Missiology after "Mission"?

John Roxborogh

> Missiology acts as a gadfly in the house of theology, creating unrest and resisting complacency, opposing every ecclesiastical impulse to self-preservation, every desire to stay where we are, every inclination toward provincialism and parochialism, every fragmentation of humanity into regional or sectional blocs. . . .
>
> Missiology's task, furthermore, is critically to accompany the missionary enterprise, to scrutinize its foundations, its aims, attitude, message and methods—not from the safe distance of an onlooker, but in a spirit of co-responsibility and service to the church of Christ.
>
> —David Bosch, *Transforming Mission*

One effect of the success of the theological project to place mission at the center of the church's self-understanding has been that the language of mission has gained currency across the theological disciplines and in the life of many churches. This affirmation of the missionary nature of the church has had its own theological dynamic as well as being encouraged by missiology, by the domestication of missiology in the language of missional churches, and by the role missiology earlier played in debates over social action and evangelism. Though the language of mission is widely invoked, however, it seems to me that its currency is not secure. If people tire of hearing about mission, as they may well do, or if frustration arises when the undifferentiated invocation of mission solves neither the problems of the world nor those of the church, what will be the future of missiology? What might missiology *after* mission look like?[1]

The theological imperative for Christian mission, certainly, and the need to reflect critically on what that means remain, whether the word "mission" is popular or not. Long-standing questions, however, about the relationship of missiology to theology and to the practice of mission require attention if the discipline is to survive and thrive as an arena in which necessary discussions about the life of the church in society can take place. In today's world the audience for missiology and mission studies also lies in the public square, within the secular university, and among people of other faiths. Missiology competes with ethics, theology, and history as a creative space for addressing the issues of the day. It competes with other disciplines in secular environments as an open environment for critical analysis of what Christians are doing and have done in the world.

In discussing the place of missiology in the theology curriculum, David Bosch noted that "the basic problem . . . was not with what *missiology* was but with what *mission* was."[2] Yet this aspect of the problem was actually an asset. In the second half of the twentieth century, missiology benefited from being concerned with subjects that were hotly debated. People looked to missiology to provide support for one view or another: social justice and evangelism, ecumenism and outreach, mission agencies and missionary-minded churches, a moratorium on missionaries, issues of inculturation, contextualization and syncretism, evangelism or dialogue, and relationships with people of other faiths. It was when those differences appeared to have been largely resolved—or ownership of their resolution shifted to others—that further thought about the genius of missiology again became urgent. Despite its achievements, the formal study of Christian mission can still feel itself under threat.

As long as mission raised issues churches wanted addressed, some difficulties could be ignored that again need to be faced. The place of missiology in the seminary is one. Bosch noted that the historical division of theology into biblical studies, systematic theology, church history, and practical theology, allowed no self-evident place for a subject that championed the intentions of God, the purpose of the church, and the challenges of engaging with culture and religion. Problems of definition and the structuring of knowledge and learning, however, are common to all academic disciplines. As missions gained support, the option of creating specialist teaching positions at least gave a voice to missiology, whatever these theoretical issues. But once either major issues surrounding mission were believed to be clearly understood or mission became simply an accepted dimension of theological disciplines in general, the presence of specialist missiologists was no longer a felt need. Since it is an aim of missiologists to be clearly understood and to encourage the acceptance of a mission dimension in other theological specializations, the discipline's demise might be seen as just the inevitable result of success.

Yet the sense is that the lack of renewal of teaching positions in missiology and mission studies is not about success at all, but rather of failure. That the missionary dimension of the theological disciplines has good theological warrant is recognized, but in practice a shared understanding about what a missionary dimension actually required others to do differently has been difficult. In my own experience, when colleagues in biblical studies and theology set students the same questions as I did in mission studies, I was not sure whether to rejoice at the affirmation of mission or to feel redundant. When disciplines are differentiated, they need also to be connected—and some issues, like this one, just need to be worked through, acknowledging the perspectives brought by different disciplines and the differing life experiences of the teachers involved, including the characteristically multicultural context out of which missiologists operate.

