athyal, Sakhi. 2000. *Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions*, ed. A. Scott Moreau, s.v. "Third World Women." Grand Rapids: Baker.

Note: states are abbreviated, publishers' names omit "publishing company" and similar entries. Pay special attention to the online references; the "cited" date is the date you browse the page to ensure it is actually online it can be the most recent date rather than when you actually wrote your citation. Once again, I am thankful to Scott Moreau for these illustrations.

The following "official" EMS Guidelines will amplify what I have said.

EMS Guidelines for Papers

The goal of the EMS is for members and friends to write, present, and have published quality papers that will increase our collective understanding of, and passion for God and missions. The best of the papers will be published in the annual volume, as there is room (current limitation is 250 pages).

While some papers may be included in the volume that were not delivered at Regional Conferences, most will work their way through the Regionals to the National level (though some papers at this level may not have been presented at Regionals). Below are some brief guidelines for writers of these papers.

1. Writing the paper:

- a. Missiology integrates history, theology, the social sciences, and strategies. As far as possible, papers should weave these four threads throughout the paper, supported by a strong bibliography.
- b. Write out the paper in its entirety. No outlines will be accepted.
- c. APA citation style is preferred (parenthetical footnotes with endnotes)
- d. Submit by required dates so respondents have time for reflection.

2. Delivering the paper:

- a. Use visuals: overheads, PowerPoint, etc.