Another difficulty is psychological. The impression that missiologists exist to tell other people what they ought to be doing is difficult to avoid. A range of evangelistic temptations, from arrogance to quietism, apply also to missiology in its witness to its own place in the world. These temptations are problems which missiology is expected to know something about. The self-understanding Bosch articulates may be inspiring for those who identify with missiology, but it is difficult to believe that gadflies should expect to feel welcome anywhere much. Maybe some personalities fit the gadfly persona quite well, but—whatever may be said about humility and service—having a desire to "critically . . . accompany the missionary enterprise" is a hard sell if one wants to win friends with mission practitioners, never mind many theologians.

But the answer does not lie in denying the truth in Bosch's

John Roxborogh has taught history and missions in Malaysia and New Zealand and is an honorary fellow at the Department of Theology and Religion of the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. He is a life member of the International Association for Mission Studies.

—john@roxborogh.com

gadfly metaphor, for that is the nature of the case. Still, the problem is real enough. The importance of missiology for Christian mission lies in its theological mandate and cultural perspective, but those who practice it have to take a measure of responsibility for its place in the life of the church, the seminary, and the university and to do their part to build the bridges of trust and respect which make conversation possible. Missiology needs to demonstrate its significance, including in places where churches are uncertain of their role in the face of cultural and political change or see themselves as threatened minorities. When conflicts in the church focus hopes and fears around competing visions of mission, missiology may again have the role of helping people understand the large scope of God's concerns. The discipline's future is likely to relate to some of the successes with which it may be historically linked, as well as to challenges it faces, but like Christian witness generally, those successes may have less to do with theological mandates than with an ability to demonstrate humility and respect for others as well as competence in what we claim to offer.

Missiology: A Success Story?

The past half century, at least, has seen consistent efforts to restore the centrality of mission in the church's thinking and to establish missiology and mission studies as respectable academic disciplines. In 1952 the Willingen meeting of the International Missionary Council found in the formulation of *missio Dei* an answer to the problem of the theological location of mission. If mission was understood as outreach across frontiers, should it be located in the agencies or in the being of the church, or somewhere else? By locating mission in the nature of God rather than the activity of the church, Willingen managed to solve, theologically if not practically, the problem of where responsibility for mission lay.

The formulation has proven robust. It is now difficult to conceive of any other foundational theological statement about Christian mission. And simply on the scale of being useful, *missio Dei* rates highly. The solutions it facilitated addressed dichotomies between social and evangelistic dimensions of mission that had appeared enduring, and its reception across denominational divides has been extraordinary. It provides Catholics and Orthodox, as well as conciliar, Pentecostal, and evangelical Protestants, with significant missiological language in common. The scope of valid Christian mission is now seen to be bounded only by the range of interests God has been revealed as having in the world.

Fears that—upon the integration in 1961 of the International Missionary Council with the World Council of Churches (WCC)—mission would be swallowed up by church may not have been realized, but assumptions about what constitutes mission were quickly and strongly challenged. But by the time *Transforming Mission*, David Bosch's magnum opus, appeared in 1991, at least a formal Trinitarian theological basis of mission found a common voice across Protestant and Catholic traditions, though differences of emphasis and pockets of hostility remained.

In 1972 the International Association for Mission Studies (IAMS) and in 1973 the American Society of Missiology (ASM) came into being to provide open and committed communities of scholarship. Both entities represented a cordial and scarcely restrained joy of discovery across liberal, evangelical, and Catholic divides. The emphasis on respectful exchange of views rather than negotiated conformity contributed to an emerging consensus.[3] The tools of a respectable international academic discipline were gradually put in place with these associations, their journals, and an expanding range of serious publications.[4] Mission studies provided models of critical analysis that were less likely to be marked by idealized piety or guarded defensiveness and gave permission to explore the complexities of cultural and religious interaction. When books like Barbara Kingsolver's *Poisonwood Bible* (1998) and critical studies of Christianity and colonialism later appeared, they were seen as essential texts rather than dangerous literature.

The contrasts, while they lasted, in missiological emphasis and in missionary and political vision between mainline and evangelical Protestants, as reflected in the WCC and the Lausanne movement, helped to fuel the study of missiology and its overlapping parallel, mission studies. People looked to missiology to provide the answers they wanted.

As denominations in the West struggled, missiology promised answers to the question of what we needed to do: help critique church growth and promote church renewal, ensure that social action is based more on theology than on politics, claim the identity of being missionary by our very nature, wrestle with our understanding of other faiths so that respect and evangelism go together. Missiology seemed equipped to develop theologies of religions and the distinctions needed if struggles with syncretism and contextualization were to deal with real dilemmas, not unspeakable foes. Missiologists could help mission agencies adjust their policies to the new demographic of Christianity as a non-Western religion.

The past half century has seen consistent efforts to restore the centrality of mission in the church's thinking.

In 1992 James Scherer and Stephen Bevans introduced the first of their three volumes *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization* with an overview "Statements on Mission and Evangelization, 1974–1991."[5] The end date of 1991 was easy to explain—it was close to the present and the year of David Bosch's *Transforming Mission*. But why 1974? One possibility is that that was the year of the International Congress on World Evangelization, held at Lausanne. The Lausanne Covenant may have needed updating virtually from the time of its drafting and the consensus behind its formulation may have been fragile, but it remains one of the core influential missiological statements of the twentieth century.[6]

In the aftermath of Lausanne, numbers of evangelical and conciliar missiologists worked to resolve the differences in perspective of their traditions. In the early 1980s some still saw the contrast as a crisis, yet a decade later the degree of accommodation between the polarizations of social action and evangelism was astonishing.[7] In *Transforming Mission* Bosch documented both: on the one hand, the starkness of the contrast in 1980 between the Melbourne meeting of the WCC Conference on World Mission and Evangelism and the Lausanne Consultation in Pattaya, and on the other hand, the terms of an emerging ecumenical paradigm evident in the CWME's San Antonio meeting in 1989 and that of Lausanne in Manila, also in 1989. Were the parallels to the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War just coincidence?[8]

If that much had been achieved, the theology of religions was

still a challenge and the story of global Christianity remained to be corrected by the inclusion of parts of the world with which missiologists could claim some familiarity. Treatment of many ethical and theological issues required intercultural skills that others appeared to lack. Someone was required to facilitate meeting with the people of other faiths who migrated to the West. Those who taught missiology could feel useful, and they could also point to a number of success stories:

- Whatever the frustrations, missiology had facilitated dialogue between mission theory and mission practice, giving value to the ideal of "reflective practitioners."
- Missiology had contributed to breaking down the polarization between social action and evangelism.
- Missiology had encouraged cognate disciplines to ask missiological questions, for example, biblical studies reading the Bible as a missionary text needing to be read in a missionary context—even if the relationships between Bible and mission and between theology and mission remained complex.
- Missiology had encouraged Christian anthropology and seen a reduction in tension between missionaries and anthropologists.
- Missiology had faced the flaws in the theology of church growth, while allowing its questions and concerns to continue to stimulate.[9]
- Missiology had helped to ensure that religious studies and interreligious dialogue were grounded in the experience of lived religious traditions.

Missiology under Threat?

Alongside the degree of recognition that missiology has enjoyed, however, are some worrying signs. If the rhetoric of mission has grown stronger, it can also appear fragile. Should the popular or scholarly use of the language of mission falter, what would happen to missiology? Can there be missiology after mission?

Problems and anxieties. I see a number of concerns. I am not sure that the resolution of the fears of 1961 about mission being swallowed up by church have not landed us with the converse problem of the church being swallowed up by mission. Familiarity with the language of mission makes everyone an expert, and it may also breed contempt. Missiologists may find they are no longer wanted even if they are still needed. The debates around which a generation of missiologists garnered their energy, learned their trade, and proved their worth do not generate much excitement anymore. Contextualization, a missiological child of the 1970s and earlier championed, has proved difficult at home and abroad and has in places been disregarded by those it was intended to help in their quest for cultural authenticity. Yet its relevance in every culture has never been greater. Despite promising exceptions, it is also not clear where the next generation of missiologists with firsthand cross-cultural experience is coming from. Can our inherited curricula allow contemporary interest in lived religion and popular culture, including digital culture, to be translated into missiological discourse?

All these theologies have a place at the table, but missiology might be better placed than it sometimes feels to broker a conversation of equals.

Redrawn maps of global Christianity continue to struggle to find a place around the theological table for all major cultural blocks to participate as full partners. Theologically, we seem to have moved successively from Western hegemonies, to black, feminist, and Latin American liberation theology, to a choice between reinvigorated Western theologies and an African, hence non-Western, paradigm for all. Asia's theological voices seem, despite a strong heritage, to need a new generation of creativity. Oceania is problematic—called on to illustrate other people's theories about what ought to be going on and uncertain how to do justice to its Polynesian, Melanesian, and European narratives. All these theologies have places at the table of our understanding of God, and missiology might be better placed than it sometimes feels to broker a conversation of equals.

Some of the recurring anxieties that surfaced at IAMS conferences I attended from 1988 to 2012 as well as at a number of ASM meetings during the 1990s seemed to me to have less to do with a prevailing concern for the theology of religions than with anxieties about a different set of "others"—that is, our fellow colleagues in the mission enterprise. Conversations easily turned to such points as the following:

- How can we convince colleagues in the academy and seminary that mission is God's and therefore is the most important topic in the curriculum and deserving of better resources? How do we establish and maintain the idea that missiology is a scientific discipline?
- What part can we play in the missionary reanimation of the church, convincing it that it should live up to its identity and should reinvigorate its missionary commitment? What role do we have in helping all the players understand that the indices of missionary commitment have profoundly changed?
- How can we convince missionary pragmatists and mission agencies that there are missiological questions they ought to be thinking about?
- How do we convince theologians that mission is "the mother of theology" without appearing to be wanting to tell them what to do?
- How do we sustain a creative relationship between theology and praxis?

The need for definition. Despite its importance, and the measure of consensus about mission, reaching an agreed-upon definition for missiology has been an elusive goal. In 1987, at the meeting of the Association of Professors of Mission, James Scherer noted that "those of us who teach and do research in this area need closer agreement on what missiology is [in order] to be able to pursue our goals in a collegial manner given both the interdisciplinary nature of our subject and the interconfessional stance we have purposely adopted."[10]

Historically, Europeans have sought to make the study of missions a science in order to gain academic recognition—and this has proved important to missiology generally—yet neither the American Society of Missiology, founded in 1973, nor its journal, *Missiology*, ventured to define "missiology," other than

to indicate that it included practically anything of interest or relevance to mission, itself undefined.

In 1978 Johannes Verkuyl related missiology to "the study of the salvation activities of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit throughout the world" and traced its development through a detailed historical and bibliographical survey.[11] Missiology was complementary to all the theological disciplines, but its perspective was global and its emphasis distinctive. Alan Tippett, the first editor of *Missiology*, was more concerned to allow contributors to define their own terms and asked readers to respect that freedom.[12] In 1999 Laurent Ramambason proposed that missiology should be defined by the activity of those who were seen to be doing mission, which grounded missiology in the lives of actual people and the reality of praxis even if he like others left Christian mission itself undefined.[13] Scherer's writings and Jan Jongeneel's ongoing concern to establish the elements of missiology that can properly be called academic, however, have helped bring some rigor to the task.[14]

I myself find it helpful to also consider some simple working statements, even if a full treatment is anything but simple. Tippett's invitation in the first issue of *Missiology* noted earlier is important. Accepting the dynamic nature of language as do scholars generally and acting in the midst of the context and range of options of our work, we have both to survey the field and to take responsibility for our own view of the situation. The statements below are unremarkable, except that I am concerned to define the term mission as a concept before addressing its usage in relation to the church outside of itself. I use the phrase "outside of itself" to signal a distinction between valid internal foci of the church and external ones, however intimately these are connected. We have to navigate the double sense of the word "mission," applying both to specific areas and tasks and also to overall purposes. Like Andrew Kirk I understand that the mission of the church "encompasses everything that Jesus sends his people into the world to do." It, however, "does not include everything the church does or everything God does in the world."[15] Hence I wish to affirm that the church does have a missionary nature without saying that mission outside of ourselves is God's only purpose for the church.

- As a concept, the idea of mission refers to a particular purpose, task, or responsibility as well as to an overall purpose. By extension it can refer to a means by which the task is carried out.
- The purpose of the church "this side of heaven" includes worship, community, and Christian mission.
- In discussion of God's purposes for the church, Christian mission primarily refers to the purpose of the church outside of its own community.
- Missiology is the study of Christian mission and the issues that arise through commitment to it across and within the cultures of the world. It includes the theology that gives rise to mission, the effect of mission on theological understanding, and the interconnectedness of mission with other dimensions of the life of the church.
- Mission studies take their focus from the critical study of Christian mission in society and history, including its social and cultural effects.

Mission and the church? Andrew Walls has highlighted the importance of mission studies for theology and church history if the church is to understand how it got to be where it is today.[16] His argument is as prescient today as ever, though the "structural problems" he refers to seem to lie more in a failure of other disciplines to recognize the scope and implications of missiology than in problems internal to mission studies itself. A theological appreciation of the importance of mission is not the same thing as coming to terms with its intercultural implications and its relativization of the Western tradition.

At the same time, efforts to champion an overriding sense of God's purpose for the church run the risk of theologically overstating the role of mission in the life and nature of the church. Such efforts can complicate relationships with other disciplines

There is a lot of room between being "merely an outpost" and being part of every aspect of the entire theological enterprise.

in the theological academy, while failing to achieve the aim of energizing churches that are preoccupied with liturgy, morality, and politics—if not finance and survival. I cannot see a sustainable commitment to mission that is not rooted in worship, and I cannot see sustainable worship that does not pay attention to liturgy. I can see a church tired of being driven by a missionary identity it does not comprehend or feel inspired to fathom. Mission is a grace inspired by love, not a burden imposed by some sort of theological or semantic accident.

Independence or integration? The desire to integrate missiology with other theological disciplines takes theology seriously, but it may blur the contribution that each has to make to our overall understanding of the mind and purposes of God. Relationship and integration are not the same thing. Bosch considers the integration model to be theologically preferable to independence or to being subsumed under an existing discipline, but he recognizes that other disciplines do not understand what it is about missiology that they are expected to incorporate.[17] Bernhard Ott is one who has worked through what a mission-centered curriculum might look like, having in view an institution that places a high value on training for mission.[18] More recently John Corrie's *Dictionary of Mission Theology* also places a high value on integrating mission and theology:

> Missiology should not be seen merely as an outpost of theological investigation, compartmentalized in the curriculum and tacked on alongside biblical theology, hermeneutics, ecclesiology and so on. It is rather that all theology is intrinsically missiological since it concerns the God of mission and the mission of God. This means that all theological categories are inherently missiological and all missionary categories are profoundly theological.[19]

It seems to me there are problems here as well as fine intentions. There is a lot of room to move between being "merely . . . an outpost" and being part of every aspect of the entire theological enterprise. Are those the only alternatives, or is this an instance of Bosch's gadfly in action? Do we not also say in missiology that truth is discovered on the edge, in liminal positions, in places of dissonance and discontinuity? Journeys of integration are not the only ones to be on in the mission of the church, and mis-

siology is not the only theological discipline able to contribute to an integrated vision of theological formation for churches, faculties, and individuals. In any case, does integration really bring us closer to the ideal that missiology is looking for, or does it create a different problem—a loss of distinction between valid theological subdisciplines?

James Scherer regarded the attempt to correlate missiology to every "discipline in the theological encyclopedia, not to mention the social sciences," to be *a priori* self-defeating. "Missiology must find a way to be holistic, integrative, inclusive, and complementary to human learning without becoming *exhaustive*."[20] Categorization and the formulation of distinctions may be overdone, but the principles of rational analysis are not of themselves an Enlightenment failure. In fact, they are a necessary task if we are to talk meaningfully about anything. Though missiology often reminds the church of the importance of what goes on at the margins, it should not be a mere outpost of theology—but neither should any other dimension of theological thought be disconnected from the whole.

Conclusion

Can there be missiology in a context where interest in mission appears to have faltered? Absolutely, though it may require addressing some questions of failure on the part of missiology and not just of the church. Did missiology overreach itself by its claims for mission to be about what was central to the will of God and the nature of the church? Possibly, but it was a risk that had to be taken. Are we tarnished by a shift from church growth as concern for lost people to schemes for the salvation of the church presented under the guise of concern for saving the world? Maybe, but they go together and we too are concerned for the church not just the world. Have statements such as "the only reason for gathering the church is mission" failed to make space for our need for prayer and driven away commitment to Christian outreach more than they have inspired a new generation?[21] Possibly, but there are situations where the spirituality of the church is not in question as much as its commitment to mission.

The validity of missiology continues to lie in the validity of mission, in the importance of the questions it addresses, and in the intercultural perspectives it brings to the issues of the day. In a sense, missiology has to believe in itself even when others may not. Being under threat is hardly new in its history. Whatever its context, however, missiological witness to God's mission, like direct witness to Christ, never ceases to need to earn the right to speak.

Notes

1. In meetings of the American Society of Missiology and through the pages of *Missiology*, *International Bulletin of Missionary Research*, and elsewhere, others have been reflecting on the nature of missiology and its future. This article is a contribution to these ongoing conversations. An earlier version was presented as John Roxborogh, "From Edinburgh 1910 to Edinburgh 2010—Witnessing to Christ Today: Perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand" (ANZAMS Symposium, Laidlaw College, October 30–31, 2009).
2. David Jacobus Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1991), 492.
3. J. Samuel Escobar, "Mission Studies—Past, Present, and Future," *Missiology* 24, no. 1 (1996): 3–29.
4. Gerald H. Anderson, "Thirty Books That Most Influenced My Understanding of Christian Mission," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 33, no. 4 (October 2009): 200–201.
5. James A. Scherer and Stephen B. Bevans, eds., *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization* (Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1992), xv.
6. Alister Chapman, "Evangelical International Relations in the Post-Colonial World: The Lausanne Movement and the Challenge of Diversity, 1974–89," *Missiology* 37, no. 3 (2009): 355–68.
7. Richard G. Hutcheson, "Crisis in Overseas Mission: Shall We Leave It to the Independents?," *Christian Century*, March 18, 1981, pp. 290–96.
8. Klaus Koschorke, ed., *Falling Walls: The Year 1989/90 as a Turning Point in the History of World Christianity* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009).
9. See, for example, C. René Padilla, "The Unity of the Church and the Homogeneous Unit Principle," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 6, no. 1 (January 1982): 23–31.
10. James A. Scherer, "Missiology as a Discipline and What It Includes," in Scherer and Bevans, *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization*, 175.
11. Johannes Verkuyl, *Contemporary Missiology: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 5, 6–88.
12. Alan Tippett, "Missiology: 'For Such a Time as This!'" *Missiology* 1, no. 1 (1973): 17.
13. Laurent W. Ramambason, *Missiology: Its Subject-Matter and Method; A Study of Mission-Doers in Madagascar* (New York: P. Lang, 1999).
14. James A. Scherer, "Missiology," in *Encyclopedia of Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 3:553–57; and Jan A. B. Jongeneel, "Is Missiology an Academic Discipline?," *Transformation* 15, no. 3 (1998): 27–32.
15. J. Andrew Kirk, "Missiology," in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, J. I. Packer (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 435.
16. Andrew F. Walls, "Structural Problems in Mission Studies," *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 15, no. 4 (October 1991): 146–55.
17. Bosch, *Transforming Mission*, 492.
18. Bernhard Ott, "Mission and Theological Education," *Transformation* 18, no. 2 (2001): 87–98. See also Stephen Bevans's reflection on the process of curriculum development at Chicago Theological Union: "Theological Education for a World Church," *Australian eJournal of Theology* 4, no. 1 (2005): 1–12, http://aejt.com.au/2005/vol_4_no_1_2005/?article=395526.
19. John Corrie, Samuel Escobar, and Wilbert R. Shenk, eds., *Dictionary of Mission Theology: Evangelical Foundations* (Nottingham, Eng.: InterVarsity Press, 2007), xv.
20. Scherer, "Missiology as a Discipline," in Scherer and Bevans, *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization*, 180.
21. Ogbu U. Kalu and Alaine M. Low, eds., *Interpreting Contemporary Christianity: Global Processes and Local Identities* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

Guidelines for Contributors

Guidelines for contributors to the International Bulletin of Missionary Research can be found online at www.internationalbulletin.org/node/377. The *IBMR* publishes original articles and reviews of analysis and reflection upon the Christian world mission. Articles previously published in print or online will not be accepted.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